



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES APRIL 2018

The GT conservation team received 131 new cases in England and 3 cases in Wales during April, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 24 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 12 by CGTs in response to planning applications included in the weekly lists.

Site	County	GT Ref	Reg Grade	Proposal	Written Response
ENGLAND					
Sunningdale Park (Civil Service College)	Berkshire	E18/0064	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of Sunningdale Park including the part demolition, alteration, restoration, conversion and extension of Northcote House (Grade II Listed), Gloucester Stables and the Walled Garden; the alteration, restoration, conversion and extension of North Lodge, the alteration, restoration and conversion of the Gamekeeper's Lodge and Store, and The Dairy; the part demolition and part alteration, restoration and conversion of South Lodge; and the demolition	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2018 It is difficult to comment on this Application as most of the documents are not accessible on your website. We have been helped by reading the response of the Parish Council, and from our previous comments on the Scoping Survey and the contents of the draft Local Plan. We commented on this site in the context of the proposals in the first consultation. We had nothing to add in respect of the second consultation. The Berkshire Gardens Trust is concerned to preserve Historic and important contemporary gardens in the County. We are working on a record of all such gardens which will include those which are registered nationally and locally, but progress is slow. We also consider planning proposals when they are notified to us either by the Local Planning Authority or by the Gardens Trust in their capacity of a statutory authority to whom all relevant applications are notified. This requirement for the LPA to notify the Gardens Trust will apply to all applications affecting properties on the Historic England Parks and

				<p>and redevelopment of the Gardeners' Cottages alongside the demolition of other buildings; and the erection of new buildings to provide 177 dwellings (Use Class C3), a care community of 103 units of accommodation incorporating communal facilities (Use Class C2), restoration of the Registered Park and Garden, provision of 13.79 hectares of SANG, plus associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping, footpaths, drainage and other associated works. Sunningdale Park, Larch Avenue, Ascot SL5 0QE. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>Gardens Register. I understand Sunningdale Park is listed as Grade II on the Register.</p> <p>We do not oppose development of this or any other site as a matter of principle, but the scale of the development here substantially exceeds the numbers in the draft Local Plan and gives rise to concerns that the site is being overdeveloped. Without access to the plans, we cannot comment in detail, but we are concerned to see the number of trees proposed to be felled. Whatever proposals are suggested for the maintenance and restoration of the garden, they need to take its setting into account. This includes the view from and to the garden. We support the comments of the Parish Council concerning the skyline profile and density impact of the proposed development.</p> <p>Our main concerns are with regard to the Walled Garden. While in theory the stated intention to restore and open up the walled garden for the benefit of the public is to be welcomed, there seems to be some conflict with this proposal given the plans for gardens and surrounds for houses which are to be built within it (as the Parish Council note in their statements within Paragraph 2b).</p> <p>The public would almost certainly be discouraged from accessing and benefiting from the opening up of a restored walled garden if this was discouraged either overtly by the proximity and style of buildings within this setting, especially if this is to be reduced in size as suggested. The (presumed/likely) absence of or minimal signage and lack of positive encouragement would be an additional factor in this context.</p> <p>Our recommendation is that consent be refused until the concerns we have raised are rectified.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Charles Elly DL Chairman of the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E17/1512	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of conditions 4, 23, 33, 34 AND 35 on approval 13/2935M - Outline application with all matters reserved except for means of access, for the erection of a high quality</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2018 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</p> <p>With reference to our comments dated 24th February 2018, we have given consideration to the applicant's response to Cheshire East Council dated 27th March 2018, and the applicant's direct response to the Gardens Trust dated 3rd April 2018 (attached). We have also considered the comments made by the National Trust dated 8th March 2018.</p>

				<p>residential development (use class C3) with associated woodland buffer, ecological mitigation and enhancements, and open spaces, on Land North of Parkgate Industrial Estate, Parkgate Lane, Knutsford, Cheshire</p>	<p>The Gardens Trust's conclusion is that we wish to maintain our objection to the above Section 73 application in respect of the proposed variation to Condition 4. We believe it could open the door to a development with a greater adverse effect on significance than the current proposal. Significance 'derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting' (NPPF glossary). In view of the Grade II* status of Tatton Park, the fact that the issue of building height has already been taken into account at the outline application stage, and the likely future conflict with local plan policy, we would not like to see the matter deferred to the Reserved Matters stage. However should the current application be approved, we would recommend that Landscape Visual Impact Assessments are submitted with future Reserved Matters applications which include information on building height, scale, form and grouping. Information on materials and colour to minimise visual intrusion and on long term uses and management of adjoining parts of Tatton Park should also inform future decision-making.</p> <p>The current proposal makes it more likely that there would be future conflicts with Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (LPS) Policy SD2 'Sustainable Development Principles'. SD2 ii requires development to "contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness in terms of a) height, scale, form and grouping"; SD2 iii requires development to "respect, and where possible, enhance the landscape character of the area", and SD iv requires it to "respect, and where possible, enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their wider settings...". LPS Site LPS 37, Parkgate Extension, Knutsford, recognises the location as sensitive, requiring "a Landscape Character Assessment to guide the scale and massing of new development and to ensure it is acceptable with the surrounding landscape. Also ensure a high quality design, which reflects and respects the character of the area, built form and surrounding landscape..." The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) submitted as part of the outline application states in paragraph 4.22 that proposed building heights "...should be limited to 3 storeys, with a range of 2, 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings". The Design Code shows images of vernacular buildings within this height range. The applicant has not</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>put forward a convincing reason why this principle should be breached, and in any case it would conflict with Macclesfield Local Plan Saved Policy BE1 'Design Guidance' which states that new development should "not normally exceed 3 storeys in height".</p> <p>The updated assessment submitted by Pegasus Group is limited in its scope, and only considers one viewpoint whereas one of the special experiences of Tatton Park is that people are free to roam over the Public Access Area. The assessment does not consider potential views from areas within Tatton Park's Register boundary that could be publicly accessible in future, or consider views from the public right of way (North Cheshire Way) within the setting of the Park. However it is likely that from the wider landscape higher buildings would be more dominant in views than the lower buildings that have been approved in principle.</p> <p>The trees in Shawheath Plantation do appear to provide a generally effective screen from viewpoint 14. The plantation trees are said to be higher (up to 20m) than assessed by Tyler Grange (12-14 m). However the photomontage provided shows that some of the houses are likely to be visible through the lower canopy, an effect that may increase as the trees continue to mature. The boundary woodlands are themselves part of the Registered landscape, and include paths, shown on plans, whose level of use is not known. No reference is made to any Conservation Management Plan for Tatton Park (we are aware of a Historic Landscape Appraisal carried out by Parklands Consortium in 2002 but this may have been superseded or updated), or other source of information on the plantations and how they are being managed. There appear to be areas of mixed plantation, and of mixed semi-natural woodland so age and management requirements may vary, also taking into account biodiversity value. Woodland is shown as present on the 1898 OS map and future management may be needed at some point which could include selective felling, thinning or coppicing, opening up the development to increased view until replanting has matured.</p> <p>The section provided is indicative. In relation to proposed buildings this is expected, but the section would have been of more use if it had been based on real ground levels rather than assuming it was all flat ground.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The updated assessment includes discussion of the proposed housing scheme in relation to adjoining commercial developments but we are most interested in the relationship with Tatton Park. Increasing the height and density of the proposed development would result in a more urban character, including increased levels of traffic and noise, which will have an increased impact on current perceptions of tranquillity and antiquity within and around the Park. The Cheshire Landscape Character Assessment 2008, referred to in the LVIA, includes the Parkgate site in the same character area as Tatton Park. This will clearly change in future, but it needs to be done sympathetically.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E18/0015	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New Welcome Building at Car Park with the addition of a new approach into the Stable Yard, resurfacing of the Stable Yard (West), New Centre Building in the Stable Yard, New Barn alterations, Refurbishment of West WC and East WC, and external alterations to Area North of Stableblock. Tatton Park, Knutsford Drive, Cheshire WA16 6QL. VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have consulted with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and we would be pleased if your officers could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>It is not the intention to repeat much of the historic, economic, social and cultural value that is associated with the structures, parks and gardens of Tatton Park. These points are well covered within the consultation documents. The GT/CGT are primarily concerned with the impact of alterations and development within the Grade II* designated area of the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England.</p> <p>As stated within the submitted documents, the intention of the proposed development is 'to enhance the experience for visitors'. These areas currently lack spatial clarity and definition, while access and arrival at the car park and stable yard provides a less than ideal sense of arrival or experience for the visitor.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that there is a coherent strategy for these areas with a modern approach to the design of structures and the use of</p>

					<p>materials. The proposal distinguishes clearly the differences between modern and historical features and materials. It is hoped that some of the 'rustic' seats and bike stands have been reconsidered with more modern detailed solutions in keeping with the overall strategy (these were presented to CGT at the consultation on 6 Nov. 2018).</p> <p>We support the improved and better defined car parking area with a Welcome Building, coach drop-off and accessible parking. The new route to the Stable Yard will result in the loss of an existing hedge which we do not believe to be historically significant; it will be a substantial improvement over the current route.</p> <p>The Stable Yard lacks spatial form and control; the introduction of a modern building on an historic footprint of an earlier structure is a positive solution along with a rationalisation of the paving materials. The Gt/CGT are pleased to support the proposal and look forward to seeing detailed resolutions to the landscape. We would recommend that the following points be considered in the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree planting with appropriate species in and around the car and bus parking. This would aid in softening the visual impact, allow these functions to sit more comfortably within the parkland, and ultimately provide some shade for parked vehicles. • Consideration be given for individual drop-off and pick-up for the less able who do not have access to accessible parking. • That appropriate herbaceous/shrub under-planting be used along the new access route connecting the Welcome Building to the Stable Yard. • That seating, lighting, litterbins, bike stands etc. be reflective of the strategic approach in the use of modern design and materials. • Selected plant material, particularly at key points and the Welcome Building also reflects a modern use. <p>Yours sincerely Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Tregothnan	Cornwall	E18/0020	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Installation of a pontoon. Limekiln, St Michael, Penkivel TR2</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.04.2018</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,</p>

				<p>4AN. MISCELLANEOUS</p> <p>as per the above application.</p> <p>The GT has read the documentation provided and would be grateful if your officers could take the following comments into consideration when deciding this application. The applicant states that the 'pontoon will be for the sole use of the owner of Tregothnan Estate' for recreational purposes. This relates directly to our concern that in future this may change and we would not wish the Limekiln to become a landing stage for a wider public. The photographs in the Design, Accessibility and Planning Appraisal show just how unspoilt this stretch of the Fal River is, with almost no visible development. We refer to Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice, Planning Note 3 (2nd Edition) The Setting of Heritage Assets (Dec 2017), which states (p.1) that : 6- Views, however, can of course be valued for reasons other than their contribution to heritage significance. They may, for example, be related to the appreciation of the wider landscape, where there may be little or no association with heritage assets. Landscape character and visual amenity are also related planning considerations. Also p.4 "Settings of heritage assets which closely resemble the setting at the time the asset was constructed or formed are likely to contribute particularly strongly to significance .." . Also of relevance is Part 2, Settings & Views, p.7, 17 - The contribution made by their setting to their significance also varies.... It can also depend on the location of the asset: an elevated or overlooked location; a riverbank, coastal or island location; or a location within an extensive tract of flat land may increase the sensitivity of the setting." There are also several references plus a photo of a floating pontoon to the south west of the Limekiln. In our opinion this already detracts from the setting of the otherwise uncluttered river scene and another pontoon would compound the situation. Our major concern is that if permitted, this development would become a precedent for future applications, spoiling the tranquility and unspoilt nature of the Fal estuary, precisely what makes it so unique and special. We do however, welcome the proposed removal of the crane and plinth within the Limekiln and agree that it compromises the experience of the limekiln and that its removal would be an improvement.</p> <p>The GT appreciates that the Limekiln, already used as a boat store and</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>presumably launch site for the owner's canoes, might not be the easiest place from which to set off without a pontoon. The river has been used as a waterway for centuries and it could be argued that the proposed structure constitutes an aspect of continuity. However, on balance, we feel that this application is contrary to your Local Plan policy 24, page 80, where proposals "causing harm will be weighed against the substantial public, not private, benefits of the proposal." We feel the application does not meet this criteria, nor are the works proposed "the minimum required to secure the long term use of the asset.' Although this proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the RPG, we concur with many of the comments submitted by the AONB Unit online, and feel that this would set an unfortunate precedent which would detract from the significance and setting in which this Repton Grade II* parkland is experienced.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Cadhay	Devon	E16/1666	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel, restoration to agricultural land together with temporary change of use of a residential dwelling to a quarry office/welfare facility at Straitgate Farm, Exeter Road, Ottery St Mary EX11 1LG.</p> <p>MINERAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2018</p> <p>The Gardens Trust were consulted on the above application which affects Cadhay, an historic designed landscape of national interest which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations in the County of Devon to ensure that your Council receives authoritative specialist advice on planning applications Cadhay House (listed grade I) is a two and three storey stone mansion dating from the mid C16 and is set in landscaped grounds. The two medieval fishponds are an important feature of the designed landscape of Cadhay. The smaller fishpond, a rectangular pool extending c 50m east between sloping grass banks lies some 80m south-east of the House. To the west, the larger pool lies c 50m south of the House and is L-shaped on plan with a wide rectangular pool to the west and a narrow arm extending from the</p>

					<p>north-east corner towards the smaller pool to the east. The larger pool is embanked to the south-east, south and south-west.</p> <p>The water supply to the fishponds comes from a spring located just below the extraction site at Straitgate Farm, a mile to the west of Cadhay. The fishponds have relied on the spring as a source of water for over 500 years. If the proposed extraction disrupts the spring and the water supply, the fishponds which are an essential and important future of the gardens at Cadhay, will be turned into a quagmire, to the considerable detriment of the historic designed landscape. The Gardens Trust is concerned about the possible effect of the proposed extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel at Straitgate Farm on Cadhay as it is likely to impact on the water supply to the medieval fishponds. We urge you to give serious consideration to this aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E18/0040	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed link extension between dwelling and existing outbuilding to create indoor swimming pool, including conversion of outbuilding to gym/changing facilities. Shortgrove Barn, Shortgrove, Newport CB11 3TX. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.04.2018</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has had the above application drawn to its attention by a local resident. As you are probably aware, we are a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, and as such should have been informed by yourselves about this application. I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet that contains guidance for Local Authorities and we would be very grateful if in future you would please make sure that any similar applications are sent to us at : consult@thegardenstrust.org.</p> <p>We work very closely with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and they have made a site visit on our behalf. In this instance we have no objection to this particular application, but we would like to express concern about the registered landscape at Shortgrove, one of the best Capability Brown landscapes in Essex. Shortgrove 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. Those structures which are not listed should enjoy protection by virtue of</p>

					<p>their location in the registered landscape. Thus Walden Lodge on the Walden road was considered to be curtilage listed when a retrospective application was made for an excessively large porch and an extension. This application was refused, but we note that enforcement action has not been effective and the porch remains in place. Other buildings have not been treated as curtilage listed, because, it seems, of the loss of the principal building, Shortgrove Hall, in a fire in 1966. This apparent lack or withdrawal of protection has led to unfortunate uncontrolled development, such as a hole, recently enlarged, in the wall of the kitchen garden where a tennis court has been built, and a flat roofed extension and other alterations to the building known as the Bothy. We would argue that, in the interests of preserving the historic landscape, these buildings and features should be treated as curtilage listed, and that a consistent policy of protection should be applied. The forthcoming sale of the estate creates potential risks for its future, and makes it important that there is a coherent approach to planning and conservation at Shortgrove.</p> <p>I would very much appreciate it if you could please confirm receipt of this letter and let us know that you have taken steps to let us know of applications in future, and will investigate the lack of enforcement procedures mentioned above.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Garden</p>
Hatherop Castle	Gloucestershire	E17/1670	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of Existing Dilapidated Glasshouses at Hatherop Castle School, Hatherop, Cirencester, Gloucestershire GL7 3NB.</p> <p>GLASSHOUSE, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2018</p> <p>My view was (as a precis) that the Trust was not in a strong position to object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The greenhouses are outside the Listing and Registered Park; • The context is heavily degraded, and the contiguous walled garden has a recent consent for an Astroturf sports pitch; • The pitch and greenhouses are incompatible uses; • The greenhouses are replacements probably built in the 1930's and are thoroughly derelict and dangerous. • The walled garden consent should achieve the reinstatement of the enclosing walls to the walled garden, and

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have suggested conditions to reinstate the South wall of the Listed stable court and the site of the greenhouses <p>On this basis, I sent back a response that gave a neutral stance should the District choose to approve demolition, as the School was unlikely to accept replacing or restoring non original greenhouses where there was already a consent in place that jeopardised there continued existence.</p> <p>Best wishes, David Ball</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. Please accept our apologies for the slight delay in responding but as well as consulting with our colleagues in the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust we put Mr Jeff Guy, a Messenger Greenhouse expert, in touch with Hatherop Castle School and we have been waiting to hear back from him before responding. He visited the site and our response is based upon his comments to us. Messenger & Co were the foremost Victorian and Edwardian greenhouse manufacturer. Their catalogue offered everything from greenhouses, vineries, conservatories, orchid stages, summerhouses and glass covered verandas etc, as well every possible accessory to make these spaces productive and comfortable. Their greenhouses were regarded as the ultimate in glasshouse manufacturing whose designs are still emulated today. Such was their fame that their clients included the gentry, aristocracy and royalty. Whenever the GT is notified of a planning application anywhere with a Messenger greenhouse, such was their reputation and quality, that we always notify the national expert Mr Guy who logs them on his database. For this reason, we would urge Hatherop Castle School to think very carefully before totally demolishing their structures. The GT/GGLT accept that two of the glasshouses are now either almost completely gone or beyond repair. Houses 1 and 2 though, are essentially intact and apparently structurally sound. They are not completely water-tight and the double doors require some attention. This could probably be repaired at a reasonable cost. Then there is the question of whether it</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>is sensible or realistic to save just half a structure. If saved then it would be imperative that some practical use is found for the two houses. If not, all that will happen is that they will be allowed to deteriorate again. Currently the larger walled garden containing the greenhouse range is unused, following the failure of the nursery. Therefore saving the two or more houses probably needs to be looked at in within the context of the walled garden, whose brickwork seems upon casual observation to be sound. However, the greenhouse range could be segregated from the rest of the walled garden fairly easily if required. It would appear that the school has no use for the greenhouses and probably sees them as a liability; not only because at present they are potentially dangerous structures, but also there are apparently issues with damp getting into the adjoining building to the rear which is used at least in part as school rooms. Should your officers decide to let the greenhouses all be demolished, we would ask that it be conditional upon as much as possible being salvaged, particularly all the ironwork, both structural and ventilation items, doors etc. We would also ask that a measured record of the structures be made for posterity. Mr Guy would be able to advise on this aspect.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
The Spinney, Essendon	Hertford shire	E18/0023	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 3 dwellings (1 x 3-bedroom and 2 x 4-bedroom) following the demolition of existing buildings. The Spinney, High Road, Essendon, Hatfield AL9 6HT. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is disappointed that there is no mention of the historical importance of the landscape. Bedwell Park, Essendon Place, Camfield Place and Bird's Hill are all early designed landscapes which cluster together in this part of Essendon. We would expect some consideration of the fact that the woodlands where the proposal is sited were historically part of the Bedwell Park perimeter belt.</p> <p>We are aware that much of the significance of Bedwell Park has been lost due to development and the laying out of the golf course. For that reason we do not raise any objections to the proposed development provided sufficient screening remains between the proposed houses and Bedwell Park.</p>

					Kate Harwood
Putteridge Bury	Hertford shire	E18/0034	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey front /side extension. The Garden House, Putteridge Park, Luton, Hertfordshire LU2 8LD. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.04.2018</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, is familiar with the Registered (Grade II) landscape of Putteridgebury and its planning history over several years.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement supplied mentions historic gardens but fails to acknowledge that the property sits within the Registered landscape and any development will have an adverse effect on this heritage asset.</p> <p>We are concerned that views across the Registered parkland from the west could be adversely affected.</p> <p>We would urge that the Garden House, formerly the Head Gardener's House, should have sufficient screening to the west of any new extension for which planning permission is granted, to prevent the new extension harming the views.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Panshanger	Hertford shire	E18/0036	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for a residential-led development of up to 650 residential units, a two-form entry primary school, provision of six gypsy and traveller pitches, a new local centre (comprising retail and community uses), new vehicular access from Hens Lane, car parking, associated infrastructure and landscaping works with all matters except access reserved. Land to North East of Welwyn Garden City, Panshanger, Welwyn Garden City AL7 2QJ. MAJOR HYBRID	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.04.2018</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens. We are familiar with the landscape, its history and significance and the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>We consider that insufficient weight has been given to the impact on the landscape heritage assets, particularly Marden and Panshanger parks, relying as it does wholly on the Beacon Report.</p> <p>The proposed development will overlook both parks and there is insufficient barrier proposed in the indicative plans to provide much needed tree screening. The EIA Chapter on Heritage by Lichfields makes the assumption that summer tree cover will render the impact negligible. This interfluvium is a key part of the setting of Marden which has open views to it. Housing up to three storeys high will severely impact on the setting of both the landscape and the listed mansion and its setting regardless of the season.</p> <p>Impact on the setting of Panshanger Park will also be severe due to the rising land on the proposed site overlooking the ground falling away to</p>

					<p>Repton's historic lake and his carefully considered planting around the head of it. Light pollution will have a deleterious effect on the settings of both sites and the noise will detract from the tranquillity of the west end of Panshanger Park.</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the scale and density of housing on this site and to providing sufficient room for more than the minimal screening proposed. Panshanger is of exceptional national historic interest at Grade II*, Marden Hill House also of exceptional national interest at Grade II* and its garden features Registered at Grade II. The significance of these heritage assets and their settings have not been accorded due weight not have the harm from their proposal been adequately assessed.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
The Mount including surrounding cobble wall	Lancashire	E17/1680	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent The restoration of the Mount Garden (Grade II registered park and garden) and the Pavilion and Lodge buildings (Grade II Listed) works will include landscape works, alterations to external appearance of the Lodge building and the excavation of the basement level with new access steps and path and internal alterations; alterations to the external appearance of the Pavilion including new balustrades, 5 new dormers and copper roof to dome and internal alterations; demolition of the existing sub-station and its brick enclosure and relocation a new GRP unit; change of use of building to a volunteer hub, artist in residence studio and cafe; two</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation letter inviting The Gardens Trust to comment on the above application.</p> <p>As previously notified to you, the Gardens Trust which is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts to comment on planning applications and fulfil this statutory role. For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2016), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case.</p> <p>The LGT recognises the importance of the heritage assets at the Mount Garden in being a Registered Park and Garden Grade II as well as the two Grade II listed buildings. We welcome and support the continued investment which Wyre Council is making to complete the restoration of The Mount and its important buildings. In addition, we applaud the detail and the thoroughness of the proposals and supporting reports and look forward to seeing the works implemented.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>

				new light posts, new lanterns on all existing light posts; new CCTV camera on post and new wall and gates onto Mount Road. The Mount Pavilion, The Esplanade, Fleetwood, Lancashire FY7 6QE. REPAIR/RESTORATION	
Capernwray Hall	Lancashire	E18/0027	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a two storey residential care home. East Gate Lodge, Keer Holme Lane, Borwick, Carnforth. INSTITUTION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.04.2018</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which lies entirely within Capernwray Park. The Park is a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II, and provides the setting for the Grade II* listed Capernwray Hall. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. As previously notified to you, The Gardens Trust, which is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts to comment on planning applications and fulfil this statutory role. For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2016), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case.</p> <p>Lancashire Gardens Trust objects to this application, which will result in the loss of a historic building from within the Park, and its replacement with a significantly larger modern building of a conventional and inappropriate suburban character.</p> <p>Capernwray Park comprises gently rolling land laid out with woodland, individual trees and clumps, created for the Marton family in the early nineteenth century, followed by the construction of the present Hall in about 1844. The Parkland has a predominantly open character in its northern part, allowing views out in this direction across the valley of the River Keer. East Gate Lodge is one of several such entrance features which are integral to the appearance, operation and enjoyment of the Park. It complements the Park and is an essential component of the whole, having a very strong association with the listed Hall, as described by the Council's Conservation Officer, a point upon which we concur. We have made a site visit and accept that the application site itself is</p>

					<p>relatively selfcontained and due to adjacent landform and plantations is not visible in views from Capernwray Hall and much of the Park. Nevertheless, East Gate Lodge is a heritage asset, and its total loss should be avoided. Whilst the current building has various unsympathetic later additions, a more imaginative scheme is required which responds to the historic context of the building and the site. In its current form the application is harmful to the significance of the Registered Park and Garden, and LGT objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Alnwick Castle	Northumberland	E17/1056	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid application comprising - Full planning permission: Change of use of agricultural land and erection of 87 residential dwellings (including 15% affordable homes), an improved junction and access road off Almouth Road, temporary construction haul road from Denwick Lane, service roads, structural landscaping, open spaces, SuDS basin and other ancillary works. Outline planning permission with all matters reserved: change of use of agricultural land and development of 23.36 ha for 183 residential dwellings (including 15% affordable homes), service roads, structural landscaping, open spaces, SuDS basins and other ancillary works. Land North East Of Windy Edge, Almouth Road, Alnwick, Northumberland.</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding the additional information submitted by the developer, published on 21st March 2018. The Gardens Trust (GT) have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and we are encouraged by the Heritage Statement prepared by Wardell Armstrong in March 2018 in response to the concerns expressed by Historic England, CC Building Conservation, the GT and the NGT last year.</p> <p>The statement confirms [Para. 4.8] our observation of last year, based on the available nineteenth century mapping by the Ordnance Survey and a brief site visit by the NGT, on the skyline drive at Denwick. It is good to see the contribution by the Alnwick archivist [Appendix A], describing and interpreting earlier mapping held by their archive and confirming that the Denwick drive is indeed part of the eighteenth century parkland layout at Alnwick.</p> <p>The reproduction of the Sauthier plans of 1788 [Appendix A] tends to confirm the NGT's impression from last year's site visit that the routing of the drive along the crest, with opportunities for changing views across the river valley and to the more distant countryside beyond, were a primary reason for the forming of the Denwick drive. We would agree with the archivist that the view from the edge of Denwick, where the drive swings around the hamlet [above Field "G" on the highlighted Denwick plan extract], was significant but suggest that the continuation southwards from Denwick along the valley crest was equally important. The highlighted extract from the Denwick plan suggests, by the line of</p>

				<p>RESIDENTIAL</p> <p>planting, which forms a "half moon bastion", that there was a "station", or intended viewpoint [at the top of the field marked "L"] at the point where the drive leaves the higher ground of the crest and starts to descend to the valley floor.</p> <p>Given the elevation (about the 200 feet above sea level contour) of the linear viewpoint along the rim of the basin formed by the river valley to the south of Denwick, any major development in the floor of the valley will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the intended views from the registered landscape. We take the point that the views are already affected by the development of the A1 by-pass and encroachment by the Post-War development of the town but would be concerned to see the further loss of open space in the valley floor.</p> <p>We would agree with the 2018 statement that the planting along the riverside was intended to demarcate Ducal ownership and indicate the boundary of the parkland proper, but would urge caution about the interpretation that the intention was to exclude agricultural land from the view, as many eighteenth century landscape designers were happy to combine beauty and utility. A landowner on the scale of the Duke would be particularly keen to demonstrate the thriving state of his in-hand and tenanted farmland, and the more extensive drives in the locality would have passed mainly through agricultural landscapes. Our observations last year on the 2017 Landscape and Visual Assessment still stand. It considers views from the public road to Denwick (Viewpoint 2) but this is taken at a lower elevation than the line of the old drive-line running along the southern edge of Long Plantation at the top of North Demense (again following approximately the 200 feet above sea level contour). Viewpoint 4, at Quarry House Farm, gives an idea of the effect of views from the drive (which was carefully routed around the south side of Denwick to maintain visibility outwards). The views to the wider valley landscape would have been maintained as the drive followed the crest along the valley side of the woodland belt, which turns southwards giving extensive views across the valley westwards across the valley towards Alnwick and the wider landscape beyond.</p> <p>The March 2018 Heritage Statement considers the views towards towards the development site from the carriage drive at Denwick [para.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>4.28, p.10] and suggests that the views are little different from that from the 2017 Quarry House Farm viewpoint but following the old drive line southwards brings the proposed development site more into prominence.</p> <p>As previously stated, designed views will clearly not be maintained, the impact on the setting of the park will involve change and the effect of the development on the registered landscape cannot be neutral. It may be possible to mitigate the impact of the new development from the historic viewpoints by revising the proposed planting and it is encouraging to see some discussion of the development of these plantings and proposals for future management.</p> <p>We hope that this registers our continuing concern that the proposed development will have an adverse impact on the setting of the registered landscape when seen from the course of the Denwick carriage drive and we would welcome some further viewpoint analysis informed by the recently provided historical information from the Alnwick archive.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Brogyntyn	Shropshire	E17/1197	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent</p> <p>Landscape alterations including removal of trees, formation of new pedestrian bridge to lake island, formation of new vehicular access onto Whitewell Lane, repairs to existing listed building, erection of single storey side extension and detached garage and workshop and installation of package treatment plant. Swiss Cottage, Whitwell Lane, Pant-Glas, Oswestry SY10 7PL. HYBRID North-Oswestry</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for your notification of the above amended scheme, which was forwarded to us from the offices of the Gardens Trust on April 17th 2018. This is a joint response on behalf of both the Gardens Trust, who are Statutory Consultees in matters relating to historic parks and gardens on the English Heritage Register, and the Shropshire Parks and Gardens Trust.</p> <p>We have studied the amended plans relating to this scheme. Notwithstanding the reduction in size of the proposed building extension (which still represents nonetheless an overall floor area increase equivalent to that of the whole of the Swiss Cottage itself), we can find no substantive change in tone or intention of the overall scheme, which if implemented would reduce the Swiss Cottage from its intended key role in the designed landscape of Brogyntyn Hall parkland and pleasure grounds, to being merely a visual 'appendage' to a visually</p>

				Team	<p>incongruous and unsympathetic building. We maintain therefore our objection to this proposed development. Yours sincerely Christopher Gallagher</p>
Badger Dingle	Shropshire	E17/1693	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of a fish stock pool. Land East Of Badger Hall, Badger, Wolverhampton, Shropshire WV6 7JR. WATER FEATURE outh - Bridgnorth</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2018</p> <p>We have received notification of the above proposal, which was forwarded from the offices of The Gardens Trust (formerly The Garden History Society) on 23rd March 2018. The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee in planning matters relating to historic parks and gardens which are included on the Historic England Register of Parks & Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England and we are acting on its behalf in this matter.</p> <p>The proposed development as outlined above lies within the Registered Park and Garden boundary of the Grade II Registered Badger Dingle, which is noteworthy as being the work of the renowned landscaper William Emes and was laid out c.1780. The land within which the existing fishing lake complex is located, is specifically described in the Historic England Register Entry as having formerly been part of the parkland associated with Badger Hall.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that Badger Dingle was added to the Register of Parks and Gardens in 1998/2000 and is included on Shropshire Council's own Historic Environment Record, we note that this is the first application relating to the site to have been referred by Shropshire Council to The GHS/Gardens Trust since the initial request to form a fishing lake there in 2008.</p> <p>It would appear that the Applicant is similarly unaware of the status of Badger Dingle as a Designated Heritage Asset, as described by the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the requirement to carry out an appropriate assessment of the impact of the proposed development on Badger Dingle &/or its Setting. A number of other buildings and structures at Badger are also included on the Historic England List, none of which, to our knowledge, have been similarly assessed.</p> <p>The proposed development site is also immediately adjacent to the Badger Conservaton Area and lies within its Setting.</p> <p>We request therefore that the applicant be required to undertake a</p>

					<p>proper assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development on the Grade II Registered Park and on the Setting both of the other Listed Buildings within the site and of the Badger Conservation Area, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)1. Once this exercise has been completed, we will be in a position to comment on the proposals.</p> <p>We request also that determination of this Application is paused until this assessment is completed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Christopher Gallagher for Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust & The Gardens Trust</p> <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for earlier 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 of Special Historic Interest, as per the above application. Having read the documentation online and seen for the first time that two earlier applications for other fish and fish stock ponds have been approved, it is regrettable that Shropshire Council did not consult the Gardens Trust (formerly the Garden History Society) with regard to these previous developments.</p> <p>As you will be aware, the currently proposed extremely large fish stock pool at Badger (180m x 90m, or more than twice the size of a Premiership football pitch) lies well within the boundary of the Badger Dingle Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden (RPG). You will have received an interim response on our behalf from the Shropshire Parks and Gardens Trust (SPGT), requesting a Heritage Statement/Heritage Impact Assessment and Statement of Significance, which are a requirement under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, see Appendix below). In the applicant's Supporting Statement, there is no mention whatsoever of the RPG and as far as we are aware, no such Heritage Assessment has been submitted. We understand also that the above request by the SPGT has been rejected, even though, in cases like this, an Assessment is required by both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, paragraph 128) and Shropshire Council's own planning policies (see below).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Understanding the significance of a park or garden, and assessing the impact of a proposal upon that significance, is essential in the application of NPPF policy and is described in Section 12 of that document. Paragraph 126 outlines the responsibilities of local planning authorities in this respect:</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance...” [our emphasis].</p> <p>In response, the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (adopted December 2015) includes within it Policy MD13 - The Historic Environment. Among other objectives, this states that:</p> <p>“In accordance with Policies CS6 and CS17 [policies within the Shropshire Core Strategy] and through applying the guidance in the Historic Environment SPD [Supplementary Planning Document], Shropshire’s heritage assets will be protected, conserved, sympathetically enhanced and restored by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensuring that wherever possible, proposals avoid harm or loss of significance to designated or non-designated heritage assets, including their settings. 2. Ensuring that proposals which are likely to affect the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, including its setting, are accompanied by a Heritage Assessment, including a qualitative visual assessment where appropriate. 3. Ensuring that proposals which are likely to have an adverse effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, including its setting, will only be permitted if it can be clearly demonstrated that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the adverse effect. In making this assessment, the degree of harm or loss of significance to the asset including its setting, the importance of the asset and any potential beneficial use will be taken into account...” [our emphasis] <p>The Shropshire Council Historic Environment SPD referred to above, also specifically refers to the requirement contained within the NPPF</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>(Para 128) that:</p> <p>“In determining [planning] applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting...”. Determining the significance of a park or garden, or elements of it, involves firstly understanding its evolution and fabric, and then clarifying the interests it demonstrates, using input from consultees and other experts, desk-based research using historical maps and other sources, and field-based research which looks at various features on the ground.</p> <p>The NPPF advises on the consideration to be taken into account in making a decision, with ‘great weight’ to be given to conservation of designated heritage assets. By considering the significance of a park or garden, and the impact of a proposal upon it, the LPA must determine whether the proposal will result in ‘substantial harm to or loss of’ a heritage asset, or ‘less than substantial harm’, and apply the relevant policy accordingly.</p> <p>In this instance we would suggest that the proposals result in ‘less than substantial harm’, but the cumulative effect of the previously built, rectangular ponds, unsympathetic to the designed Eames landscape, undoubtedly detracts from the naturalistic setting and significance of Badger Dingle. Shropshire Council should give careful consideration to input from consultees and other experts and ask the applicant for the appropriate desk-and field-based assessments which do not appear to have been undertaken. The LPA is required to undertake its own assessment of significance, and the impact of the proposal upon it (NPPF, Para 129).</p> <p>NPPF Para 134 also states that “harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal”.</p> <p>The NPPF also provides additional guidance on the nature of ‘public benefit’:</p> <p>“Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large, and should not just be a private benefit [our emphasis]. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting • reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset • securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation” . <p>It is clear that the proposed development, which is for business reasons and for the benefit of a private individual, fails this test of public benefit.</p> <p>The GT would be grateful if you could please confirm that you will ask the applicant to provide the Heritage Information described above, required under the terms of both the NPPF and Shropshire’s own Core Strategy and SAMDev plan, and until that is forthcoming, that this application will be put on hold.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Hawkstone	Shropshire	E18/0042	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of two storey front extension; conversion of detached garage to ancillary residential accommodation; erection of domestic storage outbuilding. Works to Listed Building to facilitate the erection of two storey front extension; internal works to include alterations to stairs, removal of partition walling, creation of openings, general re-configuration; conversion of modern detached garage to ancillary residential accommodation; erection of storage building. Rakepark Lodge,</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT), formerly the Garden History Society, 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 (RPG), as per the above application. The GT has studied the deposited documents online. Based on these, the GT would be grateful if those involved in the decision making process would take into consideration our comments below.</p> <p>The proposed extension itself is to the south side of the existing Grade II Listed Building and seems unlikely therefore to impact directly upon the Grade I Registered Park & Garden at Hawkstone.</p> <p>We do have some concerns however regarding the negative impact of some of the proposed alterations affecting the Grade II Listed Building itself:</p> <p>1. The proposed reduction in vertical height (achieved via a raising of the window sill) of what appears to be an attractive stone-mullioned window to the rear east side of the building, in what is intended as the proposed kitchen area (see Figure 1 below). This is a group of three 6-</p>

				Weston Under Redcastle, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY4 5JY. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<p>light windows and the proposed changes will in our view have a negative effect on the external appearance of the window, disrupting the current (and no doubt intentional) visual congruity with the dormer windows on the 1st floor immediately above.</p> <p>2. The proposed apparent raising of the existing chimney height within the new extension would mean that it would in future be clearly visible from the east (it is currently hidden by the existing roofs), projecting above the roofline of the existing rear extension. We understand the likely reasons for this proposal, but would ask that this be looked at again, to see if it can be made less intrusive.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed alteration to the garage will in principle have a beneficial effect on its current appearance as seen from the road (see Figure 1 below), but would ask that the proposed windows here are matched in form to those on the Listed Building adjacent, rather than the suburban bungalow-type windows as proposed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Longner Hall	Shropshire	E18/0051	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two storey extensions and detached garage. Chilton Cottage, Atcham, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 6QP. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2018</p> <p>The amended planning application for Chilton Cottage has just been brought to our attention and I am aware that the date for determination looms large.</p> <p>We have looked at the plans online and find little substantive change in the scale of the proposed development and the way in which it will detract from the Setting of Longner Hall.</p> <p>The proposed additions to the existing cottage will similarly dwarf what is currently a charming agricultural residence.</p> <p>The proposed wall and gates are also wholly inappropriate in that location.</p> <p>We see nothing in these amended proposals to make us change our earlier objection to this amended proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christopher Gallagher Vice Chair, Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust</p>
Newton	Somerset	E17/1515	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and	TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.04.2018

Surmaville				<p>Listed Building Consent The erection of 2 No. garages/showrooms to house up to 12 No. prestige and classic cars. Newton House, Newton Road, Stoford, Yeovil, Somerset BA20 2RX.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. Please accept my apologies for the very late submission of our comments.</p> <p>We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and would echo the concerns and points raised by both the Georgian Group and also Historic England. The lack of proper Heritage Statement indicates a failure to appreciate the significance of the site or the impact of the proposals upon it. We would therefore concur with our colleagues that more information is required in order to inform the final design before decisions can be made.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Cricket House	Somerset	E17/1666	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of water tank, erection of replacement water tank, the erection of extension to commercial building for B1/B8 use. Manor Factory, Cricket St Thomas, Chard, Somerset TA20 4BZ LIGHT INDUSTRIAL</p>	<p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.04.2018</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The application site lies entirely within the bounds of the Grade II* RPG of Cricket St Thomas, and there is no direct mention of this within the documentation online. There is no Heritage Statement demonstrating understanding of the setting of the parkland and the impact of the proposal upon its significance as required by NPPF Para 128. The GT/SGT feels that the expansion of the site will undoubtedly have some additional adverse impact upon the historic parkland, although the site has already been affected by previous development. If this application is granted, the developer should be urged to use the opportunity to ameliorate any additional harm through appropriate landscape mitigation such as parkland trees within the field area to the south and east.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Sheffield General Cemetery	South Yorkshire	E17/1565	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Conservation works to listed/non-listed historic features; walls/catacombs; and to listed/non-listed monuments, improvements to site entrance points, landscape improvements including general footpath improvements, installation of wayfinding signage, management of trees/vegetation, and improvement/inclusion of new amenities, lighting, and car parking. Sheffield General Cemetery, Cemetery Avenue, Sheffield S11 8NT. HYBRID	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2018 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. 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 these applications. Further to our earlier comments of 22 March 2018 and having considered the further revised information submitted on the 4th April, The Trust confirms that it wishes to maintain its' objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman