



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES MAY 2020

The GT conservation team received 120 new cases in England during May, 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, 45 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Bridge Farm, Bristol	Avon	E20/0100	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Request for a Screening Opinion as to whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is required for a residential development with associated communal facilities, productive gardens, new vehicular and pedestrian accesses, on site car and cycle parking provision and landscaping. - (Please note that this is not a planning application and therefore we are not carrying out public consultation on the proposal at this stage). Bridge Farm, Bell Hill, Bristol BS16 1BQ. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.05.2020</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 stone built farmhouse, with a range of curtilage listed stone farm buildings, located adjacent to the local historic park and garden of Heath House. The Grade II registered Park and Garden of Stoke Park is also located nearby. 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>The Trust notes that the site is not at present designated for residential development, but that it is proposed to be designated in the current Local Plan review. From the information submitted with the screening request, the Trust also notes that the development proposal is still at a relatively early stage in the design process, although a proposed site layout has also been submitted.</p> <p>In view of the proximity of the proposed development to the local historic park and garden of Heath House, and the Grade II registered Park and</p>

					<p>Garden of Stoke Park, the Trust considers that any application for development on the site should be informed and accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment and heritage impact assessment, as indicated in the Bristol Local Plan Review Annex – Draft Development Allocations, Consultation March 2019 (Site reference BDA2401). These assessments should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected and the level of harm that may be caused by the development.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers that any application for development on the site should be informed and accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment and heritage impact assessment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Claverham House	Avon	E20/0110	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing building and construction of a new garage with solar panels to the roof. Claverham House, Streamcross, Claverham. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020</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 Claverham House, which is identified on Know Your Place as an unregistered park and garden. ‘Other historic parks and gardens’ are referred to by Policy CS5 of the North Somerset Council Core Strategy, January 2017. Further information on the garden is contained at:- https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/claverham-house-yatton. 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 and unregistered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement does not comment on whether there would be any effect on any historic garden features, or the overall setting of the garden. The Block Plan keys in, at 15, ‘Brick walls to be removed’ and at 17, ‘Tarmac path to be re-routed’, on the north side of the proposed garage. It is not clear to the Trust whether the brick walls to be removed may form part of an historic feature, although it is noted that these appear to be on the same alignment as the ha-ha shown to the south.</p> <p>Therefore the Trust considers that it is not possible to comment on the application due to a lack of information.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers that there is a lack of information on the proposed scheme, and would expect more information to be submitted in order to assess whether there would be any effect on the significance of the heritage asset of the historic garden.</p>

					<p>Avon Gardens Trust notes that the submitted Heritage Statement does not refer to the garden as an 'other historic park and garden' under Policy CS5. No mention is made of the historic features of the garden apart from the ha-ha. The submitted Block Plan shows some garden features but not, for example, the walled kitchen garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Historic Park and Garden to Turvey House	Bedfordshire	E20/0146	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Improvements and widening of existing access to the East with brick walls and gate. Turvey House, High Street, Turvey, Bedford, Bedfordshire MK43 8EL. ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on this proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Bedfordshire 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 its behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The alteration of the access to allow large vehicles would in itself cause some harm (though less than substantial) to the registered historic landscape, by making the access less informal and obviously intended for a use that is not related to the parkland. This harm should have clear and convincing justification, in accordance with paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy framework.</p> <p>However, our main concerns are about the impact of the proposed use on the parkland and its trees. The Planning Statement (VO4 page 7) mentions "approximately 40 lorries" using the access for the purpose of an annual Steam Fayre. The Traffic Management Plan (VO5) gives more of an idea of the size and nature of the event; it refers to 500-60 vehicles for exhibitors and others in the weekend camping area, to be accessed from the Copymoor Farm entrance to the north, and between 500 and 1750 cars per day during the three-day event.</p> <p>There is no plan showing the layout of the event, but the parkland around the proposed access contains many mature trees, and an avenue of mature limes, (seen in the 1884 25" OS map) runs along the Carlton Road boundary from the Copymoor Farm access to the access which is the subject of this application. The satellite image on page 7 of the Planning Statement (VO4) makes the tree cover immediately obvious. There is no reference to trees in the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Your Council's Tree Officer referred (memo of 17 March) to the need for a</p>

					<p>Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment if the proposed access works affected the Root Protection Area of trees adjacent to the access. We suggest that the potential risk of tree damage and root compaction is much wider than the adjacent trees. We think that a Tree Survey and Impact Assessment is essential before your Council decides on development to facilitate a major event involving extensive parking, and movements of heavy vehicles including steam engines, in the registered parkland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely CAROLINE BOWDLER Bedfordshire Gardens Trust Conservation</p>
The Royal Estate Windsor: Frogmore Gardens	Berkshire	E20/0104	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a structure for a temporary period of 5 years, alterations to ground levels and associated hard and soft landscaping. The Walled Garden Frogmore, Windsor. WALLED GARDEN</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on this proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Bedfordshire 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 its behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The alteration of the access to allow large vehicles would in itself cause some harm (though less than substantial) to the registered historic landscape, by making the access less informal and obviously intended for a use that is not related to the parkland. This harm should have clear and convincing justification, in accordance with paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy framework.</p> <p>However, our main concerns are about the impact of the proposed use on the parkland and its trees. The Planning Statement (VO4 page 7) mentions “approximately 40 lorries” using the access for the purpose of an annual Steam Fayre. The Traffic Management Plan (VO5) gives more of an idea of the size and nature of the event; it refers to 500-60 vehicles for exhibitors and others in the weekend camping area, to be accessed from the Copymoor Farm entrance to the north, and between 500 and 1750 cars per day during the three-day event.</p> <p>There is no plan showing the layout of the event, but the parkland around the proposed access contains many mature trees, and an avenue of mature limes, (seen in the 1884 25” OS map) runs along the Carlton Road boundary from the Copymoor Farm access to the access which is the</p>

					<p>subject of this application. The satellite image on page 7 of the Planning Statement (VO4) makes the tree cover immediately obvious. There is no reference to trees in the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Your Council's Tree Officer referred (memo of 17 March) to the need for a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment if the proposed access works affected the Root Protection Area of trees adjacent to the access. We suggest that the potential risk of tree damage and root compaction is much wider than the adjacent trees. We think that a Tree Survey and Impact Assessment is essential before your Council decides on development to facilitate a major event involving extensive parking, and movements of heavy vehicles including steam engines, in the registered parkland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely CAROLINE BOWDLER Bedfordshire Gardens Trust Conservation</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E19/1001	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 22.50m high swann engineering column. Land At Wotton End, Kingswood Lane, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire HP18 9RB. MISCELLANEOUS devcon@aylesburyvaldc.gov.uk OUTCOME Refused APPEAL LODGED 27.04.2020 Appeal Ref APP/J0405/W/20/3248050 To be decided by way of the Written Representations procedure</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again in its role as statutory consultee with regard to the above Appeal. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and have serious concerns relating to appellant's Appeal Statement (AS) dated 26 Feb 2020, as it:</p> <p>a) Only addresses the need to make provision of a mast b) Fails to address our previously expressed concerns relating to the historic designed landscape, or to provide the further information that we requested in our original response (11.11.2019) c) Emphasizes that the application site is not in a designated area without addressing the point that, as a mast within the setting of heritage assets of international significance, it will be visible from and have a damaging effect on the heritage assets and the designated area d) Offers no reasoned options appraisal to consider the effects on the designed views if sited elsewhere.</p> <p>In particular, we would like to refute the aspects of the appellant's AS relating to the minimal effect of the proposed mast on the historic environment.</p> <p>Our continued objection is based on two aspects: 1. The Historic Impact Assessment (HIA, December 2018) is deficient in its methodology and wrong in its conclusions, and so unfortunately has misled</p>

					<p>consultees, including Historic England (HE).</p> <p>2. Notwithstanding the conclusions of the HIA, our own considerable expertise, local knowledge and depth of understanding of the site, indicates that the mast will have a significantly damaging impact from a number of key points, relating to both the Grade I designed landscape and the Grade I mansion as well as other buildings and viewpoints. Our objections in more detail are as follows:</p> <p>HIA Deficiencies</p> <p>In our original response we requested more information, based on greater thoroughness in the identification and appraisal of significant views, in order to assess the proposal. This was not supplied. The proposal was therefore refused in part due to this lack of supporting information which is covered by Para 189 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The appellants in their appeal justification, have based their dismissal of the considerable level of damage on the setting of the highly significant heritage assets, around the fact that HE regards the effect as of negligible damage. HE, like the GT, is a Statutory Consultee and the expertise of both in their respective fields is thus recognized. We are sure that the Inspector will appreciate that Historic England does not decide the application, but is a consultee of equal standing and expertise in advising on the historic environment. HE only comments on potential impact for a limited range of historic assets : Grade II* and above, while the GT comments on all grades of registered landscapes, including heritage assets which are not designated by HE but which are of local importance.</p> <p>Designed landscapes are an extremely specialist aspect of the historic environment, and we would respectfully suggest that it is possible that the HE Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas who commented, does not have an understanding of designed landscapes to the required level. Just as the GT would not be qualified to comment authoritatively about listed buildings which come under its remit, except as they relate to designed landscapes, we suggest that observations by an expert specialising in historic buildings is very unlikely to have the same depth of knowledge as those who focus entirely on historic designed landscapes.</p> <p>Our comments are based on information from advisers who are professional conservation experts and authorities in the fields of the C18 English Landscape Garden, the work of Capability Brown, as well as being familiar with the designed landscape at Wotton. In addition, the case history for this landscape shows that the setting and character of the wider</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>landscape here has clearly been identified as highly sensitive in previous planning decisions. Applications for pylons were re-routed to the north of the area to avoid visual impact.</p> <p>We believe that in commenting on this application, HE relied on the insufficient HIA to assess the importance of key views and setting, both to the designed landscape, as well as to the Grade I mansion and westerly views from it. Had our request for a more rigorous HIA been complied with, HE's officer might well have concurred with our opinion as to the level of damage to the historic views.</p> <p>Damage to the Setting of Historic Assets</p> <p>Setting is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as "The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of the asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral." (Annex 2: Glossary, National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, June 2019). The setting is not designated with the heritage asset, but every heritage asset, whether designated or not has a setting. Its importance, and therefore the degree of protection it is offered in planning decisions, depends entirely on the contribution it makes to the significance of the heritage asset or its appreciation.</p> <p>Our scrutiny of the effect of this application on views, is based on a wider, far more detailed understanding of the significance of setting upon an internationally significant historic designed landscape, than that given in the HIA. We also have a strong local understanding of this site and the largely undamaged rural setting in which the mast would be sited. We reiterate that the sensitivity of this rural setting has already been recognized in planning terms, and pylons have previously been refused permission based on this.</p> <p>Whilst HE considers the impact in this case to be negligible, for the following reasons the GT considers this to be misinformed and that considerable harm will be caused:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The views aspect of the setting in particular will be compromised by the mast. The applicants' HIA methodology relating to key views was partial. It did not identify all the key viewpoints and address these most vulnerable viewpoints. Those viewpoints that were addressed were not fully scrutinized in the relevant directions, i.e. towards the mast site. No
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>rigorous photomontages were provided to demonstrate their conclusions.</p> <p>2. In particular, damage will be caused from the upper levels of the gently undulating topography on the east of the pleasure ground circuit. This includes various key viewpoints and historic buildings roughly east of the mast. Those likely to be affected include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turkish Kiosk, • West front of the mansion, • Circuit path linking them, • Formal lawns west of the mansion within the ha-ha • Great avenue leading down to the Warrells lake and Tuscan temples. <p>Further detail is set out in our letter dated 11 November 2019 along with comment on the deficiencies of the HIA scrutiny.</p> <p>In conclusion, in our capacity as a Statutory Consultee, we remain convinced that this proposal is unacceptably damaging. As the appellant has not refuted the concerns we raised nor provided the further information that we requested, therefore our strong OBJECTION remains. We therefore urge the Inspector to REFUSE this appeal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1846	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration of the Worthies Cascade. Stowe Historic Park And Garden, Dadford Road, Stowe, Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.05.2020</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. We have studied the online documentation and feel that this is a well-designed scheme which we are pleased to see contributing to the continuing restoration of Stowe.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Combermere Abbey	Cheshire	E20/0069	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of pavilion as replacement of existing temporary marquee. COMBERMERE ABBEY, COMBERMERE PARK DRIVE,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2020</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 Cheshire</p>

				<p>COMBERMERE, WHITCHURCH, CHESHIRE, SY13 4AJ. EVENT/FUNCTION</p>	<p>Gardens Trust (CGT) who have reviewed the case history and previous discussions and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We acknowledge, as stated in our letter of 22nd August 2018, the considerable efforts of the owner to make this important historic site sustainable and the continuing challenges this presents.</p> <p>The history of Combermere in the Options Appraisal is very helpful to understanding the site and its development over many centuries, and to appreciating its significance. From the Options Appraisal it is evident that the two sites assessed as having least overall impact (taking into account heritage significance, heritage impact, landscape significance, landscape impact and visual impact), are sites 4 and 5. The Business Impact Statement puts the case that on grounds of cost, marketing and USP (as the pros and cons), neither of these sites is viable. Therefore the site proposed for the pavilion is site 1, the location of the existing temporary marquee.</p> <p>The proposed pavilion is in effect a more substantial version of the marquee that is to be removed. We acknowledge that its proposed style, reduced height, and muted colours would be less intrusive than the existing marquee and therefore have a reduced visual impact on the historic landscape and walled garden. It is designed to be free standing and easily dismantled when no longer required, in effect a reversible solution that would, in theory, allow the plot to be restored to garden.</p> <p>We reiterate our concerns expressed previously that “A proposal for either a permanent or temporary building in this location would harm significance”, concurring with Marion Barter’s assessment under 4.4 Statement of Significance that “the heritage impact varies from a low impact on the setting of the house itself, to a high impact on the affected part of the kitchen garden” but that the harm is less than substantial. We still consider that the proposal mitigates against the understanding of the historic landscape but accept that other interventions, the tennis court and recent planting, do not contribute to understanding either. We acknowledge the public benefit of a establishing a new pavilion at Combermere in terms of generating revenue to sustain the historic assets and in providing local employment and related economic benefits. However, we cannot determine the viability of alternative sites and maintain our position that less damaging sites for the pavilion are available, ones where there is the potential to develop a new USP, for</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>example a pavilion within a woodland glade.</p> <p>It is therefore for the planning authority to decide whether to accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the economic arguments for the location of the pavilion, and whether these should outweigh the heritage impact, • and to consider whether the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy SE.7 (The Historic Environment) of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, and Policy BE.9 (Listed Buildings) and BE.14 (Historic Parks and Gardens) of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011. <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Auckland Park	Castle	County Durham	E20/0096	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Works to existing structures and grounds within the curtilage of Auckland Castle. Auckland Castle, Market Place, Bishop Auckland DL14 7NR.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2020</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 Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) 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 the NGT is familiar with the site, despite being unable to visit at present, and their local knowledge informs this response. The landscaping of the immediate environs of Auckland Castle is a logical step after the conservation and repair of its buildings, and a very welcome proposal that will further enhance its fine setting. Overall, coming as they do from a distinguished landscape architect and architects, these are potentially attractive proposals that respect their location. They combine, in the main, traditional formality with a restrained inventiveness and flair: seemingly both contemporary and contextual. Materials appear to be generally natural with high quality finishes, appropriate for such an important location.</p> <p>However, in two important areas we feel the overall project lacks information, analysis and investigation, which we suggest needs to be looked at, prior to implementation. If this outstanding work is not undertaken ahead of implementation, there is the risk of significant heritage loss and thus, despite this scheme's evident design qualities, we would wish to object to the proposals.</p> <p>NORTH TERRACE AND THE WILDERNESS: INWARD AND OUTWARD PARKLAND VIEWS</p>

					<p>With one exception (the prominent North Terrace and Wilderness area on the castle's northern slopes) these proposals are set within enclosed areas, such that their impact on the wider landscape is negligible. Whilst the North Terrace restoration is very welcome, along with the retention of fine trees, removal of eyesores and introduction of neat estate railings in place of poor fencing, it is the impact of the Wilderness on inward-looking and outward-looking views of the castle and its parkland features that, we feel, needs re-examination.</p> <p>The design of the eighteenth-century parkland landscape, despite its seemingly informal and naturalistic appearance, would have been laid out to strictly controlled sightlines linking views across the park, both out to the parkland from the castle rooms and gardens, and inwards to the principal castle buildings from the distant parkland. Beyond being simple open sightlines, the principal spaces between viewpoint and the view would have a strong composition, the picture softened by individual parkland trees, clumps and woodland.</p> <p>The Gothic Seat is obviously one such viewpoint, and the Deer Shelter another, but the main one is the Castle, and then particular rooms in the Castle (even particular windows in the rooms, e.g. the landing window above the entrance stairs). These composed views have often, over time become narrowed or totally obscured by natural tree regeneration. (The Hardwick Park restoration at Sedgefield by Durham County Council demonstrated how critical viewpoints had been blocked by later planting, requiring extensive tree removal to re-open views from one feature to another.)</p> <p>One imagines that the Wilderness' role in the Auckland landscape was just such a soft foil, a framing, to inward views of the chapel from areas of the wider parkland, but also a softening of the outward view from within the castle (that landing window), screening the town to the west. This role does not seem to have been considered at all in the proposals; or if it has, it has been implied rather than stated. Is its current extent as originally planned, has it grown to block viewpoints, and does it need enlargement? This fundamental analysis has, in part, been undertaken by Purcell in Supplementary Planning Guidance in 2013, which lists 'lost key views' and draws them on a plan (figure 11) and states the objective of 'reopening' as many as possible. But there is no detailed description of these views. This kind of analysis is needed, eventually for the whole parkland, but certainly now in relation to the Wilderness. It must form the essential introduction</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>to the current proposals.</p> <p>We would further suggest that the re-landscaping of these gardens might be viewed as a rare opportunity to develop further the visual links between gardens and park, something that could turn an excellent restoration project into something even more interesting and valuable.</p> <p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>The Design, Access and Heritage Statement gives broad reassurance that there are no major changes to the form of the historic walled gardens and enclosures around the castle buildings. Close examination of the drawings also suggests that the changes in garden levels appear to be modest, though the scale of drawings often prevents detailed analysis. What is clearly needed in advance of all works on site is an examination of the potential for archaeological damage.</p> <p>It would seem that this may simply be a matter of bringing together work already done? We know that a substantial area of the site has already been comprehensively excavated by archaeologists. For the remainder, one imagines that much or all of it has been subjected to non-destructive analysis by geophysics etc.? A comprehensive report would focus on the archaeological implications of the work, potential risk and losses and any mitigation proposed. This needs both examination in advance of works, whose conclusions might influence the final designs, and subsequent onsite monitoring during the works.</p> <p>We have noted the advice from Durham County Council's Archaeology Team that a full written scheme of investigation is needed with subsequent implementation of its recommendations. We fully support this view.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and The Northumbria Gardens Trust are confident that The Auckland Project (TAP), with its short but laudable pedigree of high-quality building conservation and newly commissioned contemporary architecture, will want to address these two issues of landscape appraisal and archaeology. Were TAP not to do so, then both organisations would reluctantly have to formally object to the proposals? So as currently presented, we would place a holding objection to these applications.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tarn Lodge Estate	Cumbria	E20/0198	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Siting Of 6no. Holiday Lodges And 2no. Pods Together With Landscaping,	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has had the above application brought to its attention by a local resident. We have conferred with our colleagues in the</p>

				<p>Waste Water Treatment System, Access Track And Parking. Land to north of Tarn Lodge Farm, Heads Nook, Brampton. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>Cumbria Gardens Trust and their local knowledge has informed the GT's comments.</p> <p>Tarn Lodge and the Tower Folly, are both listed Grade II by HE, and the main house clearly derives its name from the Tarn Lake itself which was previously a highlight of the Pleasure Grounds, and now forms the proposed development site. The Tarn was specifically described as 'an extensive Lake (with Boat House) in the Pleasure Grounds' in the sale particulars of 4th October 1895. The 1900 OS map shows the original Boat House to have been on the southern end of the lake, which was reached by an avenue running north from Tarn Lodge to the western side of the woodland surrounding the Tarn. Although the garden of Tarn Lodge and the Tower Folly are currently not listed as a registered park and garden, we understand that an application has been made to HE to add the site to the register. The Tarn itself is therefore a crucial element of the original designed landscape. The Ancient Tree inventory aerial map of the site (https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/ shows that there are 39 veteran trees around the Tarn as well as 16 notable trees. Several of the veteran trees lie within close proximity of the proposed lodge sites. We would expect your tree officer to advise whether the lodges/pods will in any way harm the root zones of these trees.</p> <p>Our main concern, should your officers approve this application, is that its link to Tarn Lodge and the Tower Folly would become lost, and their significance therefore correspondingly reduced. Fencing would close off access except from the northern car parking area, and visitors would no longer understand the link with the Tarn Lodge estate which bears its name. We would suggest that it has not sufficiently taken on board how the development might affect the heritage assets and their significance, as per NPPF Para 189.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Indio House	Devon	E20/0131	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Approval of details for 22 dwellings and associated works (approval sought for appearance, scale, landscaping and layout). Land North Of Indio House,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Indio House, an historic designed landscape of importance in the local context of Devon included on the Devon Gazetteer of Parks and Gardens of Local Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust</p>

				Newton Road, Bovey Tracey, Devon, TQ13 9BG. RESIDENTIAL	<p>comments on behalf of the Gardens Trust for consultations in the county of Devon.</p> <p>We objected to the previous application for outline development of 122 dwellings in August 2013 and the outline application for up to 30 dwellings in September 2013, both of which were refused by your Council.</p> <p>However, this is a reserved matters planning application in accordance with planning appeal reference: APP/P1133/W/18/3207470 that was allowed and planning permission granted on 4th December 2018.</p> <p>We do not wish to comment on the reserved matters.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E20/0166	II	PLANNING APPLICATION To install new perimeter lighting illuminating Drakes Statue, Merchant Navy Memorial, Britannia Memorial and the RAF War Memorial on the Hoe Promenade. The Promenade, The Hoe, Plymouth. EXTERNAL LIGHTING	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application consultation which affects The Hoe, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at grade II.</p> <p>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 responds to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We are happy to support the above application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark</p>
Stanmer Park	East Sussex	E20/0115	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of a new playground area and half sized basketball court, with associated works. Land Adjacent To Northfield Lane, University Of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9BJ. PLAY AREA, SPORT/LEISURE	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and also the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications. 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.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation</p>

					<p>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.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0095	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two new semi-detached cottages. Land North Of Sparrowsend Cottages, London Road, Newport. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.05.2020</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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>In our pre-application advice, we emphasised how important it was that any development contrary to your local authority's policies, intended to enable improvements to the boundary wall of the registered landscape, be supported by a conservation management plan, an assessment of the significance of the wall and its condition, an estimate of the cost of the repairs, and a commitment to carry it out to a timetable. The applicant has not supplied any of these, so in the absence of that information, we object to this application, which in our opinion, would add to the incremental erosion of the setting of the heritage asset, with no guarantee of a public benefit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE TO M MCGARR 15.05.2020</p> <p>In our response we stated our view on this case, which is that the local authority should not countenance enabling development unless a coherent case for it has been made, setting out the reasons for the intended work, its scale and cost. We did explain this very clearly in our letter to you of April 1st, drawing attention to Historic England's guidance, explaining what we would advise including with the application. You have not followed that in the application. If you were to supply this additional information it</p>

					<p>would be helpful to both the Uttlesford officers and ourselves. We are a consultee and this is a matter between yourselves and the local planning authority who will have to make the decision.</p> <p>I am sorry if you feel aggrieved, but we did make our position absolutely clear. It was my colleague you spoke to not me.</p> <p>Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0112	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of five detached dwellings on land to the rear of the Coach and Horses public house, with associated access, parking and landscaping, and reconfigured public house car park and beer garden. Coach And Horses Inn, Cambridge Road, Newport. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.05.2020</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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>It is clear that Newport is under a great deal of development pressure and this proposal for five new 3-bedroom houses immediately adjacent to the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Shortgrove would add to the Bloor Homes development immediately to the north of the RPG. If permitted, these houses will be a further incremental erosion of the setting of the RPG. The site is currently screened by trees, but should the application be permitted, we would request that your officers ask the applicant for a tree management plan to be part of the conditions. In 2019 in Suffolk, a planning inspector emphasised that limited reliance should be placed on the ability of planting to screen views of developments, given the variability of such planting (APP/D3505/W/19/3230839). To fulfil even a partial screening role, trees and associated dense undergrowth must be managed and maintained permanently by the long-term implementation of a management plan. Even with such a plan in place, in our opinion, the additional development will result in a more prominent, urbanising, physical form at the edge of the RPG even if filtered to some degree. Your officers will no doubt 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. This states (p4) 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the</p>

					significance of the asset.' In our opinion the proposed new housing will not enhance either the listed public house or the RPG. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
New Hall	Essex	E20/0164	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of a single-storey detached dwelling house. Land North West Of 5 Bulls Lodge Cottages, Generals Lane, Boreham, Chelmsford, Essex. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2020 I am commenting on this application for the Essex Gardens Trust, which represents The Gardens Trust, a statutory consultee on historic gardens and landscapes. We object to this application on the grounds that it will lead to the further erosion of the setting of New Hall and its registered landscape. The site of this proposed development is adjacent to the boundary of New Hall School which, together with more modern buildings, occupies a 16th century Tudor brick range which was an addition to Henry VIII's palace of New Hall. This palace was favoured by Henry because of its accompanying park and the hunting therein. The landscape around it was enhanced and improved at different times by Tradescant, Richard Woods and others, and is now a grade II registered landscape on the National Heritage List. The parkland setting has largely disappeared, but elements of the gardens and formal landscape survive. The setting of New Hall, however, is under considerable pressure, from extensive new housing to the west, and development associated with the school. This application would see new development and creeping suburbanisation right at the edge of the registered landscape where at present there has been little recent change. Generals Lane retains a strongly rural character. This area has not been allocated for development, and is within the Rural Area of the emerging Local Plan. Whilst an attempt has been made to make the proposed house unobtrusive by keeping it single storey, the extensive use of glazing, stone and PV panels would not, as claimed, represent a response to the local context. It is argued that removal of existing outbuildings would be a benefit, but a new house is likely to lead to incremental change and development, with hard standings, cartlodes and outbuildings. Although in terms of the NPPF the damage to the heritage asset would be less than substantial, there seems no justification for the approval of the application or any public benefit arising from it. David Andrews
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0175	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Prior Notification of change of use of	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory

				<p>agricultural buildings to 4 no. dwellings. Longrove Barns, Shortgrove, Newport, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 3TX. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The permitted development is for the conversion of Dutch Barns to three houses. The barns are some distance from the listed buildings, in isolation close to a block of woodland. Shortgrove is not in a Conservation Area within Article 2(3) under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (designation of conservation areas), and does not fall within any of the other categories covered by this Act : AONB, the Broads, a National Park, or an area specified by the Secretary of State for the purposes of section 41(3) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (enhancement and protection of the natural beauty and amenity of the countryside. In our opinion, it is a sad omission that registered parks and gardens are not included within the terms of the Act.</p> <p>The grade II registered landscape at Shortgrove is one of the best Capability Brown landscapes in Essex. It retains parkland with veteran trees, lakes, streams, the Brettingham bridge, a magnificent Georgian grade II* stable, a grade II dovecot, two walled gardens and other walls, glasshouses, an ice house, and other features.</p> <p>The Dutch barns which it is proposed to convert are not things of any architectural merit, but in an isolated rural setting next to a large block of woodland, are recognisable as agricultural buildings. This legible identity would be confused by the insertion of large areas of glazing which would be an alien element in this context, together with the inevitable domestic setting and paraphernalia (boundaries, patios, cars etc) that they would be likely to acquire. In the absence of any intrinsic merit, their preservation in this altered form would, we feel, be damaging to the registered landscape. This would not be a public benefit as construed under the terms of the NPPF, and we therefore hope that you will find it possible to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Woodchester Mansion	Gloucestershire	E20/0155	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Renewal of temporary planning permission for external toilet block to the</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020 This renewal has been referred to The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) by the Gardens Trust, the statutory consultee for</p>

				rear of Woodchester Mansion. Woodchester Mansion, Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Stonehouse. VISITOR FACILITIES	comment. Bearing in mind the aesthetic sensitivity of the Listed Woodchester mansion and its parkland setting, the photographs that accompany this renewal of its planning consent demonstrate an aesthetic problem. Undoubtedly this is the best solution achievable at present but one would hope that a more worthy to these utilitarian structures could be anticipated in the future. On this basis one would assume that a three year temporary consent might be expected. David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Lambeth Palace	Greater London	E19/0432	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Phased mixed use development including up to 417 residential units and comprising: part redevelopment and restoration, conversion and extension of former Fire Brigade Headquarters building and demolition of the existing extension and re-provision of obelisk to provide a new fire station (Sui Generis), a new London Fire Brigade museum (Class D1), residential units (Class C3), a ten storey hotel (Class C1) with up to 200 bedrooms and a flexible retail/lobby space (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/C1), and a rooftop restaurant with ancillary bar (Class A3); demolition and redevelopment of the central workshop building to provide buildings of up to twenty-six storeys plus basements, comprising business floorspace (Use Class B1), a gym (Class D2), retail units (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential units (Class C3); development of land to the rear	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2020 The London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT) wish to register our objection to the above development and request this application be called in by the Secretary of State and subject to a full Planning Inquiry. The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), 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. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. 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). The site, 8 Albert Embankment, is surrounded by Conservation Areas which are designated heritage assets of national importance. Lambeth Palace Conservation Area was designated in 1968 making it one of the oldest conservation areas in London. The Garden Museum (listed Grade II*) and Lambeth Palace itself (Grade I) are important landmarks along the Thames. Directly opposite the Palace is the Westminster UNESCO World Heritage Site, identified as having international significance. These sites, as the centre of government and church, have been linked for a thousand years. The Albert Embankment conservation area now covers the entire southern embankment and is a response to the nature of the river and the sweeping views it affords. To quote Lambeth Council's own conservation area

			<p>to provide a eleven storey building plus basement, comprising a flexible commercial unit (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/D2/B1) and residential units (Class C3); all together with associated areas of new public realm, hard and soft landscaping, basement and surface parking, servicing, means of access and plant and equipment. (The reference for this application for Full Planning Permission is 19/01304/FUL but there is also an associated Listed Building Consent application related to these works with reference 19/01305/LB). Please use reference number 19/01305/LB to view the application documents for this proposal This application is a DEPARTURE APPLICATION: The proposed development is a departure from site allocation "Site 10 - 8 Albert Embankment and land to the rear bounded by Lambeth High Street, Whitgift Street, the railway viaduct and Southbank House SE1" of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015). This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which is available for inspection with the planning application documents. Hard copies may be obtained for a fee from Lichfield, 14 Regent's Wharf, All Saints</p>	<p>character appraisal, 'The impact of development on views of Lambeth Palace from the Palace of Westminster / Victoria Tower Gardens are particularly important given the historic relationship between these two Palaces. The proximity to the Westminster World Heritage Site means that major developments within or adjoining the conservation site could affect its setting (including views out).' The proposed development of buildings up to 26 storeys will wreck dramatic and irrevocable harm upon these historic views and settings.</p> <p>Beneath the towers, within Lambeth Palace conservation area, are green spaces with strong historic connections to the Palace, and adjacent are well-established communities, which will be harmed by the overbearing and uncharacteristic development looming over them.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF2019) p195, states, that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, it must be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve a substantial public benefit that outweighs that harm or loss. There is no evidence that the proposed development at 8 Albert Embankment will deliver substantial public benefits, if any.</p> <p>The developers will claim that the proposed development does less than substantial harm to the designated assets, but tests within NPPF2019, p196 - that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use - are still not met. There is no discernible public benefit and optimum is not the same as maximum.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, the LPGT object to the proposed development at 8 Albert Embankment and request that the decision be called in to afford these damaging proposals full and proper consideration.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Sally Prothero CMLI MCifA For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group Office@londongardenstrust.org.uk Cc : robert.jenrick.mp@parliament.uk lambethvillage@gmail.com Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				Street, London, N1 9RL, UK Open for comment icon, 8 Albert Embankment And Land To Rear Bounded By Lambeth High St, Whitgift St, The Railway Viaduct, Southbank Hse Together With Land Corner Of Black Prince Rd And Newport St London. MAJOR HYBRID	
Crystal Palace Park	Greater London	E20/0113	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters reserved except highways access for comprehensive phased regeneration of Crystal Palace Park. This will include: conservation and repair of heritage assets; removal of existing hard surfaces; alterations to ground levels and tree removal; landscaping including planting of new trees; demolition of existing buildings and structures; creation of new pedestrian paths/vehicular access roads / car, coach and cycle parking; changes of use including part of the caravan site to part public open space and part residential; erection of new buildings and structures comprising: up to 2300sqm for a cultural venue (Use Class D2), up to 530sqm of park maintenance facilities (Sui Generis) including the dismantling and reconstruction of existing maintenance depot; up to 150sqm information centre (Use	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2020

			<p>Class D1); up to 670sqm for a community centre (Use Class D1); up to 737sqm of educational institution at the Capel Manor College Anerley Hill Site (Use Class D1), and up to 3779sqm of educational institution at the Capel Manor College Farm Site (Use Class D1) of which 3399sqm comprises educational buildings and 380sqm comprises ancillary shelters/ outbuildings; and up to 18,847sqm of residential (Use Class C3) accommodation to provide up to 210 residential dwellings, together with associated and ancillary works including utilities and surface water drainage, plant and equipment. Full planning permission is sought for alteration to highways access at Anerley Hill Gate entrance, Penge Gate car park, Old Cople Lane (Rockhills Gate), Sydenham Gate car park and the creation of three additional accesses for the residential development at Rockhills and Sydenham Villas. Crystal Palace Park, Thicket Road, Penge, London SE20 8DT. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	 <p>Claire Brew Development Manager London Borough of Bromley Civic Centre Stockwell Close Bromley BR1 3UH</p> <p>20 May 2020</p> <p>Ref: 20100325/OUT - Outline Planning Application for Proposed Development at Crystal Palace Park</p> <p>Dear Ms Brew,</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above outline planning application.</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), 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. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. 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>Crystal Palace Park (Grid Ref TQ345705) is included at grade II* in the HE Register and is also on the LPGT Inventory, in Crystal Palace Conservation Area, and contains a number of significant listed buildings. The Park and several of its associated listed buildings are included on Historic England's Heritage at Risk (HAR) Register for London and the South East. The park is principally of significance as the pleasure grounds designed by Sir Joseph Paxton as the setting for Crystal Palace, originally built for the Great Exhibition in Hyde Park, when it moved to Sydenham Hill after the close of the exhibition. Laid out with terraces, Italian Garden, Great Maze, English Garden, gravel walks, statues and elaborate fountains fed by 3 lakes, the Palace and Park were opened by Queen Victoria on 10 June 1854, although in 1936 the Palace tragically burnt down. In the south of the park an early attraction was the Crystal Palace Dinosaurs, a collection of models of prehistoric creatures. Some of the trees from the original planting survive and the park has a number of lakes, initially part of the elaborate waterworks scheme.</p> <p>This application seeks permission for the comprehensive regeneration of Crystal Palace Park, including conservation, repair and enhancement of existing heritage assets, and removal of unsympathetic and visually-detracting elements, but also installation of new structures, facilities and infrastructure alongside associated hard and soft landscaping.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>2/ According to the test dictated by NPPF2019, p196 – any development causing less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset must still have that harm weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The conservation, repair and enhancement of the existing heritage assets are therefore an essential element of deciding this application. In the case of approval, all benefits will need to be secured via legal agreement.</p> <p>The LPGT supports this outline planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regeneration proposals clearly have the future of the park and its heritage assets at their heart, with the proposed new facilities and infrastructure enabling more sustainable management and maintenance in the future. • Repair and conservation of heritage assets such as listed structures, some of which are in a poor state, are listed as a high priority to be undertaken at an early stage of the phased development works. • Landscaping works, soft and hard, appear to be sympathetic to the original park layout, while addressing the needs of contemporary visitors. • The two proposed residential developments are on the edges of the park, and it is argued would bring beneficial as opposed to detrimental outcomes. They are certainly important for income generation needed to fund essential repairs to the Park and many of its most significant historic structures and features. • In the case of one of these, Rockhills, it is also of interest as the site of Sir Joseph Paxton's own residence and this historical fact presumably would be made more widely known. The other proposed residential development, Sydenham Villas, was also once the site of a number of nineteenth century villas on the edge of the park. These will also see delivery of a net increase in publicly accessible green space, with areas of the current caravan site at Rockhills returned to the Park. • The proposed new built facilities aim to bring community, educational and cultural enhancements for park visitors. <p>For these reasons, the LPGT supports the application.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,</p>  <p>Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group planning@londongardentrust.org</p> <p>c.c. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust c.c. Alison Allighan, Conservation Casework Manager, The Gardens Trust</p>
Hackwood Park	Hampshire	E17/0974	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a new Motorway Service Area to comprise an amenity building, lodge, drive thru coffee unit, associated car, coach, motorcycle, caravan, HGV and abnormal load parking, and a fuel filling station with retail</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.05.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) were disappointed that Basingstoke and Deane failed to notify us about recent additional documents relating to this application, which we objected strongly to on 25th November 2017. This is a worrying omission as the GT are statutory consultees for applications which could affect all grades of historic designed landscapes. We are grateful to have been given an extension to respond as we were only told about the new documents 3 working days before the deadline for</p>

			<p>shop, together with alterations to the adjoining roundabout on the M3 and slip roads to form an access point and works to the highway. Provision of landscaping, infrastructure and ancillary works. Land Adjacent To Junction 6 M3, Basingstoke, Hampshire. ROAD, HYBRID</p>	<p>comments. The new information provided in no way allays our substantial previous concerns and we continue to OBJECT to this unsuitable proposal. We would like to reiterate the main points of our original objection which remain unchanged. Hackwood is one of the most important designed landscapes in the country. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) is a highly selective designation, with only 145 of the 1658 designated parks and gardens in England being included at Grade I. This puts Hackwood on a par with places such as Blenheim and Stourhead. Hackwood is one of only two intact Baroque landscapes in England, and the only example of a relatively intact Bridgeman design ornamented by a host of garden buildings by James Gibbs, making it an astonishingly rare survival. There is no need for another motor way service station here as there are already ones between J 4a & 5 and between J 8 & 9, a maximum of 24 miles apart, compliant with the Dept for Transport guidance which states they should be no more than 28 miles apart. The proposed lighting to service the numerous buildings and infrastructure will be highly intrusive (12m & 8m poles) and the negative consequences of the resultant light pollution have been clearly described by the Hampshire Gardens Trust, Mr Min Wood and the Georgian Group in their responses, which we fully endorse. CPRE in its letter of objection outlined the numerous Local Plan policies which this application contravenes. We will not repeat them here for brevity, but we are especially concerned with EM11 – the Historic Environment which states that ‘All development must conserve or enhance the quality of the borough’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.’ It is impossible to see how it could be argued that a utilitarian, noisy, highly illuminated service station development in use 365 days of the year, 24 hours a day, absolutely next to a RPG of the very highest grade and importance, can possibly be said to either enhance or conserve Hackwood’s significance. Your officers will also be aware of Historic England’s The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. (SHA,Pt1). P2 of this document states ‘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’ . SHA,Pt1 p4 goes on to say ‘Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' A motorway service station will clearly affect the setting negatively and exacerbate the damage caused by the building of the motorway in the first place.</p> <p>Legislation takes precedence over the NPPG and as your officers will also be aware, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting (ie. the RPG), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66(1)). The Courts have interpreted preservation as meaning to keep safe from harm. The statutory duty to have special regard to a listed building means that decision makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. The considerable importance and weight applies to all harm, although with greater force the more important the listed building or setting. If harm is identified then there is a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission. (our emphasis again).</p> <p>Finally, we reluctantly query the response of HE. Designed landscapes are an extremely specialist aspect of the historic environment, completely separate to historic buildings or archaeology, and we would respectfully suggest that it is possible that Historic England's Principal regional Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas who commented on 7.12.17, does not have a specialist understanding of designed landscapes. Just as the GT would not be qualified to comment authoritatively about listed buildings, except as they relate to designed landscapes, we suggest that observations by an expert specialising in historic buildings is very unlikely to have the same depth of knowledge as those who focus entirely on historic designed landscapes. Our comments are based on information from advisers who are professional conservation experts and authorities in historic designed landscapes.</p> <p>We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Ombersley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E20/0129	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed internal, external and landscape works to convert the stables and walled garden into a visitor destination. The Stables Quadrangle will consist of a Museum and Educational Spaces D1, Cafe A3, Shop A1, Offices B1(a); Ombersley Court, Holt Fleet Road, Ombersley, Droitwich Spa, WR9 0HH. VISITOR FACILITIES	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.05.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation and our overwhelming concern remains the inadequate understanding of parking capacity. We responded to this in some detail in our letter of 5th November 2019 re. application 19/02203/FUL. Our views have not altered. We still have grave reservations that should the proposed parking area prove inadequate, rushed, ad hoc decisions may be made leading to the sacrifice of the shrubberies or the field next to the Church, seriously damaging to the Village Conservation Area. We fully support the comments made by Historic England in response to the above applications, and again reiterate our apprehension about the unacceptably large section of the listed wall (which forms an essential part of the very grand listed Regency north access to Ombersley Court) requiring demolition to enable coach access. We are also disappointed that the documents indicate that the Walled Garden Bothies and the Regency hot house remain derelict in the current proposal. That is unacceptable and they should be included in the plans for any work within the Walled Garden. We would reiterate our previous comment that input from an historic buildings specialist architect is absent and their advice would reassure us that the differing requirements of visitors/cars are catered for in a manner sympathetic to the important cluster of heritage assets at Ombersley. We are aware that Wychavon's former Conservation Officer (Elaine Artherton) prepared a Report on protecting Ombersley Court and its environs, which was accepted by yourselves as a policy. We would appreciate confirmation that this continues to inform Wychavon's considerations and decisions on the various proposals for Ombersley which are now being applied for in separate tranches. In our opinion, until an acceptable solution has been found for the overflow parking (see our letter of 5th November 2019), the current

					<p>application should be refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Amwell Grove and Amwell Pool	Hertfords hire	E20/0075	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a detached 3 bed dwelling. Land Opposite Amwell Grove, Cautherly Lane, Great Amwell SG12 9SP. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The site of this application lies within the setting of the Grade II Registered Amwell Grove and Pool Historic Garden and also opposite the entrance to the Grade II listed Amwell Grove and the separately listed entrance structures. It is also within the setting for the Grade II* St John's church. The proposed house on the steeply sloping site would have a harmful effect, due to its prominence and design, on the setting of all these designated heritage assets contrary to EHDC Policy HA8 and the Great Amwell Conservation Area provisions. Although a 2m screen hedge along Cautherly Lane is proposed, the terrain here requires screening of a much higher nature, particularly as the west facing glass windows would cause glare and reflection. Due to its elevated position it would also be an intrusion on the deliberately designed rural nature of Amwell Pool, particularly in the winter when there is less tree cover. The house design does not reflect the character of the surrounding conservation area and would be an intrusion into an otherwise harmonious rural area which is part of the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is contrary both the NPPF and to EHDC Green Belt Policy.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed design would cause harm to the Designated heritage assets and their settings, the character of the Conservation Area and the Green belt. We therefore OBJECT to this proposal.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Just House, Northaw	Hertfords hire	E20/0105	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of basement swimming pool with glass ballustrade. Just House, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NJ. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have considered the information contained in this application with regard to the historic landscapes in the surrounding areas. We have no objection to the application as detailed here.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Burton Constable	Humberside	E19/1717	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of former riding school and orangery to wedding venue.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for e-mailing me on 12th May with comments to the queries that we raised in our letter of 18th March.</p>

				Burton Constable Foundation. Burton Constable Hall, New Ellerby Road, Burton Constable, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU11 4LN. CHANGE OF USE	On the public access during weddings and the access to the Orangery, as the applicant says many people enjoy seeing a wedding, but maybe any adverse public response could be monitored and steps taken to mitigate it. The applicant has kindly explained the situation regarding our other queries and we trust that the condition of the lawns will be kept under review and any steps taken that are necessary to keep them in good condition. We hope that the weddings will add to the revenue stream for the support of Burton Constable and be enjoyed by everyone and thank you for answering the queries. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Lullingstone Castle	Kent	E20/0046	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of barn to a self contained four bedroom dwelling with associated parking, private garden and amenity. Unit 4, Lullingstone Park Farm Barn Estate (Barn South West Of Juniper), Lullingstone Lane, Eynsford KENT DA4 0JA. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.05.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The GT/KGT are concerned about the number of planning applications being received, seeking to build or replace existing structures in Registered Parks and Gardens, in particular at Lullingstone. If the agricultural barn is genuinely redundant in this application, then the proposed change to a four bedroom dwelling, with external finishes to reflect its original character, will not harm the setting and significance of this Registered Park and Garden. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Mote Park	Kent	E20/0130	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey side extension to form utility room, double garage and workshop, and a single storey rear extension to form an annexe. 3 Forge Lodge Bungalow, Mote Park, Maidstone,	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.

				Kent ME15 7BE. BUILDING ALTERATION	The proposed building, although not listed, lies in close proximity to the listed former lodge buildings, Nos 1 & 2. We concur with your conservation officer that it would be preferable for timber doors and windows to be used rather than the proposed upvc, and agree that a ragstone plinth incorporated below the timber boarded elevations would be a good idea. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Quenby Hall	Leicestershire	E20/0121	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two agricultural buildings to house livestock and provide storage for animal fodder, bedding and agricultural machinery, Quenby Hall, Barley Leas, Hungarton, Leicestershire. AGRICULTURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2020 EThank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The documentation accompanying this application is surprisingly sparse considering the very high importance of Quenby Hall (Grade I), and the II* stable block as well as other listed features within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden. The proposed two new barns (eventually three) are to replace an existing barn which is 120m north of the Hall. There are some structures between the Hall and proposed barns, but without a Visual Impact Assessment we are unable to determine whether or not the enormous structures will impinge on any view from either within the Hall itself or from specific vantage points elsewhere within the RPG. We were also surprised that no other sites would appear to have been considered, especially as the parkland is very large and the ownership extends beyond the boundaries of the RPG. We would like to know if other sites with convenient access routes were considered, and if so why they might have been discounted. Until we can be satisfied that the large barns will not detract from the setting of Quenby Hall or from views within the RPG, and also whether other sites might be less intrusive, we would like to lodge a holding objection. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Grimsthorpe Castle	Lincolnshire	E20/0140	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Construction of a new public art gallery and associated	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2020 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT), a conservation and education charity, considers it necessary and appropriate to comment on these planning applications. As a member of The Gardens Trust (GT, formerly the Garden

				<p>improvements to existing visitor facilities including alterations to the Grade II listed Old Coach House to create a new entrance to the Coach House Yard, a new shop, meeting space, storage & support space, alterations to the Old Stables including conversion to new cafe, alterations to Underloft Building and Old Water Tower Shed. Alterations to existing car park and creation of new visitor car park and associated landscaping. Estate Office, Main Road, Grimsthorpe, PE10 0LY. EXHIBITION/MUSEUM/GALLERY</p>	<p>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. Lincolnshire Gardens Trust would like to commend the Grimsthorpe and Drummond Castle Trust (G&DCT) on the very considerable in-depth background research, thought, care and consideration taken of the impact of these proposals. The Historic Landscape Assessment, Landscape Masterplan, Heritage Impact Assessment and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment regarding the setting of this HE Grade I park and garden, is indeed valuable record worthy of the history of the Grimsthorpe landscape, the premier seat and most significant historic estate in Lincolnshire. We have just a couple of small but understandable concerns about the landscaping proposals that are worth drawing to your attention: 1) The new car park is shown on plan only as 'approximate area'. In future, this might lead to a temptation for 'carpark creep', that is, to expanding the carpark to a much greater capacity on the open hillside, for example for big events. The G&DT do acknowledge that there is a sensitive view area beyond this car-park area - between the proposed car park and the laundry pond. Although, there is evidence of new tree-planting as a screen in the plans, we would oppose a much larger permanent carpark than as shown, which would impact considerably on the historic rural park setting. 2) The proposed new Gallery is set back and separated from the coach-house courtyard which currently has a comfortable, homely 19C rural estate 'ambience'. We are however concerned about the nearness of this modern structure to both the listed stables (HE Grade II) and Castle and its court (HE Grade I). The proposed yew screening as an understorey for a new stand of oaks might adequately help to bed the Gallery into the park setting, if it grows adequately under the new trees. However, it would look considerably darker and heavier than on the west where there is no such underplanting in the historically significant open oak pasture near the castle, across the main North Avenue approach, including remnants of 'Switzer's Oaks'. This could have a negative impact on the balance of the principal vista of Vanbrugh's north elevation of the Castle. We trust consideration will be given to the above concerns regarding the landscaping proposals. Overall, LGT trustees welcome and indeed support this significant proposal, because it seems a long overdue and worthwhile initiative of enormous</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					benefit in order to help the G&DCT conserve and maintain Grimsthorpe Castle and its unique setting, while expanding, modernising and updating the facilities, accessibility and cultural experience for the visiting public to a high standard. Steffie Shields Chairman
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E20/0079	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of 790m of hedgerow. Low Lindrick Farm, Studley Royal, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 3BD. AGRICULTURE	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, at grade I as per the above application. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey was designated as a World Heritage Site (WHS) in 1986 due to its world importance, combining the ruins of a monastic site with an early water garden and designed ornamental pleasure grounds. The site has been described as ‘one of the most spectacular scenic compositions in England’ (Hussey, 1967) and the ‘finest formal water-garden in the country’ (Jellicoe et al 1986). Due to its World Heritage Site importance Studley Royal has a Buffer Zone required by UNESCO and the proposed works lie just outside this Zone. This Zone is an indicator of the sensitive nature of the wider landscape around the WHS. This application is to remove two sections of hedge of total length 790m and to plant a further two sections of hedge in a different location of total length 870m.</p> <p>The hedge removal (400m) and the proposed new hedge (478m) between Galphay Lane and High Birkby (Studley Moor) is close to the long northern arm of the registered park and garden. The hedge proposed to be removed runs north-south whereas the new hedge is west-east.</p> <p>The hedge proposed to be removed north of Studley Roger and south of Sunley Raynes (390m) runs west- east and the proposal is for a new hedge further north nearer Sunley Raynes (400m).</p> <p>We have not made a site visit and the GT and YGT regrets that there is no information about the age of the two hedges or importance of the biodiversity in the locations. We also note that the proposed new hedge’s orientation at Studley Moor will totally change the orientation of established nature runs although it seems to link with Dick Hill wood.</p>

					<p>In nature conservation and ecological terms removal of hedge should not be undertaken in the nesting season from 1st March to 31st August.</p> <p>In terms of the history we query whether the hedge on Studley Moor is an enclosure hedge imposed as part of the partition of the Moor, and also whether the hedge to be removed north of Studley Roger might represent a boundary of a former open field system, running north and south of the village.</p> <p>Without being able to make a site visit we have not been able to determine whether this application will compromise any designed views. However, in our opinion historically the sites lie within the original concept for Studley Royal implemented by the Aislabie family. They are likely to be part of what Sarah Spooner calls 'estate landscape' – agricultural land experienced as part of a wider designed landscape, managed with reference to that but substantially for other land use purposes.</p> <p>And although the sites are not in the designated WHS or registered historic park and garden they are within the designated Nidderdale AONB.</p> <p>We consider that full biodiversity information should be provided and then the opinion of your Authority and North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) Ecologists obtained along with that of Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>In terms of the heritage NYCC archaeologists should be consulted.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register their concerns.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc, Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens	North Yorkshire	E20/0117	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of structural support system to balcony walkway with cladding to the Little Theatre. The Spa Complex, The Spa, Scarborough, NORTH YORKSHIRE YO11 2HD.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.05.2020</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 – Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens (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>We refer you to our letter of 22nd March 2020 in response to the Listed Building application: 0/00406/LB.</p> <p>Scarborough South Bay was probably the country's first seaside holiday</p>

					<p>resort and South Cliff is a designed seaside landscape of national importance within the Scarborough Conservation Area. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust applaud the recent restoration and stabilization of the designed landscape and gardens of South Cliff, which has secured this significant historic, cultural and aesthetic asset and which has the iconic Spa Complex at its heart.</p> <p>We are pleased to generally support the proposal to repair and maintain the Little Theatre (also known as the Spa Theatre); to replace the structural support system and to install better weatherproofing and repair existing windows etc. In our letter of 22nd March, we wrote that we do have some concerns about the possible visual impact of the cladding and its effect on the views and the historic character of the building. And we had noted the concerns of Historic England and trust that a sympathetic architectural outcome is being reached.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
University of York Campus West designed landscape	North Yorkshire	E20/0119	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey electrical sub-station and covered cycle park. Land Comprising Part Car Park South Of Physics Building, Goodricke Way, Heslington, York. EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2020</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>The application site is situated near the southern edge of the University of York's Campus West and the Campus West designed landscape, which has been registered by Historic England as a Grade II Park and Garden. The site is currently used as part of Campus South car park which extends to the south with the Physics building lying to the north.</p> <p>The registered landscape was designed by Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall & Partners (RMJM) and has been registered due to its historic and design interest, landscaping, designers, degree of survival and group value of the University buildings.</p> <p>We have not made a site visit, but from the documents the application site has been carefully considered and is not visible from the area around the lake or from the area around Heslington Hall and Derwent College which</p>

					<p>are at the heart of the 1960s layout. The hedge along the path helps to provide a green link and we note that much of it will be retained. The Design and Access Statement seems to note that eight small trees will be removed but we have only noted four trees for removal when comparing the existing and proposed site plans. The wildflower biodiverse roof will be a beneficial addition but some maintenance will be required to keep it in good condition. This includes cutting it back in about July, depending on the season, to reduce the vigour of the grasses and allow sufficient light for the flowering plants to compete with the grasses again the following spring.</p> <p>We have no further comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
University of York Campus West designed landscape	North Yorkshire	E20/0123	II	PLANNING APPLICATION External and internal alterations to facilitate building refurbishment with landscaping including new plaza. University Central Hall, University Road To Central Hall, York YO10 5DD. EDUCATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.05.2020</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>The application site is situated in the centre of the University of York's Campus West and the Campus West designed landscape, a focal point for the Campus beside the lake. The designed landscape is on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade II and was designed by Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall & Partners (RMJM). It was registered due to its historic and design interest, landscaping, designers, degree of survival and group value of the University buildings.</p> <p>In terms of the external works proposed we consider that overall, these have the potential to enhance the immediate and surrounding area of Central Hall, a distinctive asset. We concur with the Landscape Officer's comments, Design and Access Statement Section 3.3, part 7 which provides a firm foundation. We have some caveats:</p> <p>Lighting. We understand the requirement for new lighting but we have not noted any assessment of its environmental impact on nocturnal mammals and insects nor on the night sky, which is an ironic omission given the Astro</p>

					<p>campus designation at the west end of the lake adjacent to Walmgate Stray.</p> <p>We have not noted any environmental impact statement, so similarly, as the area of the proposal is a quiet part of the lake, we do not know the situation regarding the breeding birds, including waterfowl.</p> <p>Lakeside Path. We consider that the impact of the proposed realignment of the lakeside path, and the whole relationship of the new plaza has not been considered sufficiently. The sinuous lakeside path is a key component of the RMJM designed landscape, connecting the parkland surrounding the Hall to the more formal surroundings of Central Hall. At present the pedestrian journey from Heslington Hall offers a gradual, contemplative, wandering transition; the new alignment of the Central Hall end of this path disrupts and destroys that key feature of the RMJM design. It's important that the modest and mobile screening effect of the Salix - willow branches and leaves, the varying play of light that they provide, and their importance as a signifier of the date of the designed landscape, is recognised when they are replaced. Careful thought should determine how the replacement trees form a coherent group and their landscape effect from different viewpoints, as they develop and grow. We suggest that the Salix is planted further away from the built structure as their roots are extensive. We note that trees T6-T8 are <i>Abies grandis</i>, a beautiful tree, but one that will get very big (it is a forest tree), so we suggest that they may eventually need replacing, and it would be worth thinking now about a scheme of replacement which is incorporated into a landscape management plan for the Central Hall area.</p> <p>Hedge. We note the single species hedge at the boundary of the plaza which it is suggested can be chosen from three species – <i>Lavendula angustifolia</i> 'Hidcote', <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> 'Otto Luyken' and <i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i>. Is it intended that this should be a low barrier? Hedges in the Campus landscape are a mix of native species. Maybe if the hedge is to be planted with <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> 'Otto Luyken' rather than low-growing lavender or rosemary there is an opportunity to connect with the clipped yews facing Heslington Hall. If this hedge were also to be yew, and shaped geometrically in 21st century topiary the hedge would be a firm contributor to the contemporary design of the west campus.</p> <p>We have no further comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Mulgrave Castle	North Yorkshire	E20/0162	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Two storey rear extension to provide self-contained hotel managers accommodation. Beach Hotel, The Parade, Sandsend, Whitby, North Yorkshire YO21 3SZ. HOTEL/HOSPITALITY	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This planning application lies in the fishing village of Sandsend, close to part of the eastern boundary of the Mulgrave Castle park and estate. Mulgrave Castle is on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at grade II*. The park was laid out by the first Earl of Mulgrave in the late 18C and early 19C incorporating proposals made by Humphry Repton (d.1818). The site is made more significant because Repton's Red Book of proposals is still held by the family.</p> <p>The land behind the hotel rises steeply from sea level south-westwards up semi-wooded slopes to the 53m high top of Sandsend Rigg. Much of the slope of Sandsend Rigg lies within Mulgrave Castle's registered parkland; parkland which includes many fine features and views designed by Repton, including views along the coast across Sandsend to Whitby and Whitby Abbey. Some of the rear of the hotel is also prominent in views across Sandsend Beck and part of Mulgrave Estate for travellers descending the A174 'Lythe Bank' into Sandsend. It also features in views from those parts of the Mulgrave Estate between its entrance on Lythe Bank and Mulgrave Castle itself. Maps suggest there is an additional, smaller property between The Beach Hotel and the boundary of the Mulgrave Estate. However, the form and gradient of the slope is such that this property cannot totally block views of the proposed development from the side.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement at 10 refers to the Sandsend Conservation Area but there is no mention of the site's close proximity to the registered historic landscape and the applicant does not provide any illustration of the impact of the proposed development on the views from any part of the Mulgrave Estate or from the area around the A174 across the Mulgrave Estate to the coast.</p> <p>The proposed development is on two stories perpendicular to the main current building line with large, floor-to-ceiling glass windows for almost</p>

					<p>the full width of both floors of the extension frontage that faces the registered historic park and garden. We are concerned that sunlight reflections and glare from these windows could impact on views from the Mulgrave Estate or when descending the A174 Lythe Bank.</p> <p>We have been unable to make a site visit and it is not possible for an observer currently to assess the precise impact without access to private land, including routes across the Mulgrave Estate which are closed for a full month each May.</p> <p>We note Scarborough Borough Council Local Plan (July 2017) Policy DEC 5 The Historic and Built Environment and at 5.44c. Registered Parks and Gardens. ‘...Proposals affecting a Registered Park and Garden should ensure that development does not detract from the enjoyment, layout, design, character. Appearance or setting of that landscape, cause harm to any key views from or towards these landscapes or, where appropriate, prejudice their future restoration.’</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust is not clear that this proposal would not cause harm to the heritage assets and objects to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Ingleborough Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0180	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for change of use of former Sawmill to visitor centre, cafe, ticket office, community/education rooms with associated amenities and associated external works to provide carparking, widening of existing vehicular access and provision of new pedestrian access. The Old Sawmill, Eggshell Lane, Clapham, LA2 8DU. VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a historic park and garden site. 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 historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Ingleborough Hall, Clapham is a non-registered site, but of significance as the home of the Farrer family of whom the best-known member was Reginald Farrer (1880-1920), the traveller and plant collector. He travelled to Asia in search of a variety of plants, many of which he brought back to England and planted near his home at Ingleborough Hall. He also published a number of books connected with plant hunting and rock gardens.</p> <p>The Old Sawmill is located to the west of the ornamental Ingleborough estate lake and the Nature Trail leading to Ingleborough Cave. It is</p>

					<p>proposed that the works will include a new ticket office for the nature trail as well as café, visitor centre and fully accessible community meeting rooms. There will be improvements to the existing car parking and the provision of three disabled parking spaces. However public visitors to the trail generally park in the village's central car park.</p> <p>This is a well-documented application and a sensitively thought through proposal with community and educational benefits.</p> <p>We have one suggestion to make re Design and Access Statement 5.07 - ... the planting of a beech hedge adjacent to the post and rail fence providing separation to the domestic curtilage.</p> <p>We suggest that mixed native species hedging would be more appropriate and provide more biodiversity than a single species such as beech, which is not considered to be native to the north of England. Species such as: Hazel - <i>Corylus avellanna</i>, Spindle - <i>Euonymus europaeus</i>, Field Maple - <i>Acer campestre</i>, or with prickles; Hawthorn - <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>, Blackthorn - <i>Prunus spinosa</i>, Holly - <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>.</p> <p>We have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Middleton Park, Rousham	Oxfordshire	E20/0050	II I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION A hybrid planning application consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1; outline planning permission for up to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3); 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3); 929 m2 of retail (Class A1); 670 m2 comprising a new medical centre (Class D1); 35,175 m2 of new employment buildings, (comprising up to 6,330 m2 Class B1a, 13,635 m2 B1b/c, 	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee regarding 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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The Grade I Rousham landscape is of national and international significance and is regarded as the most complete surviving example of an early 18th century landscape designed by William Kent. Within the Rousham landscape and its setting, the house itself is listed Grade I and there are in excess of 70 other buildings, statues, walls, structures etc which are listed. The significance of the combined designated heritage assets is amplified by the almost unparalleled amount of them, and should, in our opinion, be considered as a single entity as far as significance is concerned. A negative impact on any one of these assets, correspondingly affects the significance</p>

			<p>9,250 m2 Class B2, and 5,960 m2 B8); 2,415 m2 of new school building on 2.4 ha site for a new school (Class D1); 925 m2 of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515 m2 of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2); 30m in height observation tower with zipwire with ancillary visitor facilities of up of 100 m2 (Class D1/A1/A3); 1,000 m2 energy facility/infrastructure with a stack height of up to 24m (sui generis); 2,520 m2 additional education facilities (buildings and associated external infrastructure) at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1); Creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure. the change of use of the following buildings and areas: Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8); Buildings 217, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3102, and 3136 for employment use (Class B8); Buildings 2010 and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1); Buildings 73 and 2004 (Class D1); Buildings 391, 1368, 1443, 2005,</p>	<p>of the whole, as well as individually. A key aspect of Kent’s design was using the countryside beyond the site to provide extensive picturesque views including north and north-east across the water meadows and Heyford Bridge to nearby villages, focal points such as the church towers at Steeple Aston, Lower & Upper Heyford and to eyecatchers or tree clumps which he created. The tranquillity of the rural setting and timeless quality of the Rousham landscape, complete with its pleasure grounds, temples, statues and riverside walks are a fragile resource and of the highest significance in terms of the evolution of the naturalistic garden and English landscape design. The GT/OGT wish to lodge a holding objection to the amended proposals, including re-location of sports development and 30m high observation tower with zip-wire, pending further details and clarification of the impacts on views and the setting of the Grade I Rousham landscape. NPPF para 194 states ‘Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset ... or from development within its setting ... should require clear and convincing justification.’ Cumulative impacts of features such as towers on the skyline can impact negatively and harm views. Your officers will be familiar with Historic England’s The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. ‘When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.’ (p2) Also relevant : (p5) ‘development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site’s visual boundary’ and lastly (p12) ‘Cumulative assessment is required under the EU Directive on EIA. Its purpose is to identify impacts that are the result of introducing the development into the view in combination with other existing and proposed developments.’ The LVIA should be revised and expanded to identify, assess and illustrate impacts from key viewpoints identified in the Rousham Conservation Area Appraisal, Para 9.2 (September 2018), and photomontages provided without tree leaf cover, of development over 10.5m (to comply with NPPF Para 189). Such view-points include from the Horse & Lion statue on the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use); Building 340 (Class D1, D2, A3); 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis); and > 76.6ha for filming activities, including 2.1 ha for filming set construction and event parking (Sui Generis);</p> <p>the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2.</p> <p>associated infrastructure works, including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road. Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>north of the Bowling Green, the Dying Gladiator above Praeneste, as well as from Townsend's Temple and various view points along the riverside walk.</p> <p>Causewayed Heyford Bridge, a Grade II* structure of medieval origin, prominent on the main B4030 east/west route within the setting, and contributing to key views from Rousham, is potentially impacted by the increase in traffic. OGT seeks clarification of the safeguarding of this structure in the provision of a structural survey/repair schedule of Heyford Bridge.</p> <p>In addition the GT/OGT seeks clarification of details to minimise harm to the Rousham landscape and its setting from traffic, noise and light pollution (sky glow, glare and light intrusion) in the provision of a Traffic Infrastructure Appraisal and Management Plan, Lighting Report and Tree/Woodland Planting Plan.</p> <p>The GT/OGT has also considered the potential impacts of proposals on Middleton Park. We consider that due to the siting of the development and the intervening wood, there will be no impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>We would be pleased to offer further comments once additional details are received.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Ascott Park	Oxfordshire	E20/0122	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Renewal of permissions P16/S3874/HH and P16/S3875/LB - Alterations to the existing house to return one attic space to habitable accommodation and a second attic space into a bat loft, and, alterations to an existing detached double garage to replace the roof structure and incorporate a studio / home office which is ancillary accommodation to the main house. Ascott Park Cottage, Ascott OX44 7UJ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Ascott Park is a grade II registered park and garden (RPG) dating from at least the 16th and 17th centuries, relating to a former Manor House and its successor building which was burnt down shortly after completion in 1662. The site contains a formally designed landscape with an entrance on the north with tall square gate piers, two tree avenues, and a depression marking the probable site of the 17th century house, formal garden terracing and remains of stone steps, garden buildings including an octagonal dovecote and a thatched granary, ponds and a water garden. Whilst the Design and Access Statement acknowledges the RPG there is no</p>

					<p>analysis of its significance nor of important views. This is a requirement of the NPPF paragraph 189. The GT/OGT consider that the extent of new windows and rooflights proposed will be discordant, intrusive elements on the roofs of Ascott Park Cottage and the proposed studio/home office would detract from the architectural and aesthetic interest of Ascott Park Cottage, and of views from within the RPG.</p> <p>It is considered that mitigation could be achieved by reducing the large numbers of windows and rooflights. The three high-level rooflights suggested for the south west elevation of Ascott Park Cottage could be reduced by removing the two lower ones to light the stairwell, retaining the single conservation rooflight for the proposed bathroom. In the garage, proposed for conversion to home office, the 3 rooflights, 2 on the inner slope, one on the outer, could be removed and requirements for ventilation and light provided by the proposed gable end windows alone. The GT/OGT request that a visual analysis of the impacts of the proposals on the RPG is obtained (NPPF paragraph 189) and that options for mitigation are given consideration, in order to reduce potential impacts on the architectural and aesthetic interest of Ascott Park Cottage and on views from the RPG.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement makes reference to the former stone gateway to Ascott Park being held at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. This is no longer the case, since it was moved a couple of years ago and is now installed as a doorway feature in the new Weston Library within the New Bodleian Library, Broad Street, Oxford.</p> <p>The GT/OGT wish to lodge a holding objection pending a visual analysis of the impacts on the RPG and consideration of possible mitigation of impacts of rooflights.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Fairmile Hospital	Oxfordshire	E20/0138	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Single storey rear extension and internal alterations to provide new bedroom and en-suite on the ground floor. 3 Reading Road, Cholsey OX10 9HJ. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.05.2020</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>No 3 Reading Road forms the southern part of a pair of brick cottages, of</p>

					<p>local interest, located within Fairmile Hospital's Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) designed by Robert Murnock. It is within the curtilage of Fairmile Hospital, the former 19th century asylum for the county of Berkshire. The cottages are sited adjacent to the asylum farmyard buildings to the north of the main hospital and were designed by CH Howell, also the architect of the Hospital (constructed 1868-70). The cottage is one of a number of subsidiary structures forming part of the ensemble of asylum buildings which functioned and related to the overall purpose of the main asylum by providing accommodation for staff and farm workers until the hospital closed in 2003.</p> <p>No 3 Reading Road contributes to the architectural, historic, aesthetic and communal interest of Fairmile Hospital in its original symmetrical design, materials, ancillary function and association. The Design and Access Statement by Jessop and Cook Architects records the cottage as being located on the north west adjacent to Reading Road in the park area to the south east of the now converted farmyard buildings. Visually the cottages are separated from the main hospital buildings by the farmyard buildings and a large group of trees.</p> <p>None the less, the proposed alterations to the cottage, No 3 Reading Road, impact on that part of Murnock's designed landscape, the pleasure grounds to the north and west of the main hospital building. In our opinion, any changes need to reflect both the intended symmetry of the original design of the cottage pair and respect the designed landscape in which it would be located.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement (HS) by Jessup and Cook sets out the significance of the cottage as being of medium historical and community value and the plan, design and massing and plan of the RPG as of low aesthetic and evidential value. Furthermore, the HS acknowledges that the proposed extension would be high in impact but that the proposed massing, roof shape and materials would render it neutral in impact on significance. The GT/OGT broadly accept the analysis of significance put forward but contend that the design and detail of the proposed extension in the height and length of the extension would disrupt, and not contribute positively to the symmetry of the cottage, design intent and aesthetic of the cottage itself or the designed landscape. Drawings of the proposed side elevation on the south west and rear elevation on the south east show that the proposed extension would be slightly higher than the adjacent extension and break forward from it, creating an asymmetrical junction. To mitigate</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>this it is suggested that the height of the extension be slightly reduced and the length brought in to match that of the adjacent extension.</p> <p>The GT/OGT suggest that this slight amendment in design would better respect the overall design aesthetic of the cottage pair and the RPG.</p> <p>It is noted that in 5.1.4 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment by SJ Stephens Associates that a section of hedging adjacent to the Reading Road is to be removed to allow access for machinery and materials. Is this to be re-instated? We support the tree protection measures for the mature copper beech T2 and lime T3 as these are likely to have formed part of the original landscaping to the north of the main hospital building.</p> <p>We wish to submit a holding objection pending consideration of possible mitigation of impacts to No 3 Reading Road and on the design aesthetic of the Fairmile Hospital RPG by the slight reduction of the length and height of the proposed extension.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wentworth Castle	South Yorkshire	E19/1566	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new dormer bungalow and associated works including provision of new vehicular entrance gates; Pine Lodge, Stainborough Lane, Hood Green, Barnsley S75 3EZ.</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (GT) of amendments to the above application, which we objected to strongly to on 30th January 2020. It is the only grade I registered park and garden in South Yorkshire; a hugely important, international heritage asset within your Authority's jurisdiction. Your officers will be acutely aware that anything which might affect Wentworth Castle's triple Grade I listing, needs very careful consideration. The site for this planning application lies immediately within the south west boundary of Wentworth Castle Park, a significant resource for large urban communities, especially during these unprecedented times. We concur entirely with the comments made by Emma Sharpe of Historic England (HE) in her letter of 21st May regarding the new documentation supplied by the applicant. We share HE's concern about the height of the replacement building, and the increased prominence of the long ridgeline within views from the historic parkland. The replacement building would no longer sit quietly within the landscape looking as if it could be an agricultural building. It would in our opinion become more dominant with large areas of glass and, have a negative impact upon heritage assets of the highest significance. We will not repeat HE's mitigation suggestions for reasons of brevity, but would agree with their suggestions.</p> <p>We consider that it would be possible to accommodate a new dwelling on</p>

					<p>the site, but in our opinion, this version does not fit sensitively into the surrounding parkland and the views towards the site. We therefore continue to object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
City Cemetery, Sheffield	Road	South Yorkshire	E20/0103	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 101 dwellings (including 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties) with associated car parking, roads, footpaths and landscaping works. Land Opposite Sheffield Manor Lodge Discovery Centre, Manor Lane, Sheffield, S2 1UH. RESIDENTIAL</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020</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 – in this case City Road Cemetery, registered 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>City Road Cemetery was designed by the Sheffield architectural practice of Messers M E Hadfield and Son and opened in 1881. It includes a number of listed structures and buildings and is located south west of the proposed development site with only a short section immediately adjacent to the site and separated by a substantial belt of trees, albeit deciduous. It would appear that the impact of the development will be more substantial upon the historic The Manor/Manor Lodge, an ancient monument which is located to the north and an important heritage asset. We are surprised that the Design and Access Statement does not include information about the nearby historic sites.</p> <p>We understand that the combined parcels of land that make up the proposed Pennine Village supported housing constructed during the late 1940's, demolished some years ago and which had substantial open space. The site slopes downhill from west to east and the new housing is a key part of the regeneration strategy for the area.</p> <p>We have been unable to visit the site recently and from the documents do not have any major concerns but would like to make the following points: In terms of the cemetery we suggest that some evergreen planting such as holly, laurel, Scots pine could be incorporated into the deciduous belt of trees along the eastern boundary of the cemetery adjacent to the Pennine Village development.</p> <p>We understand that the housing design has been developed with a variety of heights but consider that two (or even 2.5 storey) would be preferable</p>

					<p>to three- storey housing opposite the heritage assets. This would be less impactful and more in keeping with the existing housing. Although there is some green space along the Manor Lane boundary, The Manor/Manor Lodge is inevitably going to be in a suburban setting which we consider is somewhat at odds with its importance and heritage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Hillsborough Park	South Yorkshire	E20/0157	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new asphalt all-wheel bike track and learn to ride area, siting of 2 shipping containers for equipment storage and welfare facilities, provision of hard surfaced areas, benches, bike racks, signage, lighting columns and soft landscaping. Hillsborough Park, Middlewood Road, Sheffield, S6 4HD. PUBLIC PARK, HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2020</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 – in this case Hillsborough Park, registered 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>Hillsborough Park is located approximately 3 miles north-west of Sheffield City Centre, laying directly adjacent to the A61Penistone Road. It covers 20 hectares. The surrounding land comprises of largely residential areas to the west and south and industrial and commercial areas to the east with directly north of the site Sheffield Wednesday Football Club’s Hillsborough Stadium. The Park is a Conservation area and contains several Grade II listed buildings and structures and appears on the Local Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>The park is part of the original setting of Hillsborough Hall, (1779, listed grade II) one of the few examples of a large 18th century classical house in Sheffield and designed by Robert Adam. The park is contemporary with the house and was laid out in the tradition of English landscape parks with trees planted in naturalistic groups in open parkland, a lime avenue from the Penistone Road Lodge and a tree belt lining the south and south east boundary of the park. Hillsborough Park minus the hall was bought by Sheffield Corporation in 1890 with the hall and its grounds added in 1903. New public elements have been superimposed on the 18th century park landscape over the years which overall seem to have been placed with care to ensure the minimal loss of original features. The Historic England Risk Register listing for the park notes that the current condition of the</p>

					<p>Hillsborough Park Conservation is poor, its vulnerability is low, however its trend is deteriorating. We have noted the poor condition of some of the listed buildings.</p> <p>This is a well-documented application and we understand that the proposed bike track and further public facilities would be desirable at Hillsborough Park which serves a large residential area. Having read the Consultation Report agree that the proposed site is the best location that would not impose on the Conservation Area status and heritage of the park.</p> <p>We note the proposals regarding the trees and the details of the shipping containers and lighting and overall do not have any concerns in this location. We support the containers being painted to integrate with the landscape and to recede visually from Penistone Road where the two historic lodges are situated and where the lime avenue terminates. The 'green' roof will be a beneficial addition but some maintenance will be required to keep it in good condition. This includes cutting it back in about July, depending on the season, to reduce the vigour of the grasses and allow sufficient light for the flowering plants to compete with the grasses again the following spring. We trust the lighting will not be any more intrusive than necessary for the users and for the security of the new track, and that illumination will be on a timer, as we are aware of the impact of lighting on residents and wildlife.</p> <p>Overall, we have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E20/0087	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved, access to be considered) - Erection of up to 190 residential dwellings, purpose built care home for up to 60 bedrooms, and associated infrastructure including landscaping, public open-space, car parking and means of access off Church Field Road. Land On</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2020</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.</p> <p>Our concern is the considerable adverse impact that we feel the proposed development will inevitably have on the significance of this Registered Park and Garden (RPG), which includes not only the walled garden next to the Hall, but also the woodland garden lying between the Hall and the site, and the open parkland running along the northern boundary of the proposal site. The RPG forms part of a unique cluster of heritage assets whose</p>

				<p>The North Side Of, Church Field Road, Chilton Industrial Estate, Chilton, Suffolk. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>significance is inextricably linked, the RPG enhancing the significance of the other assets and vice versa. The applicant has, in our opinion, substantially underestimated the significance of the RPG and other assets, and consequently, even the proposed ‘mitigation measures’ (namely some moderate planting), comes nowhere close, in our view, of overcoming the harm that this proposal will cause to the RPG and other assets. We set out our objection in greater detail below.</p> <p>The significance of the four designated heritage assets (Grade I St Mary’s Church, Grade II* Chilton Hall, the Grade II RPG and the Grade II walled garden) which will be affected by the development, is amplified due to the fact that the church, hall, RPG & walled garden, were all built by the Crane family within a short historical time-frame. In our opinion, these assets constitute an important cohesive group which interrelate with one another in a shared landscape. They should therefore be considered as a single entity as far as significance is concerned. A negative impact on any one of these assets will affect the significance of the whole, as well as individually. Your officers will be familiar with Historic England’s (HE) The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, Part I – Settings and Views (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017 (SHA, PN3) which corroborates this (p2) : heritage assets ‘that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each’.</p> <p>We are surprised that the Heritage Assessment (HA) produced for the applicant by Jonathan Edis, Heritage Collective, does not include any illustrated map regressions earlier than the tithe map mentioned regarding the extent of the park prior to c1840. Such map regressions would have shown the extent of the Crane’s holdings and the relationship between the church and Hall complex, especially as the Crane family association with Chilton dates back to the late C15. We therefore challenge Mr Edis’s assertion (3.5) that ‘there must be a question mark over the significance of the rest of the designation The field boundaries in the area do not have the characteristics of a designed landscape that has been imposed on its surroundings, and the core of the designation seems to be quite localised, within the immediate surroundings of the Hall.’ The surrounding land was previously a deer park, part and parcel of the original Crane estate, and therefore of importance when looking to understand the setting of the heritage assets. The HA (4.14) mentions that the setting of the church and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>hall complex has been considerably altered and that 'it cannot be said that the historic setting is pristine in any way.' SHA, PN3 rightly states (p4) 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset'. There is no need to make the situation worse.</p> <p>The collective importance of this group of assets has been recognised in the Babergh & Mid Suffolk Heritage & Settlement Sensitivity Assessment Final Report (HSSA) of March 2018 quoted in the Heritage Assessment (1.4) : 'It is recommended that future development sites avoid further encroachment on these assets, in particular Chilton Hall and Church ..' and that 'the hall is still discernibly separate from the edge of Sudbury and would be susceptible to any development which infilled this small section of open landscape between it and the edge of Sudbury'. Allowing development across the whole of the proposed site would be extremely damaging to the significance of the RPG and related assets, completely removing their historic, rural setting outside the Sudbury settlement.</p> <p>The emerging Joint Local Plan (JLP) proposes to de-allocate the site from its current employment use, as there is currently an oversupply of employment land for the plan period and also due to the site's heritage sensitivity (Vincent & Gorbing Planning Statement (PS) on behalf of Caverswall Enterprises Ltd and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust, para 5.18). This assessment is backed up by the 2019 Strategic Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), which considers the site under Ref SS0933. It concludes that the site lies 'within an area of high heritage sensitivity' which is why it has been discounted from employment use or any other development in the emerging JLP. There is also currently a sufficient housing supply within the 5 year housing plan, so this application, especially when taken with the additional housing developments already granted in Chilton : surrounding Chilton hall to the north (see Local plan proposals map for BDC CPO1 illustrating the area of the Chilton woods allocation for 1150 residential units) plus the 130 houses at the Orchard site, also wholly within Chilton parish, takes the housing requirement well over and above the required housing target for Babergh.</p> <p>The northern boundary of the development site immediately abuts the RPG, which we reiterate, includes not only the walled garden next to the Hall, but also the woodland garden lying between the Hall and the site, and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the open parkland running along the northern boundary of the site. Much is made in the documentation about the tree belt which is it claimed will conceal the development in views from within the RPG and other heritage assets to the north, as well as protect the experience of the assets from intrusive noise and light. We consider this reliance on the tree belt to be misplaced. The tree belt between Chilton Hall and the grassland was planted several years ago when the site was allocated for employment and has no understory. Since then it has not been well maintained and the trees are in poor condition (Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Para 6.3). It consists predominantly of moderate to low quality trees. In a recent local decision (APP/D3505/W/19/3230839) a planning inspector emphasised that limited reliance should be placed on the ability of planting to screen views of developments, given the variability of such planting. In order to fulfil even a partial screening role, trees and associated dense undergrowth must be managed and maintained permanently by the long-term implementation of a management plan. Even with such a management plan in place we remain unconvinced that the development will not result in urbanising, physical form at the edge of the RPG being prominent, even if filtered to some degree, from within the RPG, negatively affecting its significance.</p> <p>In conclusion, we OBJECT to the above application as it does not comply with the emerging local plan, nor does it meet the requirements of NPPF 192(c) & 194, and if allowed, would seriously damage the setting of all the assets. The group of assets taken together will no longer be set in a rural landscape for the first time in its entire existence, and the experience of and significance of the RPG in particular, will be significantly adversely affected by the development in the immediately adjoining field.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Knepp Castle	West Sussex	E20/0043	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed construction of landscape enhancement features using imported inert material, together with the provision of public access and amenity; comprising revised landform and details to WSCC/029/18/SP.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and also the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>Summary Representatives of SGT have studied the submitted documents. The Trust</p>

				<p>Knepp Castle, West Grinstead, Horsham RH13 8LJ. LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>does not object and is minded to support the application if it is confirmed that the design of the amphitheatre has smooth slopes rather than terraced steps.</p> <p>Argument</p> <p>The site lies partly within Knepp Castle, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. Moreover, the proposed features will be clearly visible from viewpoints within the Park, indeed the Buck Farm enhancement feature is designed to be seen as an Eye Catcher when viewed from the Park. Thus, the visual impact of the features is of fundamental importance to the assessment of the proposals on the significance of the Park.</p> <p>As required by the NPPF, the application includes detailed documents describing the significance of the Park and the impact of the proposals on that significance. These identify a number of harmful impacts during the construction phase but for the completed project conclude “The final landscape forms can be regarded as a +ve addition to the Registered Park and the setting of grade II* listed Knepp Castle as its axial point.” (quote from p.25 of A02 Heritage Impact Assessment)</p> <p>The main focus for SGT has been to consider whether this conclusion is justified. The Trust agrees with the use of the term ‘engineered landform’ (P.21 of D&AS) to describe what was approved in an earlier application. Unlike the present proposals, this did not integrate the area of farm landscape ‘in style and quality, with the adjoining parkland, and visually connect it to the wider historic, man-made landscape” – which is indeed a picturesque design reflecting Repton’s principles. However it is unclear whether the amphitheatre will have terraced steps (the word ‘amphitheatre’ is always in parenthesis) – hopefully not, since it is designed as an eye-catcher, to be viewed from the Castle from a distance (the scale of the landscape is much greater than at Claremont) and, as a picturesque Reptonian feature, it should meet the requisites described by Repton in his book “Observations on Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening” including: “...it must studiously conceal every interference of art, however expensive, by which the nature scenery’s improved, making a whole appear the production of nature only” (quote on p.16 of D&AS).</p> <p>The Trust has a slight concern regarding the impact of the additional height on the surrounding pretty flat rural landscape – the spot height on the A24 immediately outside the northern boundary is c18m, so the highest point of the top of the new landform will be some 13m above that.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Provided it is confirmed the amphitheatre will have smooth slopes rather than terraced steps, the Trust considers the present proposals would turn a rather pedestrian and utilitarian arrangement of landform and trees into a piece of new landscape which complements and extends the aesthetic of the existing park to its long-term benefit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden 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 15.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for e-mailing me on 12th May with copies of the proposed plans and additional information. As I noted in our letter of 1st April the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT), the statutory consultee, and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Shibden Hall House is a 15th Century and later manor house and is listed grade II*. The landscape park is grade II on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and was laid out for the owner Jeremy Lister in the 1830's when the estate was managed by his daughter Anne Lister. She employed the architect John Harper of York to remodel the Hall and provide proposals for structural works in the grounds which were implemented by William Gray of York who also worked at Clumber Park.</p> <p>The additional information is useful but we regret that the submitted plans/documents do not indicate the significance of Shibden Hall – there is no design and access statement – and the plans do not illustrate the relationship of the cabin to the existing café building and tree or to views along the entrance/exit pathway. The plans show two solid doors to the front, which when closed give the appearance of a very utilitarian storage building. This is much to be regretted as we know that much time and effort went into designing the café building and its surroundings to create a high- quality landscaped area at a key visitor entrance and exit point. Based on the information available the proposed ice cream shed/veranda will compromise and spoil the café building and the public entrance/exit.</p> <p>Shibden Park is an important heritage asset and we underline the importance of having well-designed and sensitively sited interventions. We</p>

					do not consider that the proposal in any way goes towards this and object to this planning application. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E20/0088	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing building into eight units (C3) construction of car port structure, provision of refuse facilities, cycle storage facilities and associated works. Covered Reservoir, Home Farm Drive, Menston. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.05.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting High Royds Hospital, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at 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. The former mental hospital, High Royds, is a nationally important example of a Victorian asylum. It was deliberately placed in a rural setting with the grounds laid out in the style of a modified traditional country house estate. The site of this planning application, for the conversion of the former Victorian reservoir that served High Royds, lies to the west of the former asylum, in Green Belt land and although outside the Registered area, is part of its setting regarding the western view across agricultural land to Hawksworth Moor. In 2017, a pre-application enquiry based on a conversion scheme to four self-contained dwellings with associated car parking and amenity space, was notified that such a proposal would be over-development and intrusive in its rural setting and impact on the openness and character and appearance of the Green Belt at this location. Subsequently, your Authority approved the change of use to a single dwelling. We note that this application is now for eight dwellings which would result in considerably increased vehicle movements on a public footpath, also increased wear of the proposed road surface, and the possibility of more domestic items in the curtilage. We also note that a difference between this proposal and the approved application for one dwelling, is the doubling of the height of the windows, which would make the building far more prominent in the landscape although planting is proposed on the northern side. The latter is contrary to the intended original design. Due to the present situation we have been unable to visit the area of the

				<p>proposal to ascertain the possible impact. We understand from the Design and Access Statement that although it states that the building's appearance will remain largely as existing, the opening up of the long sides is also proposed and that the car port/refuse/cycle store will be an oak framed, open sided structure with grass roof. The documents indicate that the landscaping will retain the rural setting and we strongly urge that this is enshrined in any approval for this site.</p> <p>We do have concerns about the setting and have noted the Consultation Draft - August 2017, AIREBOROUGH LANDSCAPE CHARACTER & VALUE REPORT, A collaborative report led by Tom Lonsdale, Placecraft, please see Note below from the Report.</p> <p>We suggest that because this planning proposal lies within the setting of the heritage assets of High Royds and within the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area, that any planning permission securing a future for the site should not harm the special significance of this wider area.</p> <p>We object to this application as proposed as we do not consider that it will protect the setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust AIREBOROUGH LANDSCAPE CHARACTER & VALUE REPORT P5 Aireborough Landscape Character and Value Study. Landscape plays a profoundly important part in defining the character of the area but there is little available published material on what contributes to the sense of place and character that is Aireborough and how it gives rise to local uniqueness. Further, the area predominantly sits in an unusual glacial topographic feature called the Guiseley Gap which links Airedale to Wharfedale and contains Guiseley and Yeadon, and which is not mentioned in the Leeds Landscape, Habitat or Green Infrastructure assessments. In its response to the Leeds Core Strategy Preferred Approach 2009 Natural England advised "An up-to-date landscape character assessment is an essential part of the evidence base and Leeds should refresh existing work in this area to ensure that it is useful in informing the objectives of this Core Strategy." The purpose of this study is therefore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → to build a complete picture of the ingredients that shape the character and condition of the Aireborough landscape → to examine the value of that landscape to sustainability and delivery of
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the Core Strategy and Neighbourhood Development Plan vision.</p> <p>→ to prescribe actions to ensure its value to sustainability into the future.</p> <p>P28 In the 1880's High Royds was chosen as the site for a new West Riding Pauper Lunatic Asylum owing to its feeling of sanctuary in an area with good links to Leeds and Bradford. The hospital was self-sufficient, from its capture and use of water to its railway spur, farm, workshops and designed gardens, on what had once been Menston Common. (picture of the sublime High Royds Reservoir at Matthew Gill).</p>
Tottenham House and Savernake Forest	Wiltshire	E20/0116	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of an energy centre in the grounds of Tottenham House and Estate and associated works. Tottenham House and Estate, Grand Avenue, Savernake, SN8 3BE. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2020</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>We have studied the online documentation and have viewed the site from a public footpath during the past few days and we support the applicant's wish to introduce green energy saving technology. Our comments as to the proposed new building are as follows. It is single storey and therefore less obtrusive than the previously permitted building. We would have no objection if at a later stage the building were to be clad in wood. However, in our opinion, it somewhat pedestrian in design. As the previous permitted structure was a house with some views over the grounds, we are not certain whether the proposed energy building will be screened in some way. Should your officers approve this application, we would suggest that a selection of C18 evergreen shrubs, ideally such as Viburnum tinus, common holly, Portugal laurel, yew be used for this purpose.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.05.2020</p> <p>Further to our email of yesterday commenting on the above application, we have just received the design amendments. The building's position has not changed but it is now to be rendered with a slate and Bath stone roof. The Gardens Trust and Wiltshire Gardens Trust feel this this is an improvement and would support this amendment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
--	--	--	--	--	---