



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES FEBRUARY 2018

The GT conservation team received 155 new cases in England and four cases in Wales during February, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 29 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 8 by the CGTs in response to planning applications included in the weekly lists.

Site	County	GT Ref	Reg Grade	Proposal	Written Response
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Blackhorse Hill, Easter Compton	Avon	E17/1271	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed development within the British Ancient Woodland with enclosures, buildings, hides and public walkways. Wild Place, Blackhorse Hill, Easter Compton, South Gloucestershire BS10 7TP. VISITOR FACILITIES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.02.2018</b> Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust object to this proposal. We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We are aware that the proposed site is part of the Hollywood Tower estate, which is a Locally Important Park and Garden on South Gloucestershire's Historic Environment Register. This land has early 19C woodland walks and planting, within the landscape park of Hollywood Tower. The proposal indicates that there are going to be walkways, viewing hides, animal houses, fenced paddocks and a ranger village with a classroom and a café, which will all have a visual impact on the woodland. Therefore the applicant needs to describe the significance of any heritage assets in accordance with paragraph 128 of the NPPF. As previously notified to you, The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens. The Avon Gardens Trust is the regional part of The Gardens Trust. We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further

					<p>information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Ros Delany (Dr)</p> <p>Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Woburn Abbey	Bedfordshire	E17/1479	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed redevelopment of main office, ticket stations, toilets and access arrangements to park entrance. Woburn Safari Park, Woburn Park, Woburn, Milton Keynes MK17 9QN. VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2018</b></p> <p>Bedfordshire Gardens Trust is responding to this application on behalf of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for planning applications affecting registered historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>It appears that the replacement structures will in aggregate have a smaller footprint than the existing ones, that they will be on the same site, and that they will be single storey as before. Bedfordshire Gardens Trust does not wish to comment on the proposals.</p> <p>The curved upstand seamed metal roofs, aluminium glazing and box gutters used in the new structures are to be finished in “pastel green”, but it is not clear what shade is intended. Your Council is asked to ensure by agreement or condition that you are satisfied that the proposed colour is unobtrusive and blends with its surroundings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>CAROLINE BOWDLER</p> <p>Bedfordshire Gardens Trust</p> <p>Conservation</p>
Waddesdon Manor Eythrope Park	Buckinghamshire	E17/1399	I II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of Barn (No.3), Conversion of Barn (No. 2) to create 6 stables, Construction of new front covered canopy for Barn (No.8), Demolition and removal of Barn (No. 4) and new hard surfacing of yard. Eythrope Park Farm, Main Road, Upper Winchendon, Buckinghamshire HP18 0EP DEMOLITION, EQUESTRIAN, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could consider our comments when making your decision</p> <p>We note that, whilst neither application concerns land or buildings within a registered historic park or garden, the application site does sit adjacent to two significant registered landscapes; Waddesdon (registered Grade I) immediately opposite the proposal site and across the main road to the north west and the Eythrope park (registered Grade II) parallel to this land to the east. The proposals are therefore in the immediate setting of both nationally significant designed landscapes and it is relevant to consider them in terms of the effect</p>

					<p>they will have on the views and other aspects of the historic setting of these important landscapes.</p> <p>The first application 18/00140/APP is to convert or return existing barns to stabling, adding a new front canopy to one barn, the demolition of a modern concrete and timber and new hard surfacing of the yard.</p> <p>The Bucks Gardens Trust notes that these alterations focus on repair and restoration and welcome this application which will give new use to these currently redundant buildings and enhance the setting of the traditional agricultural yard and the wider park.</p> <p>We offer no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>The second application, 18/00139/APP is for the construction of an all weather riding arena with access track and landscaping.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement produced by AKT Planning on behalf of the Waddesdon Estate. Whilst it is clear that thought has been given to the position and design of the proposed all weather riding arena and attempts have been made to mitigate its impact in the wider setting, we have serious concerns as to whether this is an appropriate introduction into this landscape. This is based on the following understanding of the historic development.</p> <p>Although the Waddesdon and Eythrope estates developed separately until the late C19, once united in Rothschild family ownership in the 1870s they were developed to complement each other as an ensemble of outstanding design quality. Physically this link is most obviously expressed in the Eythrope Drive which connects Waddesdon Manor and Eythrope Pavilion in a single extensive ornamental carriage drive, deliberately designed for this purpose to run through both parks to the Pavilion, and from there the pleasure boat route via an unexpected lake and the River Thames to the remote and now lost tea pavilion.</p> <p>Stylistically the parks were linked by the form of the drive, which was unified across both parks, and by many highly ornamental estate buildings in similar styles by the architect Devey and builder Taylor of Bierton, as well as fine late C19 park planting.</p> <p>In the late C19, Miss Alice Rothschild used the remains of Sir William Stanhope's C18 park as the basis for her park as the setting for the drive to and from the Pavilion. It is unusual to have a park design so particularly focussed on an approach rather than the principal building,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>in this case because the building was so modest. She used Sir William's surviving fine C18 landscape features, particularly Isaac Ware's bridge and the lake, but these were more closely related to her pleasure ground, rather than forming key elements of the larger park.</p> <p>As part of Stanhope's design, Eythrope Park Farmhouse was given a castellated C18 facade overlooking the park. It was intended as an eye-catcher and therefore was deliberately incorporated in views. Despite its loss in 1916, the building remains noticeable in the same views and therefore any development on the sloping land in the park will potentially be visible from the ornamental carriage drive.</p> <p>With this historical understanding in mind, The GT/BGT question whether this position is the appropriate situation for a riding arena given its significance in the development of Eythrope park and its prominence in views from around the park.</p> <p>We object to the proposal for the riding arena for the following reasons:</p> <p>The arena will have a damaging visual effect. The proposals state that the riding arena will be surrounded by a 1.7 metre timber kickboard which will be a very solid angular introduction into the landscape. We would also draw attention to the incremental impact of a riding arena due to the equipment that accompanies it which is not mentioned in a planning application. Within the arena will be a requirement for brightly coloured jumps which can be 5ft high and 6ft across. It is likely that these will be remain in place and will create a very modern intervention in this historic landscape. Whilst not referred to in this application, we would express great concern about the possible future application for floodlighting so that the riding arena could be used in low light.</p> <p>The GT/BGT acknowledge that proposed additional planting which will mitigate the impact of the riding arena and the features mentioned above in the landscape. However, we query whether this will result in the further loss or reduction of the view that historically existed to the Farm. It seems that either the modern intervention of equestrian facilities or increased dense planting will alter the relationship of this former but significant eyecatcher with the park, and will therefore damage the views and change the character of the land adjacent and relating to this registered historic parkland.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The applicant makes reference to Saved Policy GP77 of the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan 2004 which deals with horse-related developments. We suggest that the proposed riding arena does affect the following categories : -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area</li> <li>b) The maintenance of the open nature and character and</li> <li>f) The suitability of the location</li> </ul> <p>We would therefore support the applicant's offer to produce a landscape plan but would recommend that this is done prior to any decision being made on this rather than as a condition of consent so that it can inform the decision-making process.</p> <p>We consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) that the site of this application is of considerable significance in the landscape of two nationally significant designed landscapes where simplicity and open views are the key characteristics and</li> <li>b) therefore advises the Council to reject the application to create a riding arena in this position.</li> </ul> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Waddesdon Manor Eythrope Park	Buckinghamshire	E17/1400	I II	PLANNING APPLICATION CONSTRUCTION OF ALL WEATHER RIDING ARENA WITH ACCESS TRACK AND LANDSCAPING. Eythrope Park Farm, Main Road, Upper Winchendon, Buckinghamshire HP18 0EP. EQUESTRIAN	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.02.2018</b></p> <p>As above</p>
Cheadle Royal Hospital	Cheshire	E17/1468	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Application for Planning Permission for the erection of new 60-bed and 30-bed hospital buildings and associated works, including demolition of Boiler House and adjacent buildings,	<p><b>TGT/CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have consulted with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and we would be glad if your officers could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this</p>

				<p>new car parking and landscaping (Re-submission of DC/024085 &amp; DC/044267). Cheadle Royal Hospital, 100 Wilmslow Road, Heald Green, Cheadle, Stockport SK8 3DG MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>application.</p> <p>Cheadle Royal Hospital, originally the Manchester Royal Hospital for the Insane, sits within a registered mid-19th century landscape of park and gardens. Its original 280 acres has been significantly reduced and encroached with later housing developments as well as buildings and car parking related to current use. It does, however, retain key garden components contemporary to the original layout and a significant number of mature trees.</p> <p>An understanding of the parkland and gardens is shown within the English Heritage (EH) listing description. It is worth re-stating these points as they are fundamental reasons for the listing of the parkland and gardens: 'One of the chief [constituents?] of the indirect remedial means of treating mental disease is a cheerful, well-arranged building, in a well-selected situation, with spacious grounds for husbandry, and gardening, and exercise. As built the hospital had thirty acres of meadow and eleven acres of arable land, two-and-a-half acres of kitchen garden, and five acres of flower gardens with avenues, shrubberies and gravelled walks.' Patients were involved in gardening, planning, improvements to the grounds and areas for recreation.</p> <p>Cheadle Royal Hospital and its designated area (listed Grade II) was in the first listing of parks and gardens by English Heritage in 1995. The hospital was seen as a rare and important institutional landscape of national significance and was used as a prime example of an increasingly rare landscape typology. EH used the hospital within its marketing leaflets for several years. The Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) should not be compared directly with the register for listed structures as there was a change in approach to the listing of parks and gardens at the time. Listed parks and gardens were to be limited in numbers and reflect a tougher selection criteria than structures. In 1986, Cheshire had 18 listed parks and gardens and only eight have been added since this date despite research for English Heritage (1996) stating that there were in excess of 400 parks and gardens within the county of historic interest. As such, parks and gardens on the register are highly selective and restrictive.</p> <p>The submitted Heritage Statement has a strong focus on the existing and proposed structures, but less so in terms of the registered park and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>garden. Policy SIE-1 identifies the need for a 'high regard to the built environment...Specific account of the sites characteristics, including landform, landscape, views or vistas...'. Other policies support the need for considered action when dealing with Cheadle Royal's historic landscape: Policy SIE-3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment; Policy HC1.3 Special Control of Development in Conservation Areas; HC4.1 Development of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest. Under the Heritage Statement several sections refer to the character and setting of Cheadle Royal's landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.3.9 'integrity of the historical formal layout of the site'</li> <li>• 4.41 'the spatial character is respected'</li> <li>• 4.6.2 &amp; 5.2 'improved setting to the main listed building' &amp; 'the improved setting of the historic garden and the enhancement of the conservation area'</li> </ul> <p>Car Parking: The Garden Trust has serious concerns that the current proposals do not support these statements or the previous mentioned policies. This statement is based on the proposed access route and car parking to the west of the existing building. Part of the car park is within the designated registered area. This will result in an irreplaceable loss of the historic spatial form and a significant number of trees.</p> <p>Tree Loss: The tree survey addresses the trees for their arboricultural value, but not for their historic merit. This is particularly true for the conifers which were an intrinsic part of 19th century planting. The submitted documents do not combine the proposals with the tree survey so it is not always possible to marry up the trees to be removed and their specific listing within the tree survey (789537). However it is clear that the following trees will be lost due to the development:</p> <p>T2281-B1 Beech  T2282-A1 Beech  T2285-C1 Abies group of three trees  T2286-B1 Horse Chestnut  T2287-B1 Horse Chestnut  T2289-C1 Horse Chestnut  T2292-B1 Horse Chestnut  T2293-B1 Horse Chestnut  T2300-A1/2 Scots Pine group of four trees</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Other trees will be lost as well, however they are not easily identified due to the documentation difficulties mentioned above. Only two trees are identified as grade C which are deemed to be of 'low quality and value'. The mature trees are a significant part of the historic landscape, while the conifers have historic value. The loss of these trees will have an impact on the setting of the listed structures and on the RPG.</p> <p>Landscape Strategy: The GT/CGT note that the landscape strategy indicates the selection of plants to be used. We would encourage the inclusion of some plants of the period of the existing structures and gardens. This would provide a unity between the different parts of the landscape and continue with the traditions of the period, as well as allowing for the replacement of some of the existing mature species with similar species.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GT/CGT believe that the proposal does not support the policies of Stockport MBC or the NPPF.</li> <li>• We object to the development in that it will result in the loss of the historic fabric within the defined listed area due to access roads and car parking.</li> <li>• We object to the loss of significant trees within the same area.</li> <li>• The Trust would also encourage the selection of plant material and design that would provide a link between the existing buildings and gardens and the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p>Yours sincerely  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust  Cc : Cheshire Gardens Trust – Mr Ed Bennis</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 residential development (use</p>	<p><b>TGT/CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust and we are grateful for the opportunity to comment on the implications of this application to vary conditions attached to the outline consent for a development adjacent to Tatton</p>



				<p>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>Park, a historic designed landscape which is registered Grade II* by Historic England. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. We note however that neither the Gardens Trust nor the local Cheshire Gardens Trust were consulted at the time of the outline application in 2013.</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), available at <a href="http://thegardenstrust.org/">http://thegardenstrust.org/</a> and attached as a pdf here.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We write to lodge an objection due to concerns about potential adverse implications of the proposed variation to Condition 4 of this current application. The significance and setting of the adjoining registered landscape could be affected, and we consider that an assessment is needed now, rather than as part of a future reserved matters application.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>The variation would allow previously permitted 3 storey houses to be raised to 4 storeys, and 2 storey houses to be raised to 3 storeys, which could increase visibility from within Tatton Park. Views from within the parkland are currently rural in nature, contributing to the perception of integrity of the historic landscape and to enjoyment of its expansive open spaces.</p> <p>The development would be likely to become more urban in character than previously approved. The permitted development is within the setting of Tatton Park, and it should be kept in mind that the plantation to the north is part of the registered landscape (i.e. not merely a buffer between the registered park and the development site). We recognise that the approved scheme includes some mitigation, but its effectiveness will vary with season and over time. Increasing the building height would conflict with the Design Code submitted with the original application, which is illustrated only with 2 storey estate-type houses in the local vernacular.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We would therefore recommend that before determination the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is revised or expanded to provide information on the potential effects of the variations, including the use of cross sections to show the relationship of the higher buildings to the adjoining registered park, and assessment of effects on the character of the registered site and on potential viewpoints.</p> <p>Policy</p> <p>In terms of national policy, NPPF 128 requires an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting, and NPPF 129 requires the local planning authority to take this into account. This is reflected in Policy SE7 of Cheshire East's adopted Local Plan Strategy which also states in paragraph 3 that</p> <p>"The council...will seek to avoid or minimise conflict between the conservation of a heritage asset and any aspect of a development proposal by: a. Designated Heritage Assets:</p> <p>i. Requiring development proposals that cause harm to, or loss of, a designated heritage asset and its significance, including its setting, to provide a clear and convincing justification as to why that harm is considered acceptable. Where that case cannot be demonstrated, proposals will not be supported."</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
Arley Hall	Cheshire	E17/1563	II*	PRE-APPLICATION Consultation of Proposed Arley Hall Memorial Garden	<p><b>TGT/CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.02.2018</b></p> <p>First of all, The Garden Trust would like to thank you and the others involved in presenting the proposal for a memorial walled garden at Arley on Wednesday 14 February to Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT). CGT attended on behalf of The Gardens Trust (GT), a statutory consultee on matters affecting historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>We believe that change is essential in order to ensure a viable economic future for Arley and indeed, we support positive and innovative ideas in historic gardens. The proposed walled area clearly</p>

					<p>reflects the fabric and traditions of the estate while the columbarium niches provide a novel concept in economic, design and cultural terms. Although the memorial garden (as shown in the Vision Statement (VS) is within the registered parkland, we are of the opinion that it would have minimal impact on the historic fabric of the park and gardens. This opinion is based on an extensive knowledge of the site, a site visit, a review of the historic maps and the draft Arley Heritage Statement (Dec. 2017). In principle, we are supportive of the proposal and would encourage its further development as the VS does leave some concerns. It was clear at the presentation that the proposed application was more extensive than indicated within the VS. This does raise some uncertainties about the overall scope particularly in terms of the scale of development. It may be appropriate that these concerns are addressed at or prior to the application stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal lies adjacent to The Grove, near the Chapel and registered historic buildings, garden and parkland. The presented VS indicates one walled garden area within the designated area which we feel would have minimum impact.</li> <li>• From your presentation, it is clear that the proposal is more extensive than shown in the VS with several linked walled areas as a long-term aim. In order to understand the extent of the development, we would wish to see the full proposal in order to ascertain the impact on the surrounding landscape supported with a phasing strategy.</li> <li>• We did not discuss the scale of the walls, but were surprised at the proposed 4m height which was mentioned in the Heritage Statement, which was not available prior to the meeting. While this may be a traditional height for a walled garden, the use of the space is far from traditional. Ultimately, this would produce a series of monolithic structures that would be out of scale for its situation and purpose.</li> <li>• A detailed landscape plan to the external areas of the walled garden/s would assist in sensitively integrating the proposed walled garden/garden, toilet facilities, access routes and car parking into the existing landscape and potentially linking it to The Grove and a route to the chapel. May we suggest the consideration of a contemporary approach to these walled garden enclosures within planted areas as this would give more scope to achieve satisfactory scale and less</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>intrusive appearance?</p> <p>Despite our concerns, we are supportive of the idea and would be pleased to discuss the proposal prior to application if you wish.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Margie Hoffung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p> <p>cc :Ed Bennis,Chairman, Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Stover	Devon	E17/1297	II	PRE-APPLICATION Proposed Hockey Pitch. Stover School, Stover. EDUCATION, SPORT/LEISURE	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.02.2018</b></p> <p>Pre-application consultation. New hockey pitch. Stover School</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust on the above consultation which affects Stover, a site of national importance as signified by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II. The Devon Gardens Trust works in partnership with The Gardens Trust in responding to consultations. Whilst we have no objection in principle to the proposed new hockey pitch, we would suggest that it would be appropriate to review the floodlighting of the existing tennis court with a view to replacing the existing tall floodlights with modern, lower and more directional lights, in mitigation of the proposed new hockey pitch. Yours faithfully</p> <p>John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Langdon Court Hotel	Devon	E17/1442	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Householder application for rear extension. Gatewood, Wembury PL9 0DZ. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.02.2018</b></p> <p>No objection</p>
Notgrove Manor	Gloucestershire	E17/1460	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Use of land for the siting of 'safari tents'. The Sports Field, Notgrove, Gloucestershire. CAMPING	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.02.2018</b></p> <p>Dear Mr.Perks,</p> <p>18/00252/FUL. Use of land for 5 safari tents, the sports-field, Notgrove. Gloucestershire.</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as the Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that impact on Registered or Listed parks and gardens has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust to respond to this Planning Application on its behalf.</p> <p>Although not overtly mentioned in the Design and Access Statement, this proposal on the sports-field at Notgrove Manor lies within a Grade</p>

					<p>II Registered Garden (Heritage England: PG1768) closely associated with the Listed Manor.</p> <p>The intrusive qualities of any development proposals in such a location should be considered very carefully. In this instance and particularly in the winter, safari tents will be quite visible from the village access road to the North and also from the drive to Notgrove Manor to the South. This is primarily due to the lack of understorey planting. Although helpful that the proposed safari tents are to be coloured green, five tents are substantial structures (each 9.800m+ 5.400m by 3.500m high); and whilst occupied the site will visually not be "clutter free".</p> <p>On an initial assessment based on the information available in the Application, the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) is of the opinion that this proposal should be refused on this site. GGLT fully recognises the economic importance of estate diversification, and perhaps a less obtrusive location might be available.</p> <p>However, if Cotswold District Council is minded to approve this Application, there are a number of outstanding issues that are important to clarify:</p> <p>*Is this proposal being considered as an Application for a temporary time limited consent, or one that will permit permanent use of the structures or subsequent replacement structures?</p> <p>*Are the safari tents structures to be occupied throughout the year, or are they to be dismantled over a winter period?</p> <p>* The visual intrusion of the five structures is an important factor; therefore, would the District Council consider conditioning against a further increase in number, or particularly their replacement with development of a more permanent nature e.g. caravans or even housing?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust).</p>
Cheltenham Local Plan	Gloucestershire	E17/1487	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN Cheltenham Plan Pre-Submission consultation <a href="http://consult.cheltenham.gov.uk">http://consult.cheltenham.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:localplan@cheltenham.gov.uk">localplan@cheltenham.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2018</b></p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for Plan policy and development that might impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) regarding the current Cheltenham Plan Pre-Submission Consultation.</p>

					<p>Having considered the relevant sections of the draft Plan, GGLT would wish to make the following observations:</p> <p>*Within the Historic Environment and Landscape sections of the draft Plan no specific reference is made that highlights the importance that Registered Parks and Gardens make to Cheltenham's environmental quality and economic wellbeing, both as a generality; or,</p> <p>*That the Plan is silent on the need to safeguard the continuing quality of Listed or Registered parks and gardens by protecting them both from adverse contextual impacts, ie external impacts on the setting of Glenfall House its garden and park, and Pittville Park;</p> <p>*Or to ensure that works within these parks and gardens are of the highest quality both in design and execution, ie management issues with Imperial Square and Montpellier Gardens, and recent interventions at Pittville Park.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Lambeth Regulation 123 List	Greater London	E17/1291	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN Proposed amendments to Regulation 123 List consultation  <a href="https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/consultations/public-consultation-on-proposed-amendments-to-lambeth%C3%A2%C2%80%C2%99s-regulation-123-list?utm_source=Sign-Up.to&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_campaign=17118-419196-Consultation+begins+on+amendments+to+Lambeth%27s+Regulation+123+List+localplan@lambeth.gov.uk">https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/consultations/public-consultation-on-proposed-amendments-to-lambeth%C3%A2%C2%80%C2%99s-regulation-123-list?utm_source=Sign-Up.to&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_campaign=17118-419196-Consultation+begins+on+amendments+to+Lambeth%27s+Regulation+123+List+localplan@lambeth.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2018</b></p> <p>The LPGT is affiliated to the Gardens Trust (GT) which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LPGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk">www.londongardensonline.org.uk</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>LPGT believes the Borough should agree the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development which benefits from its proximity to a public open space should contribute to its ongoing maintenance,</li> <li>• all development should contribute to the environmental quality of the borough, including the restoration and ongoing maintenance of parks and green spaces.</li> <li>• All development should take into account the levels of access afforded to existing green space and provide new space to compensate for the impact of increased densities, particularly where there is already</li> </ul>

					<p>a deficit.</p> <p>Funding mechanisms should ensure:</p> <p>a) Development close to or adjacent to a greenspace should contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional maintenance costs arising from increased footfall</li> <li>• additional facilities to cater for the additional users eg playspace, seating, planting</li> <li>• landscape improvements to mitigate adverse impacts on the park arising from the development.</li> </ul> <p>b) In areas of change, all development should contribute to the wider green infrastructure of that neighbourhood.</p> <p>c) Assets of Borough, London or National importance such as parks and gardens on the national register or which are locally listed as having special historic interest should be a priority to receive funding for investment.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Helen Monger Director London Parks and Gardens Trust</p>
397 Clapham Road, London	Greater London	E17/1504	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of rear extensions and a mansard roof extension to create 1 additional flat, providing a total of 8 flats. 397 Clapham Road, London SW9 9BT. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.02.2018</b></p> <p>Dear Mr de Bunsen</p> <p>Thank you for your email which was passed to me a couple of weeks ago. The London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) is affiliated to the Gardens Trust (GT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LPGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT's Inventory of Historic Green Spaces (see <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk">www.londongardensonline.org.uk</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Unfortunately the site you have brought to our attention is not listed either nationally or on the local list for Lambeth. The site is also not on</p>

					<p>our Inventory. We are a volunteer-led organisation with no external funding reliant on our researchers to investigate projects. The delay in my response is endeavouring to persuade one of our volunteer expert researchers to see if they could investigate. Unfortunately we do not have anyone available at this time to carry out suitable research to provide the detailed listing you would need based on the historic remains (if still there). Any researcher would also need to seek access to the site, which under the present circumstances may prove very difficult.</p> <p>The site is as you say in a Conservation Area and adjacent to two Grade 2 listed buildings. My advice, therefore, would be to emphasise the importance of the setting to the listed buildings as part of any case you present to the Council. I would also suggest that you make contact with the Conservation Officer at Lambeth Council and see if they can offer further advice.</p> <p>I am sorry that we can not be of more help in this instance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Helen Monger Director London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust</p>
Hulton Park	Greater Manchester	E17/0270	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION HYBRID PLANNING APPLICATION COMPRISING: PART A: FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION WORKS TO HULTON PARK AND EXISTING STRUCTURES &amp; HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN IT INCLUDING THE PLEASURE GROUNDS, DOVECOTE, WALLED GARDEN AND LAKES, AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN 18- HOLE GOLF COURSE &amp; CLUBHOUSE-; GOLF ACADEMY INCLUDING DRIVING RANGE, PRACTICE COURSE, ADVENTURE</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.02.2018</b></p> <p>Further to the GT's letter of objection to the above application on 14th July, we have reviewed the revised documents relating to the above application. Despite these, our strong OBJECTION remains. We would like to reiterate all our comments from our previous letter, in particular stressing that the key elements of the Strategy for this area are that it is formal Green Belt, with the designation of the majority of this area as a registered Park or Garden. In addition, there are no policies that allocate any of this land for any form of development.</p> <p>We note that the applicant stresses the exceptional nature of the proposed golf course. However, it is equally pertinent to say that an historic park of this age and rarity in Greater Manchester is also quite exceptional. The proposed residential development of approximately 192 dwellings within the RPG will result in a total loss of the designated heritage asset, and the 759 other dwellings proposed to the west of the</p>



				<p>COURSE &amp; ACADEMY BUILDING WITH SPORTS &amp; LEARNING FACILITIES, SHOP &amp; CAFE; 142 BED HOTEL WITH ADJOINING SPA &amp; CONFERENCE FACILITY; OTHER ANCILLARY BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES &amp; ENGINEERING &amp; LANDSCAPE WORKS INCLUDING A MAINTENANCE BUILDING, HALFWAY HOUSE, HIGHWAY ACCESSES, UNDERPASS, VARIOUS BRIDGES, BOUNDARY TREATMENTS, INTERNAL ACCESS ROADS, EXTERNAL LIGHTING, PARKING, LANDSCAPING; DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS/STRUCTURES; &amp; WHERE APPLICABLE THE RE-ROUTING, UPGRADING AND EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY NETWORK</p> <p>PART B: OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 1036NO. DWELLINGS, A LOCAL CENTRE (CLASS A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1) AND WHERE APPLICABLE RE-ROUTING, UPGRADING AND EXTENSION OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY NETWORK (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR (IN PART) HIGHWAYS) LAND AT AND ADJACENT TO HULTON PARK, BOLTON. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>RPG will have an extremely detrimental and negative effect upon the setting and significance of Hulton Park</p> <p>We concur with the Lancashire Gardens Trust that the additional details on management plans and restoration of the waterbodies are welcome and share their concerns within the final two large paragraphs of their letter.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.02.2018 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</b></p> <p>Lancashire Gardens Trust objected to the above application by letter dated 19 July 2017. Since then, notification has been received of a number of revised documents and these have been reviewed.</p> <p>It is noted that the application is broadly unchanged in its overall scheme, in the creation of the golf course and residential development within the Registered Park and Garden and further residential development immediately to the west of the Park.</p> <p>The documentation includes some welcome additional detail for instance on management plans and details for restoration of the waterbodies. However, the concerns and objections set out in our letter of 19 July remain. Therefore, the Lancashire Gardens Trust still objects to the application which if approved would lead to irreversible change and partial loss of this exceptional site. Hulton Park is a site of considerable age and rarity, being an example of one of the few Registered Parks and Gardens where records indicate mediaeval origins, and there are only four such sites out of a total of 32 Registered Parks and Gardens in Greater Manchester.</p> <p>On points of detail we would highlight for example two additional concerns arising from the revised documentation.</p> <p>In the Conservation Management Plan, whilst there is mention of the William Emes documents which were revealed during research into the Hulton Archive, the details on the documents and images of them have not been included in the revised document. Furthermore, whilst the Historic England listing text is incorporated, the specific HE plan of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>Registered Park and Garden is not. We accept however that the actual boundary of the RPG is nevertheless shown on numerous plans within application documentation. A new document has been produced, adding to the ES, Volume 4A Appendix 14.9 Outline Lake Desilting and Feasibility Study and Strategy (Jan 2018). Whilst this restoration work in itself may be beneficial, some of the details on the drawings incorporated in the report are of concern. One of the potential material deposition areas for Mill Dam (indicated in purple tone) covers the land presently occupied by Park End Farmhouse, and farm buildings. Although at one stage intended for demolition, in the current master plan, it was understood from the masterplan that these buildings are now to be retained.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me by email <a href="mailto:Stephen.e.robson@btinternet.com">Stephen.e.robson@btinternet.com</a>.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation &amp; Planning Group</p>
Hertfordshire Mineral Local Plan	Hertfordshire	E17/1164	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN consultation on draft Minerals Local Plan <a href="http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/minerals">www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/minerals</a> <a href="mailto:minerals.planning@hertfordshire.gov.uk">minerals.planning@hertfordshire.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.02.2018</b></p> <p>Paragraph 6.2 County Council's Vision</p> <p>The vision does not have any details in the document of how the restoration and subsequent management of mineral sites will be achieved to the high level envisaged. Current restoration and management of mineral sites is almost uniformly unacceptable with no monitoring of post-extraction filling resulting in overfilled sites which cause irreparable damage to the historic landscapes in whose setting they are sited .There appears to be no enforcement of any conditions on the landfill quotas resulting in harm to the settings of Registered landscapes at Panshanger, Hatfield, Poles, Roxford Grotto, Bayfordbury etc. plus several locally listed landscapes Further no details of enforcement or monitoring for the life of this emerging plan have been given</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4 Objective 8</p> <p>How will it contribute positively when no detailed strategy or monitoring and enforcement policies are mentioned?</p> <p>Policy 24 Restoration</p>

					<p>How will these goals be achieved? In relation to the impact on historic parks and gardens, how will HCC ensure they are restored to conserve and enhance the heritage asset? How will HCC ensure that there is compliance with the conditions requiring high-quality restoration? How will HCC deal with non-compliance resulting in overfilling of extraction sites?</p> <p>Inset Map 4 Proposed Preferred Area 1 - The Briggens Estate</p> <p>HCC mentions the Conservation Area and the Stanstead Bury Estate. Omitted are the great hunting park and Renaissance garden of Henry VIII adjacent to Lords Wood, the earthworks of the formal pond systems and garden of which are being considered by Historic England for Scheduling. Briggens Estate, a registered landscape, which adjoins Stanstead Bury and shares interconnecting views across the proposed site is also affected. The settings of all these historic landscapes will be severely harmed by both this very large development, over many years and the subsequent infilling.</p> <p>Paragraph 169 states LPAs should have up-to-date evidence of the historic environment and use it to assess the significance of the heritage assets and the contributions they make. This HCC has clearly have failed to do. The evidence from the small scale archaeological excavations to the east of Lords Wood and the historic investigations on the Henrician parkland, the new evidence on Briggens and enhanced (since the Register entry) evidence on Stanstead Bury do not appear to have been adequately considered and this has led to under- evaluation of the importance of this area of the county in heritage terms.</p> <p>We consider that much more work needs to be done on assessment and understanding of the surrounding heritage assets before this site is considered for the Preferred List.</p> <p>Comments on Omissions</p> <p>Table 2.14 Barwick</p> <p>We support your exclusion of this site at the is time. However, we consider that the heritage assessment is flawed in that it omits Youngsbury from the list of heritage assets. This Grade II landscape is the best capability Brown landscape in the county and any changes to its setting and hydrology (Brown altered the designed water features here) would cause harm to it. We suggest this is added to the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>assessment for future reference.</p> <p>Table 2.16 Water Hall Quarry Farm Fields Area</p> <p>We support the omission of this site but would add that this area has already been extensively quarried and badly restored to the detriment of the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Roxford Wood. Other aspects of the setting of the SAM have been severely harmed by the overfilling of adjacent quarries. This would destroy the last remaining original setting</p> <p>Table 2.18 Water Hall Quarry Broad Green area</p> <p>We support the omission of this site. This site is immediately adjacent to the Registered landscape at Bayfordbury and forms part of its setting. Extraction and restoration here would harm the significance of the heritage asset. This information should be added to the assessment for future reference</p> <p>Table 2.26 Water Hall Quarry Howe Green Area</p> <p>We support the omission of this site. This forms part of the setting of Woolmers Park which is on the HGT list of parks and Gardens of Local Historic Importance in East Herts. This site is opposite the views from the mansion across the parkland to the opposite side of the valley. This information should be added to the assessment for future reference</p> <p>Table 2.32 Pipers End</p> <p>We support the omission of this site. This is immediately adjacent to the II* Woolmers Park mansion and is situated within the setting of this house. It also is situated within a Locally Listed Historic Park (on the HGT List) and extraction here would severely harm both heritage assets. This information should be added to the assessment for future reference</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Danesbury	Hertford shire	E17/1422	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey detached dwelling with car parking, garage, summerhouse and associated landscaping. Land adjacent to 20 Kindersley Close, Welwyn AL6 9RN. RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are aware that historically this area was part of the Danesbury Locally Listed parkland but consider there are unlikely to be any remains of this and thus have no objection to the proposals. However, if an archaeological watching brief is required for the AAS, sub-surface parkland features such as paths or drives may be picked up.</p>

					Kate Harwood
1-7 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertford shire	E17/1477	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (materials samples) on planning permission 6/2017/0400/FULL, dated 13/11/2017. 1-7 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City AL8 8AL. MISCELLANEOUS	<b>WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.02.2018</b> We have no comments to make on the samples, unseen by us, of the materials to be used for the conversion of these properties but defer to the decision of the relevant council officers. Kate Harwood
Barvin Park	Hertford shire	E17/1484	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of pool house following demolition of existing outbuilding. 5 Oakwell Drive, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4EZ. SPORT/LEISURE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2018</b> Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, has researched the garden history of this site, formerly known as Barvin Park. This landscape has been largely destroyed by housing development. This development is currently fairly well screened from the road. We would suggest augmentation the 1.5 m hedge shown on the plans to the north of the proposed development, where necessary, to protect the views across the landscape from further erosion from this buildings which is considerably larger than that proposed to be demolished. Kate Harwood
Temple Dinsley	Hertford shire	E17/1523	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use and extension of school dormitory (C2) to form 6 no. dwellings (C3), incorporating the following listed building works; demolition and removal of conservatory, fire escape stairs and storage sheds; erection of single storey extension to accommodation block and erection of cross wing extension to north east wing; erection of lattice porch to south west elevation. Realignment of boundary wall adjacent the access; formation of amenity,	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2018</b> Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee ... We are familiar both with this Lutyens landscape, Grade II* on the HE Register and its landscape history. We have no comment to make on the conversion of the listed building but have the following concerns about the impacts on the historic landscape and also the setting of the Dower House. Lutyens was known for his care in detailing brickwork and that at the main house at Temple Dinsley is exceptionally fine in its subtleties of texture and light and shade. There are a lot of walls surrounding parking bays etc,. Similarly on the proposed 3D views illustrations, there are fences dividing the immediate landscape around the Dower House. These will detract from the views across the open parkland particularly is the land falls away from the Dower House which acts akin to an eyecatcher from some parts of the park.

				<p>parking areas and associated landscaping. The Dower House, Hitchin Road, Preston, Hitchin,. Hertfordshire SG4 7TZ.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>We are further concerned about the siting of the parking bays which are also prominent in the views and may well cause glare in addition to the intrusion of cars. Combined with the large amount of hard standing around the parking bays for turning , this reduction in the green sweep of grassland will have an adverse effect on the landscape.</p> <p>The lack of screening for the cycle and bin store and its siting, together with the new wing add a significant built aspect to this part of the site . We do have a query over the barn-like building to the south which is at present accessed from the current drive to the Dower House. There is no access shown to this on the proposed site plan (PL08). Is this to be removed? If not, how will this be accessed in the future?</p> <p>We consider that the many low walls, whose function is unclear, fences, cycle and bin store and arrangement of parking are a substantial harm to this part of the landscape and the views across the Registered parkland . We would urge that this clutter be reduced to the minimum and re-arranged to minimise adverse impacts both on the Dower House setting and the Registered parkland of Temple Dinsley. More consideration of how any remaining proposed walls could reflect either the brickwork of the Dower House or of Temple Dinsley would be a benefit</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Calverley Park and Calverley Grounds	Kent	E17/1326	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for the redevelopment of the site to include the demolition of existing buildings (the Great Hall car park, the dental surgery in Calverley Grounds and the toilet block in Calverley Grounds) and provision of new offices (including Council offices, Council Chamber and commercial office space), theatre, underground car parking,</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>Calverley Grounds (CG) forms part of the setting for Decimus Burton's 24 Calverley Park villas (II*) as well as the pleasure grounds of the Calverley Hotel (Grade II). Burton's development, 'completed by 1839 (Plan, Colbran) was begun in 1828 as a 'self-contained village landscape - virtually a new town'. Taken together with the other features of Burton's design, the whole was composed to have 'economic,</p>

				<p>and associated landscaping, infrastructure and associated works, including temporary site compound. Civic Development Site, Mount Pleasant Avenue, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL</p>	<p>architectural and scenic unity'. Calverley Hotel is the site of Mount Pleasant House, where the future Queen Victoria stayed with her mother on at least five occasions between 1822 and 1835. It is now the Hotel du Vin. CG originally formed the major portion of the grounds of the old Mount Pleasant House, later to be the Calverley Hotel. They remained attached to the hotel until after WWI and during all that time they were made available to the general public for particular events or occasions. When the hotel decided to sell off the greater portion of their gardens it made sense for Tunbridge Wells District Council (TWDC) to buy them and convert them into a public park during the 1920s. The Design &amp; Access statement (D&amp;A), part 33, 4.10.2, paragraph 3, describes the landscape as still holding "strong its original Burton's 'valley' character, central in directing views from the villas at its eastern edge towards the west." Burton's villas are arranged in a quadrangle on level ground along the North and East perimeter of the site, with all except numbers 2-4, overlooking the park. Therefore preserving the setting of these important heritage assets is crucial when considering any possible changes to CG. The GT and KGT are sympathetic to the idea of improving the current western aspect of CG, as the current C20 commercial buildings, housing and associated car parks on this side of the RPG detract considerably from its significance. 'It was part of Decimus Burton's expansive vision for the town to ring the head of this valley with a horseshoe of stone classical villas that would look out west across the valley to Mount Ephraim and the open countryside beyond.' The villas were described as being 'placed in the midst of a park, which is most pleasantly disposed by nature and adorned by art.' Although expansion of TW in the intervening years means that it will never be possible to see open countryside again from the villas, Burton's intent is clear. It is therefore important to bear in mind the statement in D&amp;A part 33, 4.10.2 paragraph 2: "The original design proposed enclosure of the western edge to physically separate Calverley Grounds from its surrounding buildings by planting along its borders." (my emphasis) The applicant's own documentation therefore highlights the fact that encroaching further into the designed landscape with more buildings (which will totally dominate the entire western end and all the designed views within the park), is entirely alien to Burton's original design aims</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>and concept.</p> <p>At present the view westwards across the park is of the Great Hall (Wilson and Willcox, 1870-2). The proposed new office block and particularly the theatre building, are both very tall, and will completely overwhelm the view from the villas, and obscure the view of the rooftops and the trees of the Common beyond. Calverley Hotel was formerly the dominant building overlooking the valley as well as being one of the major focuses from within the park , but if the new development goes ahead, the entire emphasis will be changed. The park will seem hemmed in by huge buildings and have a feeling of enclosure, totally the opposite of the outward looking vision designed by Burton. CG will appear as an adjunct to the development rather than a park in its own right.</p> <p>TWBC has given this ambitious scheme a great deal of thought, but despite this the GT and KGT feel that the current proposals completely ignore Burton's original design intent of the site as a whole. The GT and KGT would question the need for a 1200 seat theatre in a town within an hour's train ride from London. Such an enormous financial outlay on non-core infrastructure and services is surprising at a time when Local Authority budgets are being cut to the bone. Neglect of planting within CG can be rectified at any time, but an ambitious building programme such as this would change the park irrevocably. If a small proportion of the money earmarked for this project were to be diverted towards the production of a management plan for CG and its future maintenance, as well as making improvements to the western approach to the park the future of CG would be assured.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
Bayham Abbey	Kent	E17/1441	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of tennis court and outbuilding. Bayham House, Bayham Abbey, Lamberhurst, Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN3 8BG. SPORT/LEISURE,</p>	<p><b>TGT/CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. The GT has liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust and we would be grateful if you could please</p>



				MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<p>take our joint comments into consideration when considering this application.</p> <p>We were disappointed to note that Heritage Statement by Martyn Patties makes no mention whatsoever of the fact that Bayham Park is a Grade II RPG. It was created in the early C19 by the celebrated landscape gardener Humphry Repton with proposals contained in a Red Book of 1800. It seems especially ironic that this fact has been completely omitted from all the documentation accompanying this application, since 2018 is the bi-centenary of his death and numerous Repton events are being held around the country. The Kent Gardens Trust is currently researching Bayham for inclusion in a book on Repton's work within Kent. The omission of this crucial detail suggests a total failure to understand the significance of the heritage asset. We concur with all the Conservation Officer, Ms Maltby's comments as well as those of the Landscape and Biodiversity Officer, and are especially concerned that the tennis court would appear in the main public approach to the house. Whilst the GT/KGT appreciates that sites in divided ownership, as at Bayham, add another level of complexity, there is nothing to indicate that other less sensitive sites within the landscape have been considered. The documentation also fails to mention whether floodlighting is proposed which would introduce a further unwelcome element. Any additional planting to screen off the tennis court, would we suggest, introduce an alien, unsympathetic element into the open parkland setting within the core of the RPG, thereby detracting from its significance and making Repton's input far harder to understand in the future.</p> <p>We therefore OBJECT to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
Uffington Road, Stamford	Lincolnshire	E17/1402	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Residential development of 41 dwellings and associated works. Uffington Road, Stamford PE9 2HA. RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2018</b></p> <p>On behalf of Lincolnshire Gardens Trust, from desk-top survey, this development does not appear to damage any views from historic landscape/garden assets Burghley Park and Uffington Park"</p> <p>Steffie Shields</p>

Scale House	North Yorkshire	E17/1382	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for restoration of listed gate piers, installation of new wrought iron gates and railings and resurfacing of gateway entrance. Scale House, Rylstone. ACCESS/GATES	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.02.2018</b></p> <p>Full planning permission for restoration of listed gate piers, installation of new wrought iron gates and railings and resurfacing of gateway entrance</p> <p>Thank you for notifying the Yorkshire Gardens Trust regarding this application.</p> <p>Scale House is a Grade II listed house with designed gardens/grounds of considerable interest. They have evolved from a simple late 17C courtyard design, through a late 19C picturesque woodland and walled garden to a mid 20C (1939 plan) formal compartmentalised series of gardens mainly to the south and south east with Arts and Crafts influences. The house is accessed by a long driveway from the B6265 where the earlier fine entrance gates and piers were possibly relocated during the nineteenth century following the construction of the new turnpike road in 1853 to the west of the house. During recent years the wrought iron entrance gates have been lost, the piers reduced in height losing their decorative elements and the gateway entrance altered with stone-edging.</p> <p>This is a well-documented application and we support the restoration of the listed gate piers, the sympathetic installation of new wrought iron gates and railings and the resurfacing of the gateway entrance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Chairman cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Hawkstone	Shrop shire	E17/1145	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition and rebuilding of part of clubhouse and golf shop and addition of minor extensions. Hawkstone Park Hotel, Weston Under Redcastle, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY4 5UY. GOLF	<p><b>TGT CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application. Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding. We have consulted with our colleagues in the Shropshire Gardens Trust and we hope that it is not too late for us to submit the following comments.</p> <p>We appreciate the need for the Hawkstone Golf Club to update its premises to improve the accessibility and usability of the Club House as well as its energy efficiency. Upon visiting the site, there is very little</p>

					<p>sense in this part of the landscape that you are in an historic landscape, let alone one with a Grade I designation. Out of the approximately 1658 gardens listed in England, only 145 are Grade I, which highlights the extreme care which must be taken when undertaking any work in a site of this rarity and importance. The buildings in the general Club House area have been added to and altered over the years, and the site is visually poor. The proposed building is certainly more eye-catching, but stylistically the GT/SGT feel is not in any way sympathetic to a Picturesque designed landscape. The zinc cladding is not recessive and does not blend into a rural area. We would prefer some alternative form of surface cladding that minimizes the Club House's impact upon the landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E17/1066	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration of 114 Acres of Grade II listed Park and Garden including Marston Pond, Thickthorn Wood, Orrery Wood, the Keeper's Cottage and Boat House with enabling development to include 20 Lodges, Hub and Reception buildings. Change of land use from agricultural to Hotel, Leisure and Recreation. Marston Pond, Thickthorn Wood And Horley Wood, Tuckmarsh Lane, Marston Bigot BA11 5BY. HYBRID</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 15th February and please accept my apologies for the delay in responding. I appreciate you taking the time to respond in detail to the Garden Trust's letter of objection to the proposed scheme at Marston.</p> <p>I am afraid that for whatever reason I never received your email of 18th November and would certainly have responded had I seen it. I share your frustration. The Gardens Trust works extremely closely with county gardens trusts around England. I am the sole Conservation Officer for our organisation and cover the whole of England in two days a week. Therefore much as I would love to be able to make site visits I simply do not have the capacity to do so. In many instances CGTs respond to applications within their own area, but for more contentious cases, I liaise very closely with them and other national amenity societies before making responses. However, please rest assured that when I am considering individual applications I spend however long it requires reading the documentation online and speaking to other conservation professionals. In the case of Marston I have had extensive conversations the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT), with Kim Auston at HE, the Georgian Group and email correspondence with SAVE.</p>

					<p>As you are no doubt aware, the GT is the statutory consultee for all grades of historic designed landscapes, whereas HE only gets involved with Grade II* and Grade I RPGs. Kim Auston is their landscape architect for the SW but in this case the response was devolved from him to Hugh Beamish, an Assistant Inspector of Ancient Monuments (an archaeologist) rather than a landscape expert, and whose speciality is therefore not the historic parkland. It does happen from time to time that HE and the GT have differing opinions and that is to be expected, as we have different priorities when considering the effects of planning applications. The GT concentrates exclusively upon the effect on a landscape and its setting by any proposed development.</p> <p>With regard to your comment that “We do not accept that these are ‘bad’ or detrimental additions to this designed landscape. We believe they will enhance and add to this designed landscape and make it more accessible to people. These additions are designed to be beautiful 21st century contributions to this designed landscape.... New buildings and structures have always been added to historic park and gardens over the centuries and many must have been considered very ‘alien’ at the time but are now listed.” It is true that over the centuries landscapes have often had new structures introduced, but it seems unlikely that these wooden chalets will ever be candidates for future listing. The question of beauty is of course subjective and our view is that timber lodges/chalets erected within the woodland close to the centre of the RPG are simply not beautiful nor will they enhance the designed landscape. Any unforeseen or poorly mitigated consequences of development – such as night-time light spillage for example – will undeniably affect a large part of the park in a way that a peripheral development might not. I am sure you will understand the Trust’s concern regarding the enabling development given that the financial details will be a requirement of the S106 which will be a separate planning matter unavailable to the scrutiny of the Trusts. Given the specialist nature of the development this is something that the local authority does not necessarily have the expertise or experience to deal with and therefore if this scheme is granted, very close attention will need to be paid to design detail and to mitigation and that this is robustly secured by means of a S106 agreement.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Despite your assertion that this development is to 'financially sustain and manage an enterprise designed to allow people to stay in and enjoy this landscape' there is undoubtedly a commercial element implicit in this statement. With your experience of Stewardship you will be aware of what can be covered by this scheme, and if a charitable trust were formed and greater public access conceded the HLF might be a further source of funding. Apart from the significance of the park covered within the Heritage statement, it is the rural, pastoral nature and atmosphere of the park which will be changed irrevocably if holiday chalets are introduced to the woodland in this central sensitive core. The GT is pleased to note that the scrub growth on the northern shore of the Pond is to be removed, reinstating the seminal C19 views. Please note however, that the trees are still shown on your Masterplan. We agree with you that it is the views from Marston House which are critical in any restoration scheme, but it is hardly surprising if the Sandersons object to the vegetation clearance, as they will be extremely nervous that the chalets will be visible. If you look at the OS map of 1887 you can see that the clump of trees on the rising ground between the house and the lake have been cleared in the middle to provide a sightline to the lake between clumps annotated 209 and 210. Therefore it is the views from around the house which should be of primary concern when siting the lodges and mitigation planting. The GT is pleased to note that you are prepared to move any chalets further into Thickthorn Wood should it prove that they can be seen from Marston House, which as it sits on high ground to the north, commands views of a great deal of the parkland below. However, once planning permission is given it is unlikely that such an undertaking would be forthcoming given the need for a re-submission of the application. We accept that the Reception Building will not be visible as it is concealed by its location below the lake dam and also a turn in the lake. I have spoken to the SGT regarding your letter and they accept that their response was late but they had a change of personnel dealing with the planning applications and were not able to make their assessment in as timely a manner as is usual. The person now dealing with their planning responses is a landscape architect with over 25 years of experience both commercially and for a planning authority.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The Chairman of the SGT's comments regarding the level of development from the original brochure, relate to the increase in size of the Hub and Reception buildings which are now presented in the planning application. The Hub building, which is in direct line of the view from the house, especially with the lakeside trees now removed, has a relatively large footprint and is assessed to have a detrimental visual impact on the setting of the lake and potentially more widely. The GT is only too aware that any site in divided ownership faces increasing difficulties in addition to those already apparent at Marsden. Therefore a Conservation Management Plan should if at all possible try to include the other owners so that entire site can be managed along the same lines. It is to be commended that your clients are keen to enhance the parkland and I accept that the dereliction is not of their making. The GT is encouraged to hear that your clients are working on an integrated approach to the historic landscape with the Sandersons and the owners of the Lighthouse and we hope that a solution can be found which is acceptable to all.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
Woburn Farm	Surrey	E17/1329	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Details Pursuant to Discharge of Condition 9 (Conservation &amp; Landscape Management Plan) of Planning Approval RU.16/1262 (Demolition of existing sports hall and ancillary buildings (G block, Changing block, Woburn gym, shed) to allow for the erection of a new three storey building (Activity Centre) for the following: Ground floor - double height main hall for flexible use including general school use, examination hall, full indoor</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2018</b> (Amended Conservation &amp; Landscape Management Plan)</p> <p>Thank you for seeking comment on the Revised Conservation &amp; Landscape Management Plan.</p> <p>I have picked up a couple of revisions of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 9 - the Octagon building is now noted but the reference to illustrations contains an error. The Ruin at page 47 of the source article is a different structure designed as an ornamental ruin to the west of the house. It was lost in the 19th century.</li> </ul> <p>While the College has no plans to adversely affect the remaining foundations of the Octagon it would be more positive in terms of the Management</p> <p>Plan to clear and reveal the brick outline. This could help to indicate the alignment of the Long Walk illustrated at page 54 of the source.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 31 - Conclusions - The College's stated willingness to engage</li> </ul>

				<p>hockey pitch, 6 no. badminton courts, 2 no. volleyball courts, a basketball court, a netball court, 3 no. football five a site pitches, indoor cricket pitch and 4 indoor practice nets, spectator area, 6 changing rooms, storage, reception area; first floor - fitness suite/gymnasium, dance studio, function space and viewing area; second floor - general teaching space, servery, and terrace overlooking athletics track, with associated alterations to internal access arrangements, 6 parking spaces, and landscape works, with temporary construction access from Woburn Hill.) St Georges College, Weybridge Road, ADDLESTONE KT15 2QS. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>with Surrey GT and others is very much welcomed. Earlier concerns about the Grotto and watercourse re-creation remain, but can be dealt with as detailed proposals are prepared.</p> <p>Best Wishes Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Claremont	Surrey	E17/1395	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 2013/4029 (re-development of school)) for refurbishment, alterations and extensions to the Stable Court Area and the Music Pavilion, alterations to openings of Courtyard Walls, changes to landscaping of Courtyard, Quad and Walled Garden, part conversion of Coach House to care centre and changes to car parking in Stable Court.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2018</b></p> <p>I had been notified direct about these revised proposals and commented that mostly building work within the tightly constrained school's built campus with no impact on P &amp; G interests. However, the vaguely described, revised materials for an approved Music Pavilion in corner of Walled Garden needed to be to satisfaction of the planning authority.</p> <p>Best wishes Don Josey</p>

				Claremont Fan Court School, Claremont Drive, Esher, Surrey KT10 9LY. EDUCATION	
Albury Park	Surrey	E17/1493	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retention of the Albury wellsite and access track for the production of gas and electricity including: temporary flaring to re-establish gas flow, the installation of production plant and network entry facilities within the wellsite compound, the laying of an export pipeline beneath the access track and also site office, propane storage tanks, lighting, security cameras, gas powered generator, coolers, generator control room; and retention of a transformer unit, switch room, water tank, parking area and perimeter fencing all on some 1.51 hectares for a temporary period of 15 years with restoration to commercial forestry. Export of gas by underground pipeline and the use of gas in an on site generator. Albury Park Wellsite, Albury Park, East of New Road, Albury, Surrey.</p> <p>ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2018</b></p> <p>On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust there is no objection from the Historic Parks and Gardens point of view.</p> <p>It is noted and welcomed that the applicant is following the advice of the various County specialists in terms of the restoration tree mix (Planning Statement, 5.6 - Restoration).</p> <p>Don Josey</p>
West Dean, Goodwood House	West Sussex	E17/1396	II* I	<p>PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE - Replacement tower - NOTE - drawings submitted show that approved under previous consent SDNP/14/04505/FUL which has now expired - advice is sought to</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for notifying the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) of the above planning application. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust, (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has also brought this application to the SGT's attention. Representatives of SGT have reviewed the documentation submitted</p>



				<p>establish feasibility of shortened mast with increased capability for network sharing. Western Transmitting Station, Trundle Hill, Singleton, West Sussex. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>with this application. The Trust notes that the replacement tower is to be of a lower height than the existing tower - which may well have a welcome beneficial impact on the visual harm to the nearby West Dean and Goodwood Registered Parks. However if the new tower is of more bulky construction, the impact of this will need to be considered in any full planning application. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Graylingwell Hospital?	West Sussex	E17/1472	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Pipe Line Installation of 9.92km wastewater pipeline and associated infrastructure including air vents, air valves, washout chambers, compounds and haul routes. The pipeline starting point is south of Salthill Land and east of New Bridge Farm, Chichester, at Easting 484342.6. The end point of the pipeline is at Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works, Tangmere at Easting 491698.4. DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2018</b> Thank you for notifying the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) of the above planning application. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust, (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has also brought this application to the SGT's attention. Representatives of SGT have reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. On this occasion the Trust has no substantial objection. However we note the proposals include the installation of a 4m Air Valve Chamber stack in the SE corner of Graylingwell Park. While this area looked unsightly in June 2016, it has the potential to be an attractive area of parkland when the developers have cleared the site and a 4m stack would detract from that. Careful consideration should be given to the siting of this stack and the colour it is painted - green like the nearby lamp posts may be more sympathetic than the proposed silk grey colour. Screening with trees and shrubs would also help. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
New Bridge Farm, Chichester	West Sussex	E17/1473	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Pumping Station 01 Installation of pumping station comprising above and below ground plant including kiosks, draw pit and valve chamber, hardstanding, and fencing. Land to the south of</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2018</b> As above</p>

				Salthill Lane, north of Clay Lane and to the east of New Bridge Farm, on land designated as the West of Chichester Strategic Development Location. DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF	
Old Place House, Chichester	West Sussex	E17/1474	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Pumping Station 02 Installation of pumping station comprising above and below ground plant including kiosks, draw pit and valve chamber, hardstanding, and fencing. Land to the west of Old Place Lane and Old Place House and east of the River Lavant, near Madgwick lane, Chichester. FLOOD RELIEF/DRAINAGE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2018</b> As above
Gamecock Terrace, Tangmere	West Sussex	E17/1475	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Pumping Station 03 Installation of pumping station comprising above and below ground plant including kiosks, draw pit and valve chamber, hardstanding, and fencing. Land to the south of Gamecock Terrace, south of Tangmere Village. DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2018</b> As above
Parlington	West Yorkshire	E16/1142	N	GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE Concerns expressed by CGT re Leeds CC consideration as part of revised Site Allocation Plan, 5000 homes plus new roads. Parlington, Aberford, Leeds.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2018 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS No. 64 3.6.7 Policy HG2 MX2-39 Parlington Estate No. 66 Site MX2-39 No. 68 3.6.9 BL1-42 MX2-39 Parlington Estate Parlington Estate is a Registered Historic Park+Garden, Grade II. There are a number of listed buildings within that registered designed landscape, Grade II* and Grade I. There are also a number of other non-designated structures currently being assessed by HE for listing.

					<p>Whether or not these are listed, they are heritage assets closely associated with the historic landscape.</p> <p>The adoption of the term Broad Locations for Growth for Green Belt and the change in site boundary and housing numbers for Phase 1 do not alter in any way the fact that the development would result in substantial harm to the character and appreciation of the Grade II landscape and the setting of the associated listed structures. The planned development is wholly contrary to national policy guidance.</p> <p>Susan Kellerman</p>
Tottenham House and Savernake Forest	Wiltshire	E17/1324	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of Use of Tottenham House to Residential (C3 use) from Education Use (C2 Residential Institution), Ancillary Leisure Development, Ancillary Residential Accommodation and Associated Landscape Works. Tottenham House &amp; Estate, Grand Avenue, Savernake, Marlborough, Wiltshire SN8 3BE. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2018</b></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 &amp; Gardens, as per the above application.</p> <p>The Tottenham estate is included on HE's Register at Grade II*. Over the course of its long history and associations with many influential people, during the C18 Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (CB), arguably the greatest English landscape gardener in the English style, played a crucial role in its development. Although the current application site is now just over 1000 acres, substantially less than the original 9000 acres, Tottenham is one of the largest sites Brown worked on. Brown's work here is well documented and, in as much as we know of what was implemented, largely complete. It is reasonable to suggest that, despite the current state of dilapidation and neglect, Tottenham remains within the top 20 of his surviving landscapes. Any development within such a very sensitive site needs to be extremely carefully considered, and the GT has very much appreciated being involved in collaborative pre-application discussions with Balston Agius (BA).</p> <p>Due to the dereliction of most of the buildings and as a result of many years of little management or attention, the situation at Tottenham is desperate and the cost of remedial work prohibitive. In order for this important landscape and associated buildings not to deteriorate further, a solution that will not fatally compromise the designed historic landscape whilst providing a sustainable long-term solution is essential. We were initially concerned at the inclusion of family houses within the estate, but during protracted discussions with BA and also discussions</p>

					<p>with HE, the GT are satisfied that the current positioning and access arrangements succeed in this delicate balancing exercise. The houses at Lower Barn are on approximately the same footprint as earlier estate buildings, which have been there since the C18, and are also not visible from the house or its immediate surroundings. The family houses at Wolf Hall are outside the Registered boundary and will be completely screened from the main house due to topography and planting.</p> <p>The inclusion of a totally new water feature is more controversial with differing opinions as to the suitability of new lakes at all, as well as how they should lie within the landscape. The GT has consulted Brown experts and considered why Brown did not put a lake at Tottenham. In the archive of Brown instructions re Tottenham there are references to 'the canal' and water supply in the Upper Pond and the 'Leak in the Lower Canal' and mention of water collection from Dairy or Durley Coppice (ie Durley Woods A11 and Dairy House Wood A10 on the 1716 Thomas Price map). This is in exactly the same area as Ram Alley Ponds. Bearing in mind the scale of the landscape Brown was working in, and in line with recent research into Brown's holistic working methods, particularly with regard to water-engineering, the 'bigger picture' needs to be considered. If the canal Brown was talking about was a canalized section between mills at Crofton and if the afore-mentioned leak problems were there, then his advising on water engine repair and planting up 'a serpentine in the hollow beyond' makes sense. Certainly, a reservoir below Crofton, Wilton Water today (or Wide Waters), was later created to supply the Kennet &amp; Avon Canal with which Brudenell-Bruce was involved. This might explain why no lake was ever created nearer the house, as the main water feature would have been the more industrially significant and cost-effective canal below with water supplied by the serpentine reservoir beyond.</p> <p>In subsequent years, the wider canal landscape below Tottenham has changed radically, especially with the arrival of the railways and the unregistered Crofton area no longer belonging to the Park. Therefore, on balance, the GT believes that BA's proposal for new lakes in the East Park would seem to be in the recognizable spirit of natural landscape design. To a purist they may be considered pastiche, but done well, and on a big enough scale, this new water would unite all the 21st century</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>changes and new planting, and enhance the setting in line with Brown's all-embracing philosophy of improvement for the 'whole' estate. Having justified the concept of a new water body within the park, the GT had many discussions with Marie Louise Agius of BA, who took on board our comments and refined their vision for the lakes several times. The current outlines draw upon research into Brown's lake shapes by Hal Moggridge, past President of the Landscape Institute, and former principal of Colvin &amp; Moggridge, the oldest surviving British landscape practice. Our slight caveat is the positioning of the island, which ideally we would prefer nearer the head of the northern lake, closer to the boathouse, as at Wimpole for example. Should there be continued uncertainty regarding the lakes we would urge that the detail of the lakes should be conditioned, allowing further discussions without holding up the planning permission.</p> <p>The GT feels that this new vision for Tottenham maintains the spirit and sense of place. Crucially the West and East Parks will each have very different 'feel', maintaining the variety of landscape Brown intended, whilst adding a 21st century layer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The GardenS Trust</p> <p>Bruce Tunnel, named after the 1st Earl of Ailesbury, Thomas Brudenell-Bruce, is the Kennet and Avon Canal's only Tunnel, a little way from Crofton Toplock. It was constructed as the Earl refused to permit a deep cut to be made for the canal through his land and opened in 1809</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--