

THE GARDEN
HISTORY SOCIETY

Planning Conservation Advice Note 14

Management plans



GHS Head Office, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ

Tel: 020 7608 2409 Fax: 020 7490 2974 Email: conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org

www.gardenhistorysociety.org

The Planning Conservation Advice Notes (PCANs) listed below have been devised by the Garden History Society to advise those wishing to determine the impact upon historic designed landscape of specific proposals for change. This includes local planning authorities, potential developers, owners or other interested parties. These PCANs seek to inform on necessary background information and good conservation practice while at the same time encouraging critical evaluation of the likely type and extent of potential impact. Not all impact is adverse, change is not necessarily detrimental, and opportunities do exist both for development and, where adverse impact has been identified, for appropriate mitigation. Informed evaluation is essential however, if irreversible damage is to be avoided and change is to be implemented in a way that is sympathetic to the historic and visual value of designed landscape.

Titles List

PCAN 1: Change of Use (of landscape, and of principal and/or subsidiary buildings)

PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development

PCAN 3: Extension of Educational/Institutional Establishments

PCAN 4: Executive Housing

PCAN 5: Golf

PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access

PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances

PCAN 8: Telecommunications Masts

PCAN 9: Development of Domestic Amenities

PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting

PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape

PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features

PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments

PCAN 14: Management Plans (including Statements of Significance)

Appendix 1: Lists of subsidiary development generated by particular types of change

Appendix 2: General Evaluation Checklist (All types development/all types landscape)

Appendix 3: Planning Context

Planning Conservation Advice Notes 1 to 12 deal with some of the most common types of change proposed in historic landscape or its setting. Notes 13 and 14 describe documentation required to evaluate and support proposals for such change. Appendices 1 to 3, which separate out specific aspects of proposals in note form for quick reference, may also be useful for evaluation of types of change not covered in PCANs 1 to 12.

Format

PCANs 1 to 12 are divided into the following sections:

Section 1.0: Introduction

Section 2.0: Information Needed to Evaluate the Impact of Proposals

Section 3.0: Further Information Needed

Section 4.0: Potential for Mitigation

Section 5.0: Watchpoints

Section 6.0: Unavoidable Development/Damage

Section 7.0: Application of Advice

Section 8.0: Planning Context

Section 9.0: Evaluation

Evaluation

Most sections follow a set format but Section 9.0 on evaluation differs between various PCANs.

PCANs 3; 6; 8; 9; 10; 11 have a flow chart evaluation questionnaire. This may assist planning officers in particular, both in assessment of proposals and in preparation of recommendations for committee – the advice shown in upper case and bold type being intended to inform particularly on the following:

- level of potential impact
- further input which may be needed from other professionals
- further information which may be required
- where condition or legal agreement would be required to avoid adverse impact

PCANs 1; 2; 7 have checklists of questions intended to:

- highlight other relevant evaluation tools
- highlight potential implications of proposals
- list questions relevant to evaluation of impact

PCANs 4; 5 have short checklists of questions intended to:

- direct evaluation to specific conservation advice in the relevant PCAN
- assist evaluation by highlighting potential implications of proposals

PCAN 12 seeks to assist evaluators by offering conservation advice for particular situations.

Current status of advice notes

These planning conservation advice notes may be amended following trialling or with the introduction of new legislation. Any comments, and suggestions for improvement would be welcomed by the Society and feedback on content, usefulness, layout etc. of the sections on evaluation (including flow-charts) would be particularly appreciated.

Acknowledgements

Individuals and organisations too numerous to mention have been involved in various stages of preparation of these PCANs and the Society would like to acknowledge this invaluable assistance and to offer its thanks to them all.

The Society would also like to highlight the input of the Society's conservation team in place at the time the original concept was devised (David Lambert, Anthea Taigel, Kath Gibson, Sarah Couch and Linden Groves), with particular thanks to David Lambert for identification of subjects, Sarah Couch for invaluable advice and for her work on PCAN 14 and advice flow charts, Kath Gibson for invaluable advice, particularly on PCANs 1 and 7, and Linden Groves for her support and enthusiasm. The Society is also indebted to the Jubilee Fund Trustees who provided initial funding for 'pilot' PCANs, and to the GHS Conservation Committee, which has supported this initiative throughout, with particular thanks to John Sales who has provided the text for Statements of Significance (included in PCAN 14). Format and text of PCANs and Appendices were otherwise devised by Anthea Taigel (former principal conservation officer of the GHS), with the advice and guidance of Elisabeth Whittle, (Chairman of the GHS Conservation Committee).

Copyright of the text of PCANS and appendices rests jointly with The Garden History Society and Anthea Taigel.

This advice note comprises three sections:

1. *Statements of Significance*
2. *Management Plans (Maintenance Agreements)*
3. *Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plans (CMPs)*

1. Statements of Significance

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 'Conservation is about negotiating the transition from past to future in such a way as to secure the transfer of maximum significance' (Holland A. and Rawles K. 'Values in Conservation' *ECOS*, Vol 14, June 1993).
- 1.2 Conservation is a continuous process, not just a 'quick fix'. It requires assessment of the full value and meaning of what exists and arranging for the more important of these qualities and features to be retained for the future.
- 1.3 Conservation is not the same as restoration, although restoration may be part of conservation.
(See also *GHS PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*. Section 9.1)
- 1.4 Designed landscapes do not remain static. Instead, they develop and decay and, while development should be carefully considered and setbacks mitigated, it is seldom possible (and rarely desirable) to maintain the status quo. Historic designed landscapes must adapt if they are to survive and, in practice, not everything can be preserved.
- 1.5 Managing, developing and adapting historic designed landscapes usually involves making choices. Current needs and resources may drive such choices but these should be underpinned by a thorough knowledge of the site. Hence the value of historic research, recording and survey.
(See *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*)
- 1.6 Older gardens and landscapes are often overlaid by planting of a different period and by designed layouts of a later style. Evidence relating to continuous care and ownership is part of the history of the place (see also 2.3 below) and needs to be evaluated; taking into account its impact on earlier (sometimes more significant) layouts.
- 1.7 A Statement of Significance should be the starting point for any plan of adaptation, conservation, repair and development. A clear understanding of the significance of each period of a garden's or landscape's history is essential for any conservation plan.

2.0 Definition of Significance

- 2.1 Significance may be defined as that which makes a place unique, distinctive, important or of special merit by comparison with other places.
- 2.2 When applied to historic designed landscape, the term may encompass history, design, structures, plants, people associated with the place etc. However, landscapes may also be significant for their aesthetic, social, cultural, educational, horticultural, biological and environmental characteristics.
These latter qualities and features may well derive from an original layout and purpose, or from other planned changes since that time but, particularly on older sites, some may have been accidental.
- 2.3 In designed landscapes (including smaller gardens), significance may also arise from traditions of use, site-specific management regimes, long-standing cultivation techniques, or even the skills passed down through generations of gardeners and managers. These are the dynamic processes which have shaped the landscape over time and which may remain as vital to the character and distinctiveness of a place as design, structure and planting.

3.0 Research and Analysis

- 3.1 The validity of any assessment of significance is dependent on the rigour of research, extent of enquiry, acuteness of observation and quality of subsequent analysis. Good historic research will combine all these and will not be a purely academic exercise and confined entirely to paper sources.
- 3.2 Fundamental to our understanding of a place is an accurate survey of its physical features – land, buildings, ornament, water, plants – undertaken alongside a full account of its history. This procedure is now routine in the preparation of plans for conservation management and the techniques are well perfected.
- 3.3 Aspects which are sometimes dealt with less diligently include the proper cataloguing of the plant collection, especially where this is extensive. Accurate identification and research of plants, including trees and their estimated ages, can reveal much about the history of the garden or landscape and the source of its special character.
- 3.4 Public benefit and local importance should be part of the assessment of significance, especially for gardens and landscapes open regularly to visitors. Although inevitably subjective, people's general perceptions of the value and meaning of places, as revealed by questionnaires and interviews, are essential to a full understanding of significance.
- 3.5 The potential of a place should not be ignored – particularly scope for appropriate education and training as well as for repair, renewal, beneficial development and enrichment. For semi-derelict gardens, the potential for repairing and sustaining lost features and the likely impact of this on present character would receive special attention.

4.0 Order of Significance

- 4.1 A Statement of Significance is formulated by assessing the relative value of every aspect of the place as revealed by research, survey, observation and analysis and then setting each of them out in order of importance. Effective conservation and any long-term plan for retaining the essential qualities of the place rely on this accurate analysis of their relative importance.
- 4.2 It is comparatively easy to assemble a list of values, features, events and opportunities which have been significant in determining the character and distinctiveness of a place. It is more difficult, but vital, to decide upon their order of significance. A rigorous analysis of this kind is essential if the Statement of Significance is to have any value in deciding principles for long-term conservation management.
- 4.3 In managing and conserving gardens and landscapes, conflicts inevitably arise (e.g. between appropriate garden style and the desirability of conserving wildlife habitat). Resolving such conflicts and realising potential, in search of an agreed ideal is fundamental to garden and landscape conservation.
- 4.4 Unless the relative importance of the significant elements of the place is clearly defined there is little basis for the resolution of conflict or for deciding priority in repair and renewal.

JOHN SALES May 2004

5.0 Purpose and application

- 5.1 A historic landscape assessment (HLA) will provide much of the information needed to devise a Statement of Significance, although it is unlikely to cover such aspects as described in 3.4 and 3.5 above and the detailed examination described in 3.3 above may be beyond the remit of individual HLAs.
- 5.2 A Statement of Significance is a useful evaluation and conservation tool which extends the remit of an HLA and forms a solid basis for the decisions on a garden or landscape which will be made through a Conservation Management Plan (CMP).
- 5.3 A Statement of Significance for any site should be devised by suitably qualified and experienced professionals. As noted in 4.2 above, while it may be relatively straightforward to decide what is significant about a place, decisions on whether one aspect is of greater, similar or lesser significance than another is very much more complex.

However, because of the wide-ranging nature of enquiry, it is also essential that committed individuals on site should be actively involved, especially owners, managers and estate workers. Unless the Statement of Significance is 'owned' by these key people, any subsequent conservation plan may be difficult to implement.

- 5.4 A common aim for conservation of historic designed landscapes is maintenance of cohesion and integrity and Statements of Significance should be integrated within this wider picture i.e. they should not be regarded as definitive conservation 'hit lists' or as an end in themselves.
- 5.5 Correctly applied, a Statement of Significance can be an invaluable aid both to those wishing to conserve historic landscapes and to those seeking to identify opportunities for change or development within them. Even for previously unknown or unrecognised historic designed landscapes (i.e. those on which no previous research has been undertaken) an experienced professional may be able to devise a preliminary Statement of Significance which can be of assistance at an early stage in the decision-making process.
- 5.6 However, the most common application of a full Statement of Significance is to provide a benchmark for decisions on conservation, to resolve potential conservation conflicts, and to support the decisions of a conservation management plan.
- 5.7 Taking into account management constraints (e.g. staffing, funding), environmental concerns and proposed new uses and opportunities, the statement of significance should lead to a clear statement of management principles to guide owners and managers in all decision-making, both in the immediate future and in the longer term.

2. Management Plans (Maintenance Agreements)

1.0 Explanation

- 1.1 All designed landscapes require maintenance: raking and levelling of paths; clearing out of gutters and downpipes on buildings; mowing; cleaning of water courses etc. These are routine tasks and part of day-to-day management.
- 1.2 Routine horticultural tasks, such as weeding, sowing, transplanting, potting on etc., will also be part of the day-to-day gardening routines of a place.
- 1.3 Regular inspection regimes too (e.g. of structures and trees) are important to identify remedial works which may retard decay (e.g. external and internal redecoration of structures, pruning out of diseased branches etc.).
- 1.4 Where designed landscapes include areas devoted to commercial crops (e.g. farming, market gardening, forestry etc.) or stock rearing, other routine management and maintenance tasks will be specific to these operations.
- 1.5 Estate Management Plans, devised either in-house or through commissioned land agents, usually focus on the above type of routine maintenance and management.
- 1.6 Management plans (and proposed maintenance agreements) put forward as part of development proposals may also cover only this type of routine maintenance.
- 1.7 Management Plans as described in 1.5 and 1.6 above are important to ensure efficient day-to-day running of historic estates and sites. However, while such plans will include assessment of projected future maintenance and may even give detailed information on the phasing of such works and the date when a plan should be reviewed, they do not fulfil requirements for conservation management of historic designed landscapes.
- 1.8 The fundamental difference between the type of management plans described above and historic landscape conservation management plans is that the former is a relatively short-term programme designed to maintain the 'status quo' for the immediate future. In contrast, the latter – through addressing potential for repair of areas and features which may have already decayed and/or been damaged, evaluating the significance of these and of more robust survivals, and outlining a phased replacement programme for essential landscape structure and fabric – is designed to restore and maintain cohesion of, and to ensure the long term future of, a historic landscape.

3. Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plans (CMPs)

For detailed guidance for owners, managers and consultants see *Conservation Management Plans for restoring Historic Parks and Gardens* (Consultation Draft), Jenifer J White. English Heritage (Gardens and Landscape), London. 2001.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The history of almost all designed landscapes includes both positive and negative changes. The latter are those which fail to either preserve or enhance the ornamental layout. These may be attributable to natural processes of growth and decay or to imposition of facilities, structures etc. which are unrelated to an existing or proposed ornamental layout.
- 1.2 Occasionally in the course of a landscape's history, new ornamental works might also be considered as negative – e.g. where landscape structures and areas of high aesthetic merit and quality have been replaced by those of inferior craftsmanship and materials, or 'off-the-peg', mass-produced or pattern book designs, which contributed little to the individual character and quality of such landscapes.
- 1.3 The types of negative changes which have no relevance to an existing or proposed ornamental layout are many and varied. In the context of the whole landscape, some have only limited effect and it may be relatively easy to reverse damage by their removal or to mitigate against any adverse impact (e.g. a new agricultural building within a boundary tree belt). The adverse impact of others can be much more significant.
Requisition of designed landscapes (most commonly country house landscapes) by the armed forces during World War II, and the removal of ornamental ironwork in both public and private landscapes during the same period, are both examples of negative changes which have had far-reaching adverse effects.
- 1.4 Appreciation of the importance of designed landscapes to national heritage is relatively recent – the process of registration* is still only some thirty years old. Such appreciation, together with recognition of the value of historic designed landscapes of local or regional significance, is still growing and confers responsibility in respect of appropriate repair and future conservation management.
*i.e. inclusion on the *English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest*, which confers a status of national importance upon a historic designed landscape.
- 1.5 It would be unreasonable to suggest that identification of a landscape as having a history of ornamental design should automatically give protected status – not everything can be conserved. However, evaluation of the significance both of the overall landscape and of its features and designed elements should inform decisions and proposals for change. Such evaluation requires detailed examination and thorough understanding of the development history of the landscape.
Good conservation practice indicates that proposals for change should flow clearly from a comprehensive conservation management plan based on a full historic landscape assessment.

2.0 What type of information should a CMP provide

- 2.1 A historic landscape conservation management plan is a blueprint for the future of a site. It will draw on a historic landscape assessment to explain the significance of the site, and the contribution made by various areas and elements to such significance (see Part 1 of this PCAN).
- 2.2 A CMP will identify those features and areas of the landscape which require repair, and evaluate the site and its setting in terms of need for mitigation of any adverse impact which cannot be removed. It will also consider how overall design cohesion might be reinstated if some areas or elements have been lost (e.g through sale into separate ownership or development).
- 2.3 A CMP will identify clear conservation aims both as a set of overall principles for the site and as specific aims for individual features and areas.
- 2.4 A CMP will make recommendations for appropriate land management and propose long term strategies for phased repair and replacement of significant elements. It should also address any potential management or land use conflicts.

2.5 In brief, a CMP should aim :

- To inform on current status and use of the designed landscape by:
 - identifying different landholdings and land use of both the site and its setting
 - identifying any designations existing within the site or its setting (e.g. listed buildings; areas of archaeological significance; conservation area etc.)
 - identifying any consents, agreements, licences etc. which may constrain landscape management
 - identifying any relevant commercial or business interests which may affect landscape management.
- To describe fully the designed landscape in the context of both its history and its current condition.
- To analyse all information, consider significance; evaluate potential for repair and future conservation management, and identify constraints and opportunities for further change.
- To define the issues relating to future conservation management.
- To set down the aims, principles and standards for repair and future conservation management.
- To set out the action required to achieve the above aims.

3.0 Format and content

Given the extensive variation between designed landscapes and the different reasons for which a CMP may be produced, it is undesirable to be too prescriptive regarding format and content, and the following is intended only as a broad outline of what may be included.

3.1 Presentation

Good presentation can significantly reduce the time needed to absorb and evaluate the information which a CMP contains. A presentation checklist may be invaluable to the compiler (it is all too easy to omit basic information such as name of site, present owner, location and grid reference) and serve as a contents page for the evaluator.

3.2 Setting the context

3.2.1 Purpose and approach

A clear statement of the purpose for which the CMP has been prepared and an outline of approach and methodology may usefully be included in this section. The extent of the area covered by the CMP should be clearly identified on plan at an early point in the document.

3.2.2 Land ownership and land use

The areas of different landownership and different types of landholding, which make up the historic landscape covered by the CMP, should be clearly identified. Information on current land use of all areas (e.g. forestry, farming, sport etc.) is also an essential part of a CMP and an overall plan of this may be included here.

3.2.3 Statutory and other designations

All designations (both national and local) which apply to the historic landscape or its setting should be set out (e.g. registered landscape; special landscape area; listed structures; archaeologically significant or environmentally sensitive areas, conservation area designation; TPOs etc.), together with relevant policies in local and county structure plans (both general and, where applicable, site specific). Any relevant supplementary planning guidance may also be identified here.

Any current planning consents, granted but not yet implemented, may be included in this section.

3.2.4 Other management constraints

Any rights etc. which apply in, on, under or over the land and which may affect or influence management decisions (e.g. rights of access, mineral extraction licences, field sports licences, wayleaves etc.) should also be set out, together with any management agreements entered into (e.g. Countryside Stewardship, Woodland Grant Scheme Management etc.) or conditions which have been imposed in respect of other grant aid or planning obligations. The areas covered by such rights, licences, conditions etc. should be clearly identified on plan. For public landscapes, or those with communal or selective access, the various interests of relevant communities and individual groups should be identified.

3.2.5 Further work required

Surveys which are still to be undertaken or significant gaps in information should be identified here.

3.3 Overview of the site

3.3.1 Any description of the site will draw upon both a historic landscape assessment (see *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*) and assessment of the significance of various areas and features (see Part 1 of this PCAN).

These will usually suggest a number of useful preliminary site divisions (e.g. areas around and including dominant structures; particular types of designed landscape such as formal gardens or landscape park; etc.). Each of these can be described briefly according to topography, significant features and elements, any known related areas and structures, important associations and provenance.

3.3.2 For large or complex sites (i.e. those with many phases of change) a precis of the history of development of the historic landscape, in the context of relevance to the significance of the site, may be included here. This will usually be divided into main phases of change giving dates and related significant alterations, together with background on who was responsible for changes, why these were undertaken and, where relevant, setting these within a wider context (e.g. social and political history). Such history will be condensed from the historic landscape assessment for the site and will be continued to the present day.

3.3.3 Explanation of the significance of the site, arising from a Statement of Significance (see Part 1 of this PCAN) will highlight the criteria used in relative evaluation of significance and will usually list main areas, features etc. which appear under the identified headings (highly significant, significant in local or regional context etc.). Such explanation may also include a list of factors which detract from the site and any useful comparisons to be made between the site and similar designed landscapes.

3.4 Defining the issues

This section sets out the decisions reached in the CMP within the context of constraints and opportunities.

3.4.1 The range of issues which may be addressed here varies widely between sites but may include information on how necessary funding for conservation works might be secured (together with background information on results of any action taken in the recent past); the extent of funding required; potential conflicts of interest of use etc.). Any commercial or business interests included within the landscape and which are intended to support its repair and conservation should also be identified.

3.4.2 It is important to set out the aims of any conservation management, and site-specific conservation policies are an essential part of any CMP. It is helpful if these are included at this stage (or within a separate Conservation Statement, where this is produced) so that they can provide a benchmark for evaluation of the conservation proposals put forward in the body of the report. Such policies should be supported by explanation of the reasoning behind them and brief description of how it is envisaged that such policies will be implemented.

3.5 Area evaluation and analysis

This section usually forms the main body of a CMP. Detailed proposals will arise from a critical evaluation of the history, significance, current condition, potential for repair, potential for reinstatement of overall cohesion and examination of constraints and opportunities (including potential future needs).

The most common format for presentation follows division of the site into a series of areas (based on main phases of historical development, current management regimes, current land holdings etc.).

3.5.1 A plan of the whole landscape separated into the identified areas should be available and plans of each individual area, at a suitable scale and with sufficient detail to facilitate understanding of the explanation of proposals (including, for example, identified vistas, viewpoints etc.), should also be provided.

3.5.2 Photographs of the site as existing, and photomontages of proposed changes may be invaluable aids to communication of intention.

3.5.3 For each area the following will be included:

Physical description (topography, current land use, views, relationship to other areas etc.)

Designations applicable to the area will be identified, together with any identified constraints (public access; grant conditions, separate land ownership etc.)

Outline of main events and historical associations specific to the area in question (i.e. precis of that part of the development history of the designed landscape which applies)

Identification of specific aspects of development history which may be relevant to an area (e.g. access; historic land management; use).

Examination of current condition in the context of site development history.

This will include an overview of the condition of surviving features (buildings, hard landscaping; planting etc.) and elements (views, vistas, panoramas, designed landscape compositions etc.), together with identification of factors which are detrimental. Assessment of the viability for, and potential significance of, any repair will follow.

Evaluation of the condition of the area in respect of various design phases and the contribution, or potential contribution, of the area in question to overall cohesion of the designed landscape will be an essential part of this examination.

Aspects of particular significance, and areas of particular vulnerability will be identified

Conservation policies (see 3.4.2 above) which are applicable to an area will be identified.

Recommendations, arising from analysis of the above information, will form the final part of each area evaluation.

These will include proposals for repair, future conservation management prescriptions and identification of opportunities for new work.

3.5.4 Detailed evaluation on an area by area basis should be drawn together in a comprehensive analysis of the landscape as a whole. The relationship of the designed landscape to any wider historic estate and to lands around should be examined, and any essential setting (e.g. borrowed landscape views) identified and explained. Information on how the designed landscape is perceived from outside, particularly from points of public access and approaches should also be included. Such comprehensive analysis will also include potential for restoration of design cohesion and may list the constraints and opportunities which apply to both the site and its setting.

3.6 **Phasing and review (see also 4.5 below)**

To be effective a CMP should include a clear and realistic programme of works, with a timescale within which each is to be completed.

All CMPs need to retain a measure of flexibility to respond to unforeseen circumstances and possible future proposals for change, and should be updated on a regular basis. A CMP will include arrangements for review therefore and specify the intervals at which these should be undertaken.

3.7 **Appendices**

A range of documents and plans may be included as appendices (e.g. designation descriptions – listed buildings, registered landscape etc.; condition surveys; archaeological and ecological surveys etc.).

4.0 **Watchpoints**

4.1 While archive evidence is important to underpin repair and conservation of a site, care should be taken that this is not influenced unduly by the nature or availability of such evidence. This is of special relevance when considering the first edition Ordnance Survey maps for the country (produced at various scales e.g. 6", 25" and 50" to the mile).

These maps are generally agreed to be remarkable both in accuracy and in detail. They have proved an invaluable source of evidence to researchers into historic landscape, and particularly to those researching sites with design inception in the second or third quarters of the nineteenth century; a period which saw the layout of numerous public parks, landscapes around institutions (e.g. asylums, hospitals, orphanages etc.), seafront gardens and ornamental cemeteries.

For these landscapes, the above maps (most of which were produced between the 1860s and 1890s) are frequently an excellent representation of an original, comprehensive design (layout usually being maintained for 2–3 decades at least), with original planting matured but not decayed (i.e. complete as designed). As such, they have been used in many instances as an appropriate foundation for repair and future conservation.

However, while for the reasons outlined above such approach may be legitimate for a specific range of landscapes of a specific period, unless the rationale is properly understood there is a real danger of 'restoration to the first edition OS' being used to guide repair and conservation in situations where it is wholly inappropriate. For most historic landscapes, the first edition OS represents a single 'snapshot in time', with the elements and features it

shows (such as boundaries, drives, structures, planting etc.) deriving individually from any one of a series of design phases or significant events, in varying condition and varying stages of maturity and decay. To seek to replicate this 'snapshot' is to misunderstand the principles of landscape repair.

- 4.2 Good conservation practice indicates that proposals for change for historic landscape (whether new features, new design layer or other repair or development) should flow clearly from identification of constraints and opportunities in a CMP.

The series of GHS PCANs acknowledges that some development may be proposed without such proper foundation and that, where an authority is minded to grant consent to proposals as they stand, condition or legal agreement may be imposed to the effect that a CMP be undertaken as part of such consent and in the context of corresponding gain. However, the latter is always second best and will deal with the 'remainder' (i.e. undeveloped part) of the landscape rather than a cohesive whole.

Every attempt should be made to ensure that a CMP underpins and supports proposals.

- 4.3 Potential for repair of the historic landscape should be rigorously examined to ensure that present and future commercial or business interests (including potential development) do not inappropriately constrain the remit (and thus the findings) of a CMP.

Briefs for consultants employed to produce a CMP which are transparent and open to scrutiny will be helpful in this context.

- 4.4 A CMP offers a comprehensive evaluation and analysis of a historic designed landscape as an entity. While component parts should be carefully appraised and significance highlighted, maintenance of their relationship to background, setting and overall landscape cohesion is critical both to good conservation and to future appreciation of a historic site.

- 4.5 Where a CMP is to be tied to condition, planning obligation or Section 106 Agreement, grant offer, management agreement etc., arrangements for monitoring, review and arbitration in case of dispute should be clear.

5.0 Use and application

(Information taken from the English Heritage consultation draft referred to at the start of this section.)

- 5.1 A CMP is important to guide day-to-day maintenance and management of historic landscapes, both in the prioritisation of works (particularly where resources are limited) and in their specifics. It is essential to inform and manage a programme of repair and conservation.
- 5.2 A CMP will provide an informed basis for preparing development proposals and as such may be used to support proposals for change.
- 5.3 A CMP may be used to support applications for grant aid (e.g. Heritage Lottery Fund [HLF]; English Heritage etc.).
- 5.5 A CMP may underpin and support Management Agreements (Country Stewardship [DEFRA], Tir Gofal [CCW, in Wales], UK Wood Pasture and Parkland Habitat Action plan initiative etc.).
- 5.6 A CMP may provide detailed guidance as part of a plan prepared for Inheritance Tax Conditional Exemption.
- 5.7 As a long term strategy document a CMP will explain the basis of conservation decisions so that these may be appreciated and taken forward by succeeding owners. A CMP will also create a new record of a designed landscape, and of current upkeep and management decisions and so provide continuity with past plans and records.