



### CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JUNE 2018

The GT conservation team received 141 new cases in England and one case in Wales during June, 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, 41 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and 10 by CGTs in response to planning applications included in the weekly lists.

Site	County	GT Ref	Reg Grade	Proposal	Written Response
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Kings Weston	Avon	E18/0217	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of site to store 20 Self Storage units (B8 use class). Karakal, Penpole Lane, Bristol BS11 0EA. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2018</b> Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust objects to this proposal because it would cause serious harm to the designated heritage assets of Kings Weston, contrary to national and local planning policies. No public benefits from the development would outweigh this major harm. The Avon Gardens Trust, formed in 1987, is part of The Gardens Trust which is the statutory consultee for proposals affecting sites on Historic England's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. One of its roles is to help safeguard the heritage of historic designed landscapes within the former County of Avon by advising local planning authorities on statutory and non-statutory parks, gardens and designed landscapes of importance. From its inception the Trust has been interested and concerned about the historic landscape of Kings Weston. The Trust's first article about Kings Weston was used by Historic England as a reference in their Register entry for the Park. Planning History Contained within the red-edged application site and excluded from it is

				<p>a former water reservoir building. In 1986 permission was granted for its conversion to “light storage use” with three parking spaces adjoining to the east having a right of access to Penpole Lane. This building is in a different ownership to the application site and is used by Karakal for the storage of racket sports equipment.</p> <p>In 1987 English Heritage designated a small area of parkland around Kings Weston House as a Grade II Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>A single storey, football changing room/social club known as Fairways was located between the Karakal building and Penpole Lane. In 1992 outline permission was given for its replacement on the same site by a single storey public house. The Fairways building was then demolished. Subsequently English Heritage extended the boundary of the Kings Weston Park to include the whole parkland associated with Kings Weston, bringing the application site within the registered historic landscape.</p> <p>In 1994 the Government published Planning Policy Guidance 15 which advised local authorities to “protect registered parks and gardens in preparing development plans and in determining planning applications”.</p> <p>In 1997 the Council adopted the Bristol Local Plan which accorded with this Government advice by containing</p> <p>Policy NE9 “Historic parks and gardens and other designed landscapes of national and local importance defined on the Proposals Map and described in the Appendix will be protected. Development which would adversely affect the character or appearance of historic landscapes, and in the case of nationally important sites, their settings will not be permitted.” and</p> <p>Policy NE10 “...Priority will be given to pursuing restoration of the following historic landscapes (iii) Kingsweston House grounds”</p> <p>In view of these changed material considerations, in 1997 the Council refused the renewal of the outline permission for the public house due to its harmful effect on the Grade II registered Kings Weston House Park, on the setting of the Grade I listed Kings Weston House and on the Kings Weston and Trym Valley Conservation Area.</p> <p>An appeal against this decision was dismissed in 1998, the Inspector</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>concluding that:</p> <p>"4. The buildings on the site have been demolished.....</p> <p>5. In <i>Iddendum v SSE</i> [1972]WCR 1433 it was held that a use cannot survive if the buildings necessary to sustain it are removed. It follows that any use rights, associated with the former public house, have been lost in planning terms.</p> <p>11. The appeal site is in a prominent position near to Shirehampton Road. The proposed development would introduce buildings and commercial activity into the heart of the registered Kingsweston Park. In my view the development would seriously intrude into, and harm, the spacious open parkland appearance and natural landscape character of Kingsweston Park contrary to Policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan and national policy advice in paragraph 2.24 of PPG15. It would also harm the setting of Kingsweston House, a Grade I listed building, insofar as Kingsweston Park provides a fine and appropriate setting for the House, contrary to the aims of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>12. I reach these conclusions notwithstanding the presence of nearby buildings to which you refer, in particular the converted reservoir building (contained by the appeal site) and the two-storey pavilion to the west. These buildings detract from the appearance and character of Kingsweston Park. Nevertheless the proposed development would considerably add to the harm caused by built development even though it would screen these buildings to some extent. Moreover it would run counter to Policy NE10 of the adopted Local Plan under which the Council would well bring forward proposals for the removal of existing inappropriate buildings in "Kingsweston House Grounds", such as the existing buildings referred to above.</p> <p>13. The Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area comprises the prominent ridge of land linking the villages of Shirehampton and Henbury, and contains the former estates of Kingsweston House and Blaise Castle House. Almost all the registered Kingsweston Park falls within the Conservation Area. Kingsweston Park makes a significant contribution to the fine quality of the landscape in the Conservation Area. Harming the character and appearance of Kingsweston Park would seriously harm the character and appearance of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Conservation Area contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and Policy B13 of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>14. In summary the proposed development is contrary to policy in the development plan, contrary to the requirements of section 72(1), and contrary to national policy advice...</p> <p>15. There have been significant changes in material circumstances since the outline planning permission was granted in 1992. These changes fully justify a counter decision on this occasion.</p> <p>16. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss your client's appeal."</p> <p>In 2010, 2013 and 2014 applications were submitted for Use Class B1 and B8 enterprise units on the application site to the side and rear of the Karakal building. The last application was for 9,000 sq ft of floorspace.</p> <p>Objections were made by English Heritage, the Garden History Society, the Georgian Croup, the National Trust, the Council's Conservation Advisory Panel, the Kings Weston Action Group, the Avon Gardens Trust, the Oasis Academy, the Shirehampton Cricket Club, local Councillors and members of the public.</p> <p>The Council refused all these applications, for reasons including:</p> <p>"2. The proposed development, by reason of the combination of its location, scale, character, and nature of use, would be detrimental to the function, historic interest and visual amenity of the Grade II registered park of the Kings Weston House Estate, the setting of the Grade I listed Kings Weston House and the Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Local Plan Core Strategy (June 2011), and Policies DM26, DM27, DM29 and DM31 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014)."</p> <p>In 2011 the Kings Weston Action Group was formed to promote the conservation and enhancement of the historic, registered Kings Weston Park <a href="http://www.kwag.org.uk">www.kwag.org.uk</a> The Action Group has worked closely with English Heritage (now Historic England), and the Council and the National Trust as majority landowners of the Park, tirelessly championing the Park, undertaking physical restoration work, making</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>new discoveries through their research, and holding exhibitions, tours and talks. As a result, the interest in the history of the Park and support for the future restoration of its key features is now huge.</p> <p>In 2014 the Action Group carried out the first phase of the restoration of the Great Avenue of lime trees shown on an engraving by Jan Kip circa 1710 and the estate map of 1720. The map shows the extent of the Great Avenue from the front of the Kings Weston House through to meet the top of Park Hill, Shirehampton. The Avenue passed through 'The Circle' from where other paths radiated out into the landscape. Some of the original Great Avenue planting remains along the carriage drive leading to King Weston House. The Group restored the corresponding arm of avenue trees, planting 15 lime trees, and the intention is to extend this avenue south west along its original alignment to the top of Park Hill.</p> <p>In 2014 the Council adopted the Kings Weston Estate Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plan, which officers had researched and drawn up in consultation with all stakeholders. The Preface says:</p> <p>"For the communities of Avonmouth, Shirehampton, Sea Mills, Lawrence Weston and Henbury, Kings Weston is a much loved local green space. For the wider city, the estate represents a major heritage and green infrastructure asset supporting Bristol's credentials as European Green Capital 2015. With community support and partnership there are rich opportunities to make good past problems, to deliver sustainable heritage uses, promote healthy lifestyles and support lifelong learning. The Kings Weston Conservation Management Plan describes the history of the estate and how it has evolved. It sets out the ways in which the estate is valued, and provides a framework for conserving and enhancing those values. It offers an ambitious and clear set of conservation recommendations for the future care, management and promotion of the historic assets. We ask that landowners, tenants, developers and development control committee members take this conservation management plan into account when considering future changes in and around the Kings Weston estate."</p> <p>In 2016 the Shirehampton War Memorial on the opposite side of Penpole Lane was designated as a Grade II listed building. The</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>application site is within the setting area of the war memorial. In 2017 an application was submitted for the change of use of the site to Use Class B8 "Storage or distribution". A plan showed 77 shipping containers in three rows to the side of the Karakal building, and two rows to the rear, 2.6 m high and clad with larch timber boards. This was refused for the reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposed storage containers would be of a poor quality design, and would dominate the site - interrupting views into and out of the Kings Weston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, views of the Grade II listed War Memorial, and towards the Registered Park and Garden to the rear. As a consequence, the containers would result in substantial harm to the aforementioned heritage assets with no commensurate public benefit that would outweigh this harm. In addition, the containers would offer a poor response to the site which would fail to respond to (and to incorporate) existing land forms, green infrastructure assets and historic assets and features (including archaeology). The proposal is therefore contrary to the The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; the NPPF, policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Core Strategy 2011; and policies DM26 and DM31 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</p> <p>2. The proposal would introduce structures and activity which would impact directly on trees, and areas protected for their nature importance, with no supporting survey and with no proposed mitigation, and which has not been informed by the correct surveys required by National and Local Plan policy. It is therefore contrary to the NPPF, policy BCS9 of the Core Strategy 2011, and policies DM17 and DM19 of Site Allocations and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Development Management Policies 2014.</p> <p>3. The proposal would result in increased transport movements on the site and its impacts have not been properly and fully explored within a Transport Statement. Essentially, the application has failed to provide key information on baseline travel data, multi-modal trip generation, an assessment on the impact on junctions, and robust visibility splays. The proposal would therefore negatively affect the safe operation of the highway, and as a result, would fail to comply with the NPPF, policy BCS10 of the Core Strategy 2011 and policy DM23 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014.</p> <p>In April 2018 all vegetation was removed from the land to the side and rear of the Karakal warehouse (land which is designated as a Wildlife Corridor in the Bristol Local Plan), and without planning permission the ground surface was raised by importing rubble and gravel to form a new and level hard surface. This material infilled the Georgian ha-ha running along the north and across the property boundary which was defined by an iron railing running along its bottom. The new hard surface extends over the rooting area and up to the trunks of some remaining trees threatening their future survival unless it is removed. Most of the trees and saplings and all the undergrowth along the east and north margins of the land have been felled and cleared making the application site highly visible from the parkland, whereas previously it was well-screened.</p> <p>A security fence has been erected along part of the north boundary and a portacabin brought onto the land.</p> <p>These works are in preparation for the proposed use of this part of the application site by YardArts, a performing arts and circus organisation which intends to lease the land for a 'village' with a 10m performance tent for shows, 20 caravans and trucks for residential and workshop use, a café and a communal/ social area. Permission has not yet been sought for this proposal.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Designated Heritage Assets</p> <p>1. The Grade II registered, Kings Weston House Park, a historic landscape of national importance described by Historic England as “A mid to late C18 park, laid out with advice from Lancelot Brown, containing the remains of a formal layout dating from Sir John Vanbrugh’s early C18 redevelopment of an earlier site”. The Park is the designed setting of the Sir John Vanbrugh-designed Grade I listed House. It contains three other buildings designed by Sir John Vanbrugh which are also Grade I listed (the Loggia, Brewhouse and Echo), two Grade II* listed buildings designed by Robert Mylne (the Stables, and the two lodges, pool and walled garden) and fourteen Grade II listed buildings (eg the five Lodges to the Park and the ice house). Apart from the application site and the Karakal building which are in private ownership, the 220 acres of the Park are owned either by the Council or (south of Shirehampton Road) the National Trust, and are accessible to the public either as a public park or by using public footpaths.</p> <p>2. The Grade I Listed Kings Weston House, designed by Sir John Vanbrugh for Edward Southwell and built in 1712-19. Grade I Listed Buildings are of “exceptional interest, sometimes considered to be internationally important. Just 2.5% of Listed Buildings are Grade I” (Historic England). The House is accessible to the public through its use for corporate and private events, and as a café.</p> <p>3. The Grade II Listed Shirehampton War Memorial. Historic England’s reasons for its designation were :</p> <p>“* Historic interest: as an eloquent witness to the tragic impacts of world events on this community, and the sacrifices it has made during the First World War; * Architectural interest: a well-crafted cross design in dressed stone to the design of Ernest Newton; * Intactness: the structure is largely unaltered; * Group value: it provides an additional feature of note within the Kingsweston Estate (Registered at Grade II) dating from the ownership of the philanthropist Philip Napier Miles.”</p> <p>History : The war memorial to the men of Shirehampton Parish who died in the First World War was designed by Ernest Newton CBE RA FRIBA and constructed on land given to the parish by Philip Napier Miles of Kings Weston House. The house served as a military hospital during the First World</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>War. The memorial was unveiled by Brigadier-General C. G. Bruce CMG DSO on 4 September 1921 and dedicated by the Archdeacon of Bristol.”</p> <p>4. The Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area, covers the historic registered Parks of the Kings Weston and Blaise Castle Houses and provides an area of quasi-rural character within the urban area of Bristol.</p> <p>Current application</p> <p>Permission is sought for the change of use of the red-edged application site to Use Class B8 “Storage or distribution”. This use class includes open air storage eg of vehicles and materials.</p> <p>It is proposed to site 20 shipping containers for self storage on that part of the application site between the Karakal warehouse and Penpole Lane where in 1998 the Inspector refused to grant permission for the single storey public house. The remaining part of the site would be used for customer car parking.</p> <p>The containers would be 20 ft long and 2.6 m high, clad with timber and with a metal roof. The self storage business would be arranged remotely with no staff on site. No restricted opening hours are proposed. It is said that the permitted development, 2m high perimeter fence which has been installed at the rear of the site would be extended to the gated entrances and road frontage. A 10ft high gate is shown and a CCTV pole would be put on the corner of the warehouse. As a public benefit it is proposed to give a 2m strip of land to the Council for a pavement alongside the Lane.</p> <p>National Policies</p> <p>Paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework says: “In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary...”</p> <p>No mention is made in the Heritage Statement of the listed Shirehampton War Memorial and the effect of the proposal on its</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>setting and its significance.</p> <p>Paragraphs 132 and 133 say that  “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.”</p> <p>“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss...”</p> <p>No such “clear and convincing justification” for the proposed storage use has been made nor would any “substantial public benefits” result.</p> <p>Local Policies</p> <p>The Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy 2011:  Policy BCS22 Conservation and the Historic Environment  “Development proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including: Historic Parks and Gardens both nationally and locally listed”</p> <p>The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 :  Policy DM31: Heritage Assets  “Development that has an impact upon a heritage asset will be expected to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the asset or its setting. Registered Historic Parks and Gardens: Development will be expected to have no adverse impact on the design, character, appearance or settings of registered historic parks and gardens and to safeguard those features which form an integral part of their character and appearance.” The Policies Map shows the application site as being in the ‘Registered Parks and Gardens’ boundary of Kings Weston.</p> <p>Policy DM17: Trees  “All new development should integrate important existing trees. Development which would result in the loss of Ancient Woodland, Aged</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>trees or Veteran trees will not be permitted”</p> <p>The Kings Weston Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plan 2014 (p 86) :</p> <p>“The privately owned Karakal warehouse occupies unused land between Shirehampton Park and the Twyford Cricket Club. The warehouse is a single storey, utilitarian business unit, with associated informal car parking and a large subsoil heap stockpiled at the rear of the warehouse. The informal car parking lies within the line of the Great Avenue that extended from Kings Weston House.”</p> <p>Policies for the Penpole Lane part of The Little Park (p 124) :</p> <p>“Strengths: Hedgerows and hedgerow trees reinforce a rural landscape character. Sense of enclosure offered by surrounding trees structure</p> <p>Weaknesses: Presence of Karakal industrial units/uses within the designated historic landscape and close to the historic avenue.</p> <p>Opportunities: Potential to relocate the Karakal warehouse off site and to reintegrate the land within the designed historic landscape</p> <p>Vulnerability: Future re-development, expansion and/or intensification of the sports ground and industrial sites</p> <p>General Conservation Management Policies:</p> <p>a Maintain the semi-rural character of Penpole Lane</p> <p>b Consider reintegration of the Karakal warehouse area within the historic landscape should the opportunity arise through relocation of the business off site and return of the land to public open space</p> <p>c Prevent further visual and physical impact of built features on the designed historic landscape, particularly the principal axis from The Circle</p> <p>Specific policy for site LP7 Karakal warehouse: Conserve and maintain Penpole Lane hedgerow and trees. Consider reintegration of the Karakal site within the historic landscape should the opportunity arise”</p> <p>Assessment of Proposal</p> <p>The Karakal converted reservoir building pre-dates the designation of the Historic Park in 1987. However, it is a low key warehouse use operational only in the week; at weekends and during the evenings (when the public most uses the parkland) no activity takes place. It has no signs or lighting and is mainly faced with green cladding.</p> <p>The applicants say that “On the east side the belt of trees obscure the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>view of the existing building from the parkland” and that the view from the east has a “well-established bank of screening trees” making the proposal difficult to see. That was the case, but following the recent removal of the boundary trees, saplings and undergrowth the whole application site is plainly visible from the Park.</p> <p>The proposed customer car parking and the security fence around the site up to the gate on Penpole Lane would be seen from both the parkland and the Lane, harming views of the landscape of the Park. Whilst there are hedges which would help to screen the shipping containers, there is no guarantee that they would not be removed in future, making the site open to view from the Lane.</p> <p>The self storage business would operate 24 hours a day and seven days a week, and commercial signs and lighting would be likely to be needed. As a result this objectional commercial use would be most damaging to the heritage assets referred to above. In particular the peaceful, natural background and setting of the listed Shirehampton War Memorial would be disturbed and harmed by it.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that “The appeal site is in a prominent position near to Shirehampton Road.</p> <p>The proposed development would introduce buildings and commercial activity into the heart of the registered Kingsweston Park. In my view the development would seriously intrude into, and harm, the spacious open parkland appearance and natural landscape character of Kingsweston Park....It would also harm the setting of Kingsweston House, a Grade I listed building, insofar as Kingsweston Park provides a fine and appropriate setting for the House....” This would be the case for this proposal too.</p> <p>No Tree Survey has been submitted and the proposal would be likely to harm three prominent trees. The first Lime tree in the avenue on Penpole Lane would be affected by the footings of the security fence which would be dug close to its trunk and the second Lime tree in the avenue would be affected by the placing of the containers and contents over its rooting area. The Ash tree next to the Karakal building would also have containers placed on its rooting area. This would be contrary to BS 5837 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction and be likely to result in these trees’ decline and loss. This would</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>conflict with Policy DM17 and the CMP policy to “Conserve and maintain Penpole Lane ..trees”.</p> <p>The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies BCS22, DM31, and the CMP policies to “Maintain the semi-rural character of Penpole Lane” and “Prevent further visual and physical impact of built features on the designed historic landscape, particularly the principal axis from The Circle”</p> <p>The public benefit offered is giving a 2m strip of land for the Council to make a pavement. However there is no need for such a pavement as there is one on the opposite, south side of the Lane. Furthermore, the north side of the Lane has no pavement which contributes to the Lane’s semi-rural appearance. A pavement replacing the current verge would urbanise this section of the Lane and be contrary to the CMP policy to “Maintain the semi-rural character of Penpole Lane”. It would not be a public benefit but would cause harm.</p> <p>The Council’s CMP’s policy is to “Consider reintegration of the Karakal warehouse area within the historic landscape should the opportunity arise through relocation of the business off site and return of the land to public open space”. It is hoped that future funding may allow the Council to buy the whole site, demolish the warehouse and return the land to open parkland.</p> <p>However, if permission is given for the proposed Class B8 storage use, this restoration of the historic landscape will not be possible. It could also result in a new application being submitted for the redevelopment of the whole site as a more intensively used and visible warehousing estate which the Council would find difficult to refuse.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust considers the proposal would not conserve but cause serious harm to the nationally important, Kings Weston designated heritage assets, and would conflict with both the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council’s Policies particularly those of its Conservation Management Plan. We urge the Council to refuse planning permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely  Ros Delany (Dr)  Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Planning Inspectorate's letter dated 12.05.98 ref.T/APP/Z0016/A/97/289338</li> <li>2. Kings Weston Estate Historic Landscape Conservation Management Plan p 2 Preface p 7 Site Features, p 16 and 17 1712 : The Kip Engraving, p 28 and 29 The Halett survey 1720, p 86 The Little Park, p 124 Conservation Management Policies The Little Park and p 150 Appendix B: Gazetteer The Little Park.</li> </ol>
Rockwood House	Avon	E18/0231	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of three storey, 90no. bed nursing home with parking, landscaping and associated works. Land East Of Gravel Hill Road And North Of Rockwood House, Yate, South Gloucestershire BS37 7BW. MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.06.2018</b></p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance of Rockwood Park, Yate, which is contained within South Gloucestershire's local list of Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>We write to object to this application, which will result in significant harm to the locally registered historic park and garden.</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 Gardens Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to Avon Gardens Trust.</p> <p>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 <a href="http://www.thegardenstrust.org">www.thegardenstrust.org</a></p> <p>The significance of the site is that it forms the remains of a small country park and is of interest as the home of the author Dearman Birchall, as set out in the Gazetteer of Historic Parks and Gardens in Avon.</p> <p>The proposed development would be inappropriate in terms of its scale and massing and would result in the direct loss of a substantial part of the locally listed asset, and fragmentation of the remainder.</p> <p>The proposed development would conflict with the aims of Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy, which states 'ensure heritage assets are conserved, respected and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance' and Policy PSP17 of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan which states that 'Development proposals will be expected to: protect and, where appropriate, enhance the design, character, appearance</p>

					<p>and settings of historic parks, gardens or battlefields; and safeguard those features which contribute to their significance, character or appearance. ‘</p> <p>Consequently we object to the application, which would result in significant harm to the locally registered historic park and garden. We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Warmley House	Avon	E18/0261	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 8no hardstanding bases for caravans. Kingsway Park Tower Lane, Warmley, Bristol, South Gloucestershire BS30 8XW. CAMPING</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.06.2018</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 Avon Gardens Trust (AGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The registered gardens (Grade II) adjoining Warmley House (II*) lie within the core of the Warmley Conservation Area, which contains 9 listed buildings. Their historic setting has been increasingly compromised by a variety of modern developments adversely affecting the significance of the only remaining 18th century integrated industrial complex in the country to have encompassed a full range of industrial processes from the smelting of metal to the production of finished goods. Most of the original planting has been lost and Warmley has suffered from a subdivision of ownership. However it still retains a wealth of unusual features, many of which incorporate the use of recycled material from the industrial works such as clinker and slag blocks. The focal point of the garden was a large 13 acre lake (now dry) which doubled as a reservoir for the works watermills, in the middle of which still stands a gigantic statue of Neptune, now marooned on dry land next to a caravan park. Currently Warmley is on the EH ‘At Risk’ Register, and so any application which could potentially further threaten the site must be scrutinised extremely carefully to ensure that it does not cause more harm or encroach further into this fragile landscape. The main reasons for designating Warmley as a</p>

					<p>Conservation Area were to preserve and reinforce the historic character of the site, to enhance the links between the various buildings/features, and to minimise the impact of modern development. These objectives are not currently being met.</p> <p>The Heritage Assessment states (7.1) that “The impact level on the registered Warmley gardens ... is assigned as not significant, as the development site is presently outside of the publically accessible area of garden. Assuming that trees or high vegetation remains along the site's northern boundary the proposed development will not be visible from the gardens.” We would draw your attention to HE’s Setting of Heritage Assets, Part I – Settings &amp; Views, p2 which states : “The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. ... The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.” (our emphasis)</p> <p>The Heritage Assessment omits any mention of the adjacent Viewing Mound. Atkins’ 2007 CMP (61) states : ” To the south of the gardens is a feature that neatly encapsulates what the whole enterprise was about – the interrelationship between productivity and pleasure. The Mound is similar to the viewing mounds found in 16th and 17th century formal gardens, but a number are known in 18th century gardens as well ... To the north, one would have looked out over the walled gardens to the lake with Neptune and the Summerhouse beyond, perhaps glimpsing the coal mines in the distance, whilst to the south Champion’s industrious works belched smoke and fire to a continuous cacophony of batteries and steam engines. Nowhere else on the site is the juxtaposition between works and garden so pronounced.” The site of the proposed mobile homes extension plot is to the south, where the works/housing formerly stood. This area is also now important for an additional practical reason : it is the only access for vehicles to the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



				<p>Gardens and therefore crucial for their ongoing maintenance. We note that this point has been picked up in the Conservation Officer Mr Ian Gething's report, "an arrangement that is long-standing and critical to protect, given the lack of alternative suitable access points into the gardens."</p> <p>The GT/AGT takes issue with the Heritage Assessment's claim that (7.2) "The setting of Warmley brass works scheduled ancient monument ... is assigned an impact level of not significant. The present car park is not an original feature of Champion's brass works, so its loss will not have an adverse impact on the monument. Extending Kingsway Mobile Park may result in a partial loss of clarity of the scheduled ancient monument boundary, as the boundary currently runs below the southernmost caravan. Conversely, the land immediately south of the development site was originally occupied by housing, so placing mobile homes on the site may be considered as a partial return to the area's original use." Had Champion's workers' housing not been demolished in the 1960s, it is very likely that they would now be incorporated within the listed structures, a very far cry from the architecturally undistinguished mobile homes proposed in their stead.</p> <p>The GT/AGT OBJECT to this proposal and feel that if it is allowed, it will not only make maintenance of the RPG almost impossible, but it will further encroach upon this fragile site, detract from its significance and certainly not make any positive step towards removing the site from the HAR register.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.06.2018</b></p> <p>Members of the Avon Gardens Trust whole heartedly endorse the facts and comments contained in the letter sent to you from Margie Hoffnung, the Conservation Officer for The Gardens Trust, the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England on their register of Parks and Gardens, as per the application, to construct eight hardstanding bases for caravans</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>within the Grade II registered gardens and within the core of the Warmley conservation Area.</p> <p>The South Gloucestershire local Plan, [SGC 2013], includes the following relevant policy:</p> <p>“South Gloucestershire has an important legacy of heritage and cultural assets and a wide range of undesignated historic buildings, archaeological sites and remains, and historic parks and gardens as well as places, areas and landscapes of historic interest..... These assets make a significant contribution to the identity of the locality in which they are set, helping to create a sense of place. Applications for development which affect heritage assets and their settings directly or indirectly will need to describe the nature of the significance of the assets affected, and set out how development will maintain and enhance heritage assets and their settings in a manner appropriate to that significance. New development should seek opportunities to draw on the historic environment in order to maintain and enhance local character and distinctiveness.’ [Policy CS9 8.8].</p> <p>We see no real evidence of the heritage assets being enhanced or respected by creating a visually detrimental caravan park. The argument that it will improve a currently derelict car park is divisive; the car park is wasteland left derelict after the demolition, in the 1960’s, of the unique early 18th C. housing, built for the workers at the Champions Brassworks. Something that would not be allowed to happen today.</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust object to this proposal and feel that if it is allowed, it will not only make maintenance of the Registered Park and Garden almost impossible, but it will further encroach upon this fragile site, detract from its significance and not make any positive step towards removing the site from the ‘Heritage At Risk’ register.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Blaise Castle and Hamlet	Avon	E18/0290	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two family dwellings, associated access and	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.06.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust about this application for the residential development of land which on its northern side adjoins the Blaise Castle and Hamlet, historic, designed landscape of national</p>

			<p>landscaping.(Self Build). 76 Grove Road, Coombe Dingle, Bristol BS9 2RT. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>importance included by Historic England in its Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. This grade is for parks and gardens which are “particularly important, of more than special interest” and only 28% of them have this high grading.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, which is the statutory consultee for development affecting registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with the County Garden Trusts to comment on planning applications and fulfil this statutory role. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and is responding on behalf of The Gardens Trust to this consultation.</p> <p>We are concerned that the statutory requirement to consult with The Gardens Trust on the previous application no. 16/01406/F was overlooked. It appears that this was also the case for the statutory consultation with Historic England.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust’s publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens - Guidance for Local Planning Authorities (2016) confirms the requirement for this statutory consultation :</p> <p><a href="http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/">http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/</a></p> <p>It also explains how the National Planning Policy Framework applies to planning applications affecting the historic environment i.e. that the applicant is required to describe the significance of any affected park or garden, assess the impact of the proposal upon it and should at the very least have consulted the relevant historic environment record (para.128). However, the applicant for the previous application made no reference to the Blaise Castle and Hamlet Registered Park and Garden, and the possible impact of the proposal on its significance.</p> <p>The NPPF also says that “Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) ... They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.” (para. 129) However, no reference was made in the planning officer’s report to the Blaise Castle and Hamlet Registered Park and Garden and the impact of the proposal on its</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>significance, or to the Council's adopted Policies BCS22 and DM31 for the conservation of the historic environment.</p> <p>With the current application the 'Planning Statement including Heritage Statement' makes no reference to Blaise being a Registered Park and Garden. It only says that "The site adjoins Alderdown Wood which is identified by the Bristol CC as Important Open Space, Historic Parks and Gardens, ...." The only assessment of the proposal is about its effect on the Conservation Area. "Our assessment of the site and the immediate surrounding context identifies that the proposals would preserve and enhance the character of the Kingsweston and Trym Valley Conservation Area."</p> <p>Clearly this does not accord with the NPPF and makes the application deficient.</p> <p>We have looked at the submitted plans, visited the site to assess the proposal, and consider that it would have minimal harm on the significance of the Blaise Castle and Hamlet Registered Park and Garden. Consequently we raise no objections to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Sneyd Park	Avon	E18/0304	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of Cafe and Replacement WCs and Education Booth. Demolition of Existing WCs. Public Conveniences, Circular Road, Sneyd Park, Bristol. CATERING, VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.06.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust about this application for the demolition of existing WCs, and replacement with new WC facilities, a café and a visitor education booth within the Downs Conservation Area. The Downs are a designated site of Nature Conservation Interest, [SNCI]. The proposed works are adjacent to a listed heritage asset, a drinking fountain donated by William Hind in 1883, and within the curtilage of a listed building, 'Towerhurst.'</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, which is the statutory consultee for development affecting registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with the County Garden Trusts to comment on planning applications and fulfil this statutory role. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and is responding on behalf of The Gardens Trust to this consultation.</p> <p>We have looked at the submitted plans, and consider that it would have minimal harm on the significance of the Downs Conservation Area.</p>

					Consequently we raise no objections to this application. Yours sincerely Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Sandleford Priory	Berkshire	E18/0050	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 bed extra care facility as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150sq m, B1a up to 200sq m) and D1 use; the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access. Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury. MAJOR HYBRID	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2018</b></p> <p>BGT has responded to earlier iterations of this application. We now have two main concerns relating to the potential adverse impact of this current application on the Grade II registered landscape of Sandleford Priory:</p> <p>Firstly, the effects of the proposed new sports pitches near the kitchen garden and consequential effects of access to and car parking for these facilities;</p> <p>Secondly, the proposed play facility in the NEAP and car parking on the line of sight from the historic Priory.</p> <p>1) Sports Pitches</p> <p>The proposed new sports pitches between High Wood and the kitchen garden appear likely to detract from the setting of the kitchen garden, which is an historic asset linked to the rest of the Priory landscape to the east of the A34.</p> <p>The proposed linear planting of a hedge and trees to the south of the pitches to soften their visual intrusion would form a visual barrier by abruptly separating this part of the registered estate from the house and the rest of the historic landscape, potentially affecting adversely views to and especially from the Priory to the south-east.</p> <p>The Landscape Strategy, but not the GI plans or Masterplan, now shows a car park within an area which was previously designated as open space north of the NEAP. Also, although the pitches are outside the designated Grade II registered landscape, we are concerned that allowing any cars access into this area is likely to be visually intrusive and will limit appropriate tree planting and landscaping which is both commensurate with the proposed Country Park while relating to the topography of the landscape and respecting views to and from the historic designed Sandleford Priory landscape.</p> <p>2) Play Area</p> <p>Similarly, any play area in the NEAP should be designed appropriately if it is to be permitted in this area of the Country Park, for example</p>

					<p>constructed of wood rather than brightly coloured and conspicuous given the proximity of the historic designated Grade II Sandlesford Park landscape.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>BGT therefore objects to the current proposals for the sports pitches as they will harm the Registered Park and Garden. We also request further information on the impacts of the NEAP and car park on the views from Sandlesford Priory to ensure that these heritage assets are protected.</p> <p>With kind regards,</p> <p>Fiona Hope BGT Executive Secretary cc: the Gardens Trust CPRE Berkshire</p>
Sandlesford Priory	Berkshire	E18/0053	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for up to 500 new homes, including 40% affordable, a 1 form entry primary school with land for its expansion to 2 form entry, replacement and/or expansion land for Park House Academy School, extra care elderly units as part of the affordable housing provision, access from Warren Road and emergency access from Kendrick Road, a recreational facility for families of children with special needs, green infrastructure including children's play areas and informal open space, pedestrian and cycle links through the site, sustainable drainage and other infrastructure. All matters reserved. Sandlesford Park West, Newtown Road, Newtown,</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2018</b></p> <p>BGT understands that Sandlesford West is the land immediately to the west of Sandlesford Park and that this is the first application for this area (other than earlier applications for the Warren Road access) and that the Sandlesford Park Supplementary Planning Document covered only the eastern and not the western part of this application.</p> <p>BGT's two main points of concern are:</p> <p>Firstly the harm to the historic tree-lined access down Warren Road across to Sandlesford Priory to the setting of the designated Grade II designed landscape.</p> <p>Secondly, the potential visibility of part of the development in views from Sandlesford Priory.</p> <p>1)Warren Road</p> <p>We note that there is currently a temporarily approved realignment relating to a previous application for the upgraded Warren Road, with Options A and B as further alternatives.</p> <p>Whichever route is approved needs to respect the important landscape feature provided by the line of trees along Warren Road and down the footpath towards Sandlesford Priory. The trees were planted along the historic route across the Sandlesford Estate to Sandlesford Priory from Andover Road and continue along the footpath to the northern boundary of the site. A line of trees is shown on John Rocque's 1761 map and demonstrates the continuity of this historic landscape feather</p>

				Newbury. MAJOR HYBRID	<p>of the Sandlesford Estate up to the current date. We ask that a careful assessment is made of all three alternatives to ensure that the trees are protected both individually and to avoid harm to this heritage asset. Similarly, any works to upgrade the proposed footpath extension will need to protect the continuing tree line.</p> <p>2)Visibility Issues</p> <p>The views from Sandlesford Priory contribute to the significance of the setting of this historic asset within the wider registered landscape, as illustrated by SLR16, the forerunner to the current Environmental Statement. This earlier document contained photomontage images of view 8 from the Priory showing the extensive view westwards to the woodlands and open fields which contribute to soften the edge of settlement and protect views of the surviving elements of historic interest (especially those associated with Sandlesford Priory). The SLR16 view 8 now needs to be reassessed to determine the effect of the proposed development in the southern part of Eastern Fields, given the higher density of this area, with some development up to three storeys high, which will increase the overall mass and scale of this built form and potential visibility of the buildings, in particular potentially in the views from Sandlesford Priory.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>BGT therefore objects to the current proposals as they stand and requests that further information on the impact(s) of the road access off Andover Road and the impact(s) on the views from Sandlesford Priory are submitted to ensure that these heritage assets are protected.</p> <p>With kind regards,</p> <p>Fiona Hope BGT Executive Secretary cc: the Gardens Trust CPRE Berkshire</p>
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	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2018</b></p> <p>Updated comments to supersede those made by the Berkshire Gardens Trust on 1 May 2018.</p> <p>Overall support is given to the conversion and residential development proposals that affect the MDS area of Sunningdale Park. It is difficult to justify objections to demolition and new buildings on previously</p>

			<p>(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 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>developed land that formerly providing training college facilities for the Civil Service in the 20th and 21st centuries. This is in accordance with policy GB9 where development within the Green Belt can be permitted on this previously designated Major Developed Site. In addition the emerging Borough Local Plan policy HO1 makes allocation for homes and specialist accommodation for older people in the Green Belt at Sunningdale Park.</p> <p>The challenges lie with the remainder of the historic parkland and gardens around the grade II listed building, Northcote House and other curtilage listed structures where they adversely impact on the significance of the grade II Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Walled Garden: Objections are raised to the principle of residential development proposed within the Walled Garden as this part of the site is significant for being the oldest built form in the Park, plus there are vestigial remains of the most historic fabric on the site within these walls. It is considered that the setting of the Walled Gardens is also significant due to its association with the former house which stood adjacent. Support is given for clearing the interior and demolishing the dilapidated glasshouses within the walls, but, so that the significance of this space can be enhanced a suggestion for developers is that its use should be for growing plants and that the space could be rented out as allotments (for residents and maybe the public if they get access to the Park). It is appreciated that the opinion of the surveyors is that it would be unviable to preserve any of the glasshouses, however the conservation and retention of the long Edwardian glasshouse should be reconsidered to provide a valuable amenity within the Park by a continuance of horticultural use.</p> <p>Pleasure Grounds: It is noted that grade II listed Northcote House, the old track through the centre of the site, the southwest woodlands, specimen veteran trees and the Pleasure Grounds are of high significance. The Journal of Horticulture &amp; Cottage Gardener (1899) gave a detailed description of the grounds including all the Pulhamite works. The sales particulars for the property in 1946 described the gardens as being the same as in the aforementioned Journal. It is therefore important for the protection and enhancement of the registered Park &amp; Garden that the evidence is used to restore, where appropriate, and for</p>
--	--	--	--	---



					<p>new plantings to reflect 21st century horticultural practice but so as not to jar with the character of the slopes down to the lakes from the house. The proposed conservation of the formal gardens with its Pulhamite works and lake is laudable, particularly as views will be created (or recreated) from the house to this part of the landscape by the selective removal of some trees. The Planting Strategy for this area is supported, however should the proposals be permitted a Condition should be appended requiring a Conservation Management Plan for the former Pleasure Grounds.</p> <p>SANG: The parkland consists of formal lawns, meadows and woodland in a gently undulating landscape. Some of the significance lies within the woods intersected by long walks, skirted by flowers and ferns, two summer houses with seats in commanding situations. It is important that the character of these areas of the registered park and garden are protected from the creation of new formal and informal footpaths as the proposed SANG (to mitigate for development) will have a harmful impact on the character of the parkland. The high quality approach to Northcote House from South Lodge with its specimen trees and views over open grassland make a positive contribution to the historic character of the landscape. The proposed circuitous tracks and footpaths of the SANG, contrived to fit the criterion of SANG provision, rather than creatively designed to offer walkers more direct routes through the woodland, to the pond and to the Walled Garden, will harm the open views.</p> <p>The SANG will be much more extensive than it needs to be; the requirement is 8.41ha with 13.79ha proposed.</p> <p>The creation of the SANG is likely to make the landscape less resilient to change with harm created by human and domestic animal disturbance on the open space and woodlands.</p> <p>Biodiversity will be adversely affected due to the public and particularly domestic pets using the area which has largely been untouched for many decades. The concept that a few bird and bat boxes will be sufficient to offset the potential displacement of wildlife is ill thought through.</p> <p>Usually SANGs use permeable hoggin for the paths – there are objections to the use of ‘Colas Fibredec’ surfacing in these proposals as</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>this is considered an impermeable surface treatment. The SANG landscape plan drawing has an inset photo indicating that natural hoggin will be used for footpaths so the conflict of what is actually being proposed needs to be clarified.</p> <p>The proposed parking provision of nine spaces for public parking at South Lodge for users of the SANG will be insufficient as there are no set standards for visitor parking. On street parking is already an issue in the Sunningdale Conservation Area.</p> <p>Vehicular traffic will be increased due to the high number of residences and their disposition across the site will lead to an adverse impact on the flora and fauna. Similarly there will be an increase of light at night with such large scale residential development. If permitted there should be a Condition limiting night time 'street' lighting along with careful design especially where it will impact the gardens and parkland areas.</p> <p>The large scale proposals for residential development and a SANG represents a marked difference in the way the land is used which will have significant harmful impacts on the environment and Park and Garden. It is the degree of harm that is at issue here. Redundant buildings and neglected or poor management of the landscape will be somewhat mitigated by the proposed conservation, restoration and ongoing management of the gardens close to Northcote House. There is the potential for increased biodiversity through replacing the orchard, especially as a mix of fruit trees are proposed within the Planting Strategy.</p> <p>The potential three year construction plan is a long time for the far reaching and long term effects on the displacement of wildlife and potential harmful environment for the vegetation on site. This is exacerbated by leaving the creation of the SANG as the final part of the phasing of the development plans.</p> <p>Whilst it is paradoxical in policy terms to support plans for development yet oppose plans for the SANG, in this instance the objection to the SANG is because of the change of use of this parkland which was originally created for humans viewing across whilst leaving it to wildlife to explore.</p> <p>The Glade: Whilst the principle of development can be supported at The Glade the detail of the proposals are considered as over</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>development in the Green Belt principally as over 100 trees will need to be felled to secure it. Development here should be severely scaled down in terms of number of units and the layout amended to retain most of the trees. The individual specimens of trees may well be of 'B' and 'C' value but the positive contribution that the groups of trees makes outweighs the argument for their felling. Provision should also be made in this area for maintenance vehicles and equipment storage for the whole site along with the retention and refurbishment of the tennis courts as amenity for residents.</p> <p>These are updated comments made by the Berkshire Gardens Trust now that the full documentation is made available to view. The conclusion is still to object to the following elements of the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Development within the Walled Garden</li> <li>* The creation of a SANG</li> <li>* Development at The Glade</li> <li>* Harmful impacts on the Registered Park and Garden by increased vehicular movements and insufficient parking</li> </ul> <p>If the BGT can be of further help, please let me know.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Charles Elly DL Chairman of the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Wimpole Hall	Cambridgeshire	E18/0221	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of multi-use trail. Wimpole Hall, Wimpole Park, Wimpole Park Road, Wimpole, Royston, Cambridgeshire SG8 OBW. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.06.2018</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 Cambridgeshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and would be grateful if you could please take the following comments into consideration when making your decision.</p> <p>Wimpole is a very significant surviving historic parkland landscape not just locally but also nationally, and is a major example of the work of other important designers/architects (Bridgeman, Repton, Greening, Soane, James 'Athenian' Stuart &amp; Emes) as well as Brown. In addition there are various cultural and heritage assets within the park. (D&amp;A Statement 2.1.1) This cycle trail would affect three of the most important, key assets: the Hall itself, the Model Farm and the Gothic</p>

					<p>Tower. In terms of the education of future landscape/garden historians/landscape architects etc, the remarkable evidence (collection of plans/drawings, surviving historic assets) at Wimpole are probably the best in Cambridgeshire, and indeed amongst the top historic parks in the country, for understanding the rise and holistic development of 18C estates in particular. Should this application be permitted, visitors would no longer be able to 'read', appreciate or even understand Brown's original design. It is therefore extremely undesirable to impact in any way on the immediate setting of the hall and the still existing historic landscape character out in the park, but most especially in the area around the south front of Wimpole Hall.</p> <p>The NT wishes to install the cycle trail to attract yet more visitors to a venue, which with over 300,000 visitors annually, we would suggest, already approaches over-saturation. Increased visitor numbers would add to problems of conservation and further impact on the fabric and management of the estate. The GT/CGT feel this could cause substantial additional harm particularly as the trail is intended to be clockwise (D &amp; A.4.2) where this will, at times, be the busiest area. The GT/CGT do not agree that the effect of increased use on the local landscape character and the on the registered park as a whole is neutral. In particular this route for cyclists would have an additionally harmful impact on the commanding and stately main view south from the hall, (the major spatial 'WOW factor' experience), an aspect the Planning Design &amp; Access Statement admits is already "well-trafficked" (D&amp;A Statement 5.15). Additional cycle traffic would only add to a 'theme-park' feel.</p> <p>Demonstrable health benefits already exist at Wimpole in terms of walking and riding. Therefore we feel that the cycle trail with its stated "slightly adverse effect" around the edge of the Belts of (D&amp;A Statement 5.13) should not be undertaken at all, since this is central to views in the heart of the park and could set a precedent for further degradation of the historic landscape character. In addition, occasional glimpsed views of cyclists especially to the west of the hill, the site of James Athenian Stuart's classical pavilion, and leading down to the Arrington Gates, and in front of the plantations making up Brown's belt north, would be out of keeping with the peaceful pastoral and rural</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>nature of the park. This area of the cycle trail is one where visitors who climb the hill to where Stuart had his pavilion, can still admire the view east to the hall and the 2 mile avenue, and look south to the walnut avenue, the park trees and pasture, and west towards Arrington Gates. If this trail is permitted, they will in future see an obtrusive, straight-ish, trail which does not marry with any other surface in the park and where cyclists will also distract and detract from the view. It would alter the impression of the wider estate and its seemingly unchanging 18c century ambience considerably, and make it no different from any modern public common or 20C/21C country park. Since the route of the cycle trail cannot run through the Wimpole Wood belt owing to its SSI designation, in our opinion the circuit scheme should be abandoned completely. A shorter, compromise circuit trail (approximately 5 kms) on the east from the Old Wimpole Road past the Home Farm and back down beside Oddy Doddy Lane would have less serious impact on the heart of the most significant central core of the historic landscape. A wild-flower 'safety margin' of 12.5 metres along the north belt would impact on the view and textural nature of the landscape and not be in keeping with its historic design or use, and could become unkempt which would also not be in keeping with Brown's philosophy : "Keep all in view very neat". Since the park has already a rich bio-diversity, new measures for increased bio-diversity alongside the trail are unnecessary and, more importantly, detrimental to the aesthetic and cultural impact and the reading of the historic designed landscape. Whilst we welcome plans to plant 1,000 new trees over the next 10 years, the plan to create 2.70 hectares (6.7 acres) of new woodland (D&amp;A Statement 5.28 &amp; 5.35) to mitigate the damage done by the trail could cause substantial harm to views and the design of the historic landscape. We would like to conclude with a quote from Marchioness de Grey's famous letter : 'Mr Brown has been leading me such a Fairy Circle &amp; his Magic Wand has raised such landscapes to the Eye – not visionary for they were all there but his Touch has brought them out with the same Effect as a Painter's Pencil upon Canvass...' The magic of Wimpole is being able to walk out in the park and still experience the same 'fairy circles' as the original owners, exploring all the painterly views that were intended and indeed created. This same enchanting experience</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>would disappear if inappropriate 21C bicycles were to dart across the scene along the straight, obtrusive trail - disturbing the eye, the distinctive historic character and the charm - let alone the increased necessary signage for safety purposes.</p> <p>The GT/CGT therefore OBJECT to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Doddington Hall	Cheshire	E18/0181	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for development of 12 no. sites for residential development for 112 no. dwellings with means of access and layout included, but with all other matters reserved, for a 10 year phased release and delivery period and associated community betterment (parking overspill next to School, enhanced parking next to Church permissive pedestrian paths, play space, public access, community orchard, educational contribution and affordable housing). [Re-submission of 16/5719N : addition of extra 2.81 ha of land and 10 no. dwellings]. DODDINGTON ESTATE, BRIDGEMERE, NANTWICH, CHESHIRE CW5 7PU. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.06.2018 (J10 PLANNING LTD)</b></p> <p>Further to your email and telephone call, we respond to your comment that the Gardens Trust 'radically' changed its response as follows: When we responded to the first application 16/5719N for up to 102 houses on 12 sites on 8th January 2017, we suggested that a site visit to assess the impact of the proposed housing sites would enable a more accurate assessment to be made as to the impact upon the Registered landscape. We also requested that a Heritage Assessment be made available. The application was refused.</p> <p>The second application 18/2153N (a resubmission of 16/5719N) is for 112 houses on 12 sites. The Design, Access and Supporting Statement: Landscape Appendix 5, Viewpoint Photographs now showed for the first time that despite additional landscaping treatment the proposed housing on sites 1 and 3 would be visible from within the Registered Park and Garden. We repeated our request for a Heritage Assessment. Our objection and comments arose from this additional information submitted as part of the planning application. The Garden Trust maintains its OBJECTION to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust cc. Ms Gemma Horton – Cheshire East Council</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E18/0202	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning consent 13/2935M for siting, design, appearance and</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.06.2018</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 very</p>

				<p>landscaping details for residential development (C3 Use Class).  LAND NORTH OF PARKGATE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, PARKGATE LANE, KNUTSFORD WA16 8DX.  RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>late submission of our comments.  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>.</p> <p>Summary  We have lodged an objection to a previous application to vary Condition 4 as we consider that the significance and setting of the adjoining registered landscape could be affected by the increases in height of the proposed houses which this variation would allow. The current submission provides proposed details in relation to the original approved scheme. We have assessed the likely effect of the proposals on the character and setting of Tatton Park, and in relation to the objectives that were set out in the outline application. Unfortunately, we have concerns about this application too, as set out below, and would recommend that it is refused.</p> <p>Proposed character of the development  The proposed housing is far too urban in character for this greenfield site next to a historic parkland which is nationally of 'more than special historic interest'. Only one small residential character area in the plan shown on page 8 of the Design Statement dated April 2018 is 'semi-rural'. We would like to see a more sensitive and lower-key approach to development in keeping with the need to retain as much as possible of the currently rural ambience of the Tatton Park setting. Since this new development will be isolated from the rest of Knutsford it could be treated as a village, which seems to have been the original approach (see references to 'Village South', 'Village East' etc on the plan in page 12 of the Design Code dated July 2013) rather than a central part of a town. It does not need to have a very urban character because there is an industrial estate to the south, nor does it need to 'make a statement'.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust
Arley Hall	Cheshire	E18/0359	II	PLANNING APPLICATION New memorial walled garden, including ancillary landscaping, car park area and reception facilities. THE MARL FIELD, ARLEY HALL, ARLEY PARK, ARLEY, CW9 6LZ. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2018</b></p> <p>Representing The Gardens Trust (TGT), members of Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) attended a pre-application meeting regarding the proposed developments at Arley. Comments were submitted to the developers and we are pleased that some of our points have been addressed. It should be noted that CGT has an active involvement with Arley as The Viscount Ashbrook is patron of the Trust.</p> <p>The information and drawings submitted for planning now show the full extent of the proposed development along with access and car parking facilities. While this has gone some way to explain the scale of the development, the visual impact of the walls should be more clearly illustrated to give an accurate impression of their scale. The illustrations used to show the impact have used only the base line of the wall rather than a full 3D representation. As such, we find it extremely difficult to make an assessment of the full impact and would advise that additional drawings are submitted to make an assessment.</p> <p>Similarly, the elevations of the wall would be clearer and more useful if they were presented as a cross-section through the enclosed garden area and the surrounding landscape. We understand that the wall height has been reduced to mitigate its impact, however, the nature of the drawings do not make this point visually clear.</p> <p>As the development is to be phased, a phasing plan along with a structure landscape plan would indicate a time scale and how new planting could provide a framework for Phase 1 and future phases.</p> <p><b>TGT CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2018</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 Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) representing the GT attended a pre-application meeting regarding the proposed developments at Arley. It should be noted that CGT has an</p>



					<p>active involvement with Arley as The Viscount Ashbrook is patron of the Trust.</p> <p>The proposal was supported in principal however concerns were raised about the scale of the proposal, the height of the walls and that the presented drawings showed only the first phase of the development. The information and drawings submitted for planning now show the full extent of the proposed development along with access and car parking facilities. While this has gone some way to explain the scale of the development, the visual impact of the walls should be more clearly illustrated to give an accurate impression of their scale. The illustrations used to show the impact have used only the base line of the wall rather than a full 3D representation. As such, it is extremely difficult to make an assessment of the full impact and we would advise that additional drawings are submitted to make an assessment.</p> <p>Similarly, the elevations of the wall would be clearer and more useful if they were presented as a cross-section through the enclosed garden area and the surrounding landscape. We understand that the wall height has been reduced to mitigate its impact, however, the nature of the drawings do not make this point visually clear. A phasing plan should also be included as we understand that the project may extend up to 20 years. Supporting this, a landscape structure plan would indicate how the visual impact of the walls could be softened and how the planting could unite the scheme with the existing landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Youlston Park	Devon	E18/0273	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION SITING OF REPLACEMENT TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPOUND INCLUDING ERECTION OF ONE 27.5 METRE HIGH LATTICE TOWER (WITH THREE ANTENNAS &amp; FOUR TRANSMISSION DISHES), BOUNDARY FENCE, TWO EQUIPMENT CABINETS &amp; ONE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Garden History Society on the above application which affects Youlston Park, an historic designed landscape 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. We have visited the site previously and have studied</p>

				METER CABINET AT TELECOMMUNICATIONS SITE. YOULSTON PARK, NORTH SHIRWELL ROAD, SHIRWELL, BARNSTAPLE. COMMUNICATION/CCTV	the documents on your website. As the proposed mast would be of a similar height to the existing mast which would be removed, it would appear that the replacement mast would not cause any further detriment to the Registered landscape of Youlston Park. Yours faithfully, Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer
Newark Park	Gloucestershire	E18/0305	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of play area including composting WC. Newark Park House, Ozleworth, Wotton-Under-Edge, Gloucestershire GL12 7PZ. PLAY AREA, VISITOR FACILITIES	<b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2018</b> The Gardens Trust (GT) has recently been made aware of this planning application submitted by the National Trust (NT) in relation to the installation of a playground at Newark Park. As you are undoubtedly aware, the GT is a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting any grade of site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, so should certainly have been involved in the whole process. We are disappointed not to have been consulted and to discover that this very poor application has been approved by delegated decision. We have serious reservations about the proposal and would have objected strongly had we been consulted. In our view the application causes serious harm to the significance of the historic designed landscape. Conformity with the policies of Newark's CMP should have been one of the criteria by which CDC assessed the application. Stefanie Van Stokkom from Newark contacted the GT in March 2017. I visited the site with her and emailed her this response on 13.3.17: "Dear Stefanie, It was good to meet you this morning and thank you for taking the time to show me round. I do appreciate the need to get more visitors down to the lower part of the garden and to improve the visitor experience especially for children. However, as I explained, the site you have potentially earmarked is not one that I feel the Gardens Trust would be able to support, especially as the large laurel bush which currently partially hides the view to the field is due to be removed opening up a direct sight line to the proposed play area. The area by the summerhouse, lake, folly and pergola is a particularly sensitive part of the designed landscape within the estate,

				<p>with an atmosphere of tranquillity, secrecy and views out into the combes and woods beyond. A playground sited exactly where the view is concentrated would be very detrimental to the setting of these features and spirit of place. It would also negatively affect the significance of the designed landscape. You mentioned that the gap in the wall at the western end of the field where you would like to site the play equipment may have once been the site of a second summerhouse. This would definitely need to be investigated by archaeology and further research and the second large area of broken down wall is likely to be a hazard for young children and would be extremely expensive to repair.</p> <p>I was glad that you were able to then take me back up to the area immediately to the east of the stable block. The sparse woodland just beyond that area to the west would be a much more discreet site. It would be easily further screened from the entrance drive by only a few more shrubs as the existing vegetation/trees already mostly hide it from view.</p> <p>I appreciate that the stable area needs considerable renovation before it can be used as a restaurant/shop area, but a playground in the vicinity here would have the advantage of being closer to the car park/toilets and also parents could enjoy a coffee whilst safely watching their children play. My feeling is that rather than spend approx £30,000 on a playground so far from the main area, you could perhaps graze the field with sheep in the winter, and then mow paths/grass mazes etc there in the summer. It would also have the benefit of keeping the Japanese knotweed at bay.</p> <p>Stepping stones on the boggy areas would also not be too noticeable. As the site is also very visible from above, you could leave logs to play/climb on and also use them as seats in appropriate places. As they decay they would be habitats for beetles etc. This would be very ephemeral and not in any way detract from its spectacular setting but give educational/play value and you could set up nature trails/bird boxes/I Spy etc for nature things. You could save the £30,000 earmarked for the playground for when you have got the stables renovated and keep the play area up at the top ...”</p> <p>I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet The Planning System in</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens – Guidance for Local Planning Authorities. We feel that due process has not been correctly observed with regard to this application and would therefore question the validity of the decision. We will consider referral to the Local Government Ombudsman should no satisfactory explanation be offered.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p>
Premier Inn, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E18/0278	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a three-storey extension to the northern elevation of the existing hotel and a single storey extension to existing entrance lobby (C1), alterations to car parking layout, landscaping and associated works. Premier Inn, Stanborough Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6DQ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.06.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. Based on the information contained in this application HGT do not wish to comment on the proposed new buildings. We are disappointed however, that opportunity has not been taken to increase the tree/shrub cover within the car park although welcome the few extra shrubs/trees on the perimeter.</p> <p>Kate Harwood  Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Hemel Water Gardens	Hertfords hire	E18/0338	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION SUBMISSION OF RESERVED MATTERS (SECONDARY ACCESSES, APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE FOR A FIRST PHASE OF 150 FLATS AND 294SQM ANCILLARY RETAIL FLOORSPACE) TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 4/03624/14/MOA (RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (UP TO 207 UNITS) AND ANCILLARY RETAIL UNIT (UP TO 375SQM) OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR THE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>We have studied the documents supplied with this application and would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>The proposal claims to enrich biodiversity but we are unclear how an absence of street trees and use of artificial lawn would advance that. It should be possible for some small-species trees to be planted along the street to reduce the utilitarian aesthetic currently proposed. aid biodiversity and provide a more pleasant environment.</p> <p>We have not seen a convincing justification for the use of artificial grass. To claim that it would provide a green cover throughout the year, overlooks the fact that grass in England does just that. Nor seen in the schedules any proposals for maintenance of this artificial lawn or a cleaning routine to cope with dog and other waste which may occur.</p>

				STRATEGIC ACCESS ONTO COMBE STREET). LAND ADJACENT TO THE FORUM AND DACORUM WAY, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD HP1 1HL. RESIDENTIAL, RETAIL	We suggest that more consideration is given to the provision of a high-quality landscape. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Welwyn Garden City Campus, Oaklands College	Hertfords hire	E18/0353	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of existing doors in blocks E, F, G, H and J. Welwyn Garden City Campus, Oaklands College, The Campus, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AH. MISCELLANEOUS	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2018</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. HGT is unable to comment on these plans for the following reasons: 1. The files named 'Photographs' and 'Elevations' are not available online 2. The Application Form refers to DAS for details of the proposed work. However DAS 1 and 2 are listed on the website as Superseded Plans with no detail of how these have been refined for current plans on which we should comment. HGT would be happy to comment on this application if these issues can be resolved Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E18/0247	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of an 18no. hole miniature golf course with associated landscaping and ponds, erection of a payment kiosk and a food kiosk. MINUATURE GOLF COURSE, NORTH BRACING, SKEGNESS. SPORT/LEISURE, VISITOR ATTRACTION, GOLF	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.06.2018</b> Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) welcomes this opportunity to comment on this planning proposal. As a member of The Gardens Trust (TGT) LGT works closely with the TGT (formerly the Garden History Society), the statutory consultee for all planning and development proposals affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. Thanks to local knowledge, LGT advises the TGT and, on occasion, comments on their behalf. Comments were requested no later than 15 June 2018. Therefore, it was unfortunate to find that the documents for the above planning application had been removed by today so comment online was impossible. Fortunately, I had looked at the plans when they were first brought to my notice although I was unable to comment at that time and wished to confer with colleagues before doing so. LGT welcomes the fact that, following a pre-application meeting and consultation with LGT representatives, the applicant has made a considerable effort to re-think the designs for the minigolf-course, and had taken LGT's advice re the setting and existing planting particularly

					<p>of the unusual yellow-flowering broom tree, <i>Genista aetnensis</i>, which are likely remnants of the original garden design of Esplanade and Tower Gardens, HE Grade II. We also welcome that efforts will be made to plant appropriate shrubs and trees, and to share the history and significance of the site with visitors. As a result, LGT has no objections to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Steffie Shields Chairman, Lincolnshire Gardens Trust</p>
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E18/0293	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to existing building to provide an external staircase. GO KART TRACK, TOWER ESPLANADE, SKEGNESS PE25 3HH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2018</b> No objection</p>
Rousham	Oxfordshire	E18/0	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1; Outline planning permission for up to 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3); 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3); 929 m2 of retail (Class A1); 670 m2 comprising a new medical centre (Class D1); 35,175 m2 of new employment buildings, (comprising up to 6,330 m2 Class B1a, 13,635 m2 B1b/c, 9,250 m2 Class B2, and 5,960 m2 B8); 2.4 ha site for a new school (Class D1); 925 m2 of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515 m2 of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2); 30m in height observation tower with zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up of 100 m2 (Class D1/A1/A3);</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.06.2018</b> Thank you for the extended time to comment on the above application. Our main concern has been with the potential impact of the proposals upon the highly sensitive Grade I registered park and garden at Rousham. We agree that inter-visibility from the proposal site to other registered parks in the vicinity (Aynho, Middleton and Kirtlington) is not an issue. We note the conclusion in the Environmental Statement that from the key outward viewpoint in Rousham Park (#16 the Dying Warrior statue) the overall effects of the development “are negligible and not significant in landscape terms” (ES 7.4.95). Given that the proposal is for the redevelopment of an existing military/industrial site then we agree from the evidence provided that this is probably the case. However we do think it unfortunate that the photoviews in Appendix 7.1 were taken mainly when the deciduous trees were still in full leaf which may give a somewhat distorted view of the visibility of the site from Viewpoint 16. We note also that in Vol.2 Table A The Potential Visibility of the Proposed Buildings states quite unequivocally that there is no inter-visibility between the site and Viewpoint 16 up to a building height of 30m (for the proposed Viewing Tower).</p>

			<p>1,000 m2 energy facility/infrastructure with a stack height of up to 24m (sui generis); 2,520 m2 additional education facilities (buildings and associated external infrastructure) at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1); creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure; Change of Use of the following buildings and areas: Buildings 357 and 370 for office use (Class B1a); Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8); Buildings 217, 3102, 3136, 3052, 3053, 3054, and 3055 for employment use (Class B8); Buildings 2010, 3008, and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1); Buildings 2004, 2005 and 2006 for education use (Class D1); Buildings 366, 391, 1368, 1443, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use); Building 340 (Class D1, D2, A3); 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis); and 76.6ha for filming activities (Sui Generis); the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified</p>	<p>This being the case then we have no objections to the application proposals. Peter Edwards (on behalf of OGT/TGT) cc. Maybeth Harasz (OGT), Margie Hoffnung (TGT)</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				in Schedule 2; associated infrastructure works including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road. Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5HD.	
Lower Gatton Park	Surrey	E18/0403	II	PLANNING APPLICATION The existing cladding needs to be replaced due to very bad condition (partly rotten and decomposed). The proposed new cladding would provide new aesthetic look to the building but also increase the U value of it, which currently is not satisfied due to poor insulation of the construction. The proposed development also includes change of the windows within the cladded walls, to match the existing windows where they have already been replaced. The board is Marley Eternit Cedral, colour C105 Dark Oak (see attached photo '2823_Sample'). Please also see attached a PDF copy of coloured art work: 2823_Coloured elevations & 2823_Front Elevation. The Royal Alexandra And Albert School, Gatton Park, Rocky Lane, Reigate, Surrey. MISCELLANEOUS	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2018</b> No physical or visual impact on the P & G interests. Don Josey Surrey Gardens Trust
Lower Gatton Park	Surrey	E18/0416	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent The	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2018</b> No physical or visual impact on the P & G interests.



				proposed application comprises a change of existing UPVC windows to new timber windows in a traditional style (see attached drawing 2822A020). In addition, a retrospective change of use from existing office to staff accommodation. The Bothy, The Royal Alexandra And Albert School, Gatton Park, Rocky Lane, Reigate. MISCELLANEOUS	Don Josey Surrey Gardens Trust
Warwick Castle	Warwick shire	E18/0227	I	Retrospective application for the development of a Maze attraction, including a Viking ship and other themed structures, pathways, landscaping and associated infrastructure. Warwick Castle and Grounds, Castle Hill, Warwick. VISITOR ATTRACTION	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2018</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and would like to submit these joint comments for the above retrospective application.</p> <p>Merlin Entertainments' planning applications for new visitor facilities at Warwick Castle appear with some regularity. They always stress their strong commitment to enhancing and preserving the designed heritage assets within their care, in this instance (Planning Design and Access Statement (PDAS): 'the proposal has sensitively considered the significance and setting of Warwick Caste and other heritage assets. The proposal is small in scale and well screened from important vantage points by dense vegetation.'</p> <p>The HE entry for Warwick Castle states : "The principal historic interest of the Park and Gardens is in their association with 'Capability' Brown... and also Robert Marnock and Harold Peto, who designed mid-19th and early-20th century gardens respectively. Together these layers of history which illustrate the improvements and tastes of the various owners ... contribute to the significance of the Grade I grounds." Robert Marnock's work at Warwick Castle was begun in the mid nineteenth century under the patronage of George and Anne Greville, the 4th Earl and Countess of Warwick. His significant work at Warwick was summarised by Paul Edwards in Country Life (February 16, 1984, pp.</p>

					<p>420-424), and was described in the Gardener's Chronicle (Jan 1892) as a "charming and secluded rosery, also a piece of Marnock's work, and it is well worthy of him". The rose gardens, including their modern reincarnation (officially opened in 1986 by the late Diana, Princess of Wales), are specifically mentioned in the HE list entry. The GT suggests that to remove a designed heritage asset, mentioned in the listing entry, without applying for planning consent, shows a flagrant disregard rather than a commitment to conservation and we would not be examining this retrospective application had its removal not been brought to the attention of WDC by Dr Chris Hodgetts. Indeed, the destruction of the rose garden and its replacement with a maze is covered in just three paragraphs (2.7-2.9) within the PDAS, and the Rose Garden itself merits just two sentences (Para 2.9), whereas the justification for their removal and replacement with the Maze covers several pages. We would have liked to have seen an Options Appraisal suggesting what alternative sites were considered which might have avoided destroying completely an important part of Warwick Castle's heritage.</p> <p>The GT has been in communication with Adam Busiakiewicz, an art historian and doctoral candidate at the University of Warwick, whose PhD thesis looks at the artistic achievements and patronage of Anne Greville (1829-1903), 4th Countess of Warwick. Mr Busiakiewicz's research into the significantly understudied Warwick Castle Archive (now owned by the Warwickshire County Record Office) has uncovered large amounts of correspondence between Marnock and the 4th Earl that includes drawings and designs for this particular garden. The 4th Earl and Countess of Warwick's contribution to the Castle and its grounds were unquestionably undertaken with great attention to detail, and continued the highly sympathetic and thoughtful improvements made by successive owners since the seventeenth century, including Capability Brown's work there in the mid eighteenth century. By contrast, the new 'Horrible Histories Maze' is filled with new fast growing laurel hedges, themed displays and a Viking long boat. It is entirely out of keeping with the setting, despite being hidden by trees and hedges. Merlin Entertainment's installation of this attraction, without consulting the WDC, is indicative of their disregard for the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>designed heritage assets in their care as well as the correct planning protocols, in favour of commercial development.</p> <p>The RPG is a highly selective designation. Warwick is one of only 145 internationally important Grade I designed landscapes in England, from a total of 1658 designated parks and gardens. This puts Warwick on a par with places such as Stowe and Stourhead, so it is incumbent on Warwick DC to robustly uphold the NPPF which makes it very clear that harm to such heritage assets should be wholly exceptional and any adverse impact on key views and settings should be very strongly resisted. Indeed NPPF Para 132 states that “ ... great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. ... Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance notably ... grade I ...registered parks and gardens ... should be wholly exceptional.” We would also suggest that the obliteration of the rose garden is contrary to NPPF para 133, where “a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent...”</p> <p>The GT/WGT OBJECT to this application and we would urge WDC to refuse this retrospective application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  The Gardens Trust</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2018</b></p> <p>We wrote to Nick Corbett last year about the unauthorised changes made to the rose garden at Warwick Castle. We are pleased to see that an application has been submitted. We wish to object and write in support of our colleagues at the statutory consultee, the Gardens Trust.</p> <p>You will be aware that the mid C19 Rose Garden was re-created in about 1985-6 using the original drawings by Robert Marnock. The landscape architect was Paul Edwards, who was at that time retained as consultant by Madame Tussaud’s. It was formally opened by the Princess of Wales in July 1986 the presence of a great many Warwick</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>people and children, which brought it to the notice and affection of many.</p> <p>This tawdry construction, which is unworthy of its setting is an unwelcome intrusion into the Grade I Warwick Castle gardens and is seriously detrimental, particularly by reason of the destruction of the Rose Garden. Although the rose Garden is a modern re-creation of an historic feature, it is included in the Historic England Register description and is within the curtilage of the Grade I Castle.</p> <p>We therefore request that you refuse permission for this application. Should you be minded to grant, we strongly urge that any permission be time-limited, with a requirement that the rose garden be reinstated at the end of that period.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christine Hodgetts Warwickshire Gardens Trust</p>
Peel Park	West Yorkshire	E18/0267	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of existing vacant care home to 26 apartments and construction of extension to create an additional 28 apartments. The Mount Nursing Home, 43 Lister Lane, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD2 4LP.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.06.2018</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Peel Park, a public park included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens at Grade II* and thus is particularly important nationally. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts with regard to this planning application.</p> <p>The Mount, lies immediately to the north of Peel Park, (at the northwest corner) and due to the topography of the park which is laid out in the valley, the site prominently overlooks the park and is part of the park's setting.</p> <p>Peel Park was the first publicly owned park in Bradford, opened in the early 1850's, and named in memory of Sir Robert Peel. The Mount was one of three villas to the north which were designed to be part of the park and a feature of this area of Bradford called Bolton and Undercliffe of which the important Undercliffe Cemetery (Grade II*) is also a significant historic feature. Indeed The Mount had its own private entrance to the Park's Carriage Drive and the stone gate piers of this entrance are still extant.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that significance of a heritage asset 'derives not only</p>

					<p>from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.' In our view the construction of an extension to The Mount, as proposed, will result in harm to the setting of Peel Park and thus to this western area which also includes the listed lodge with gate piers and ornate gates (grade II).</p> <p>The proposed Block B is indeed a 'block' with no aesthetic quality, no pleasing architectural features, poor fenestration and materials. Its height and massing will dominate the very attractive original building which although altered in recent decades is built of stone and retains much of the quality of its original design. The proposed extension will also impact on the character of the neighbourhood, reduce the amount of green space and in our view is over development of the site. The sixteen car parking spaces up against the park boundary (where the railings may be original) will also be detrimental to the setting of Peel Park.</p> <p>We appreciate that currently there are deciduous trees on this boundary of the park which partially obscure The Mount in the summer but of course do not do so in the winter. Trees can be lost very rapidly due to storm damage or felling. Indeed, for half the year when the trees are not in leaf, this proposed block B would severely mar views of The Mount from the Carriage Drive, and in particular from the imposing flight of stone steps linking the site of the former late C19 conservatory to the Carriage Drive.</p> <p>Peel Park is a heritage asset much used and enjoyed by the community and for the reasons outlined above we strongly object to the construction of this extension to The Mount.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Chairman  Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E18/0418	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Alterations to grounds to create chain ferry across lake, Harewood House, Harrogate Road, Harewood, Leeds LS17 9LG.  MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.06.2018</b></p> <p>In general, the Gardens Trust welcomes proposals for measures to increase access to historic gardens and parks for public enjoyment and education, provided the increased volume of visitors does not cause irreparable damage to the fabric of the landscape. However, there are real concerns about some aspects of alterations for this chain-link ferry</p>

					<p>proposal for which we understand work has already begun. The choice of location is perhaps an issue but also the considerable effect of more modern machinery on the character and sense of place of the Brown lake which is such a fundamental part of the setting of Harewood House.</p> <p>Harewood's lake is a fine and relatively unspoilt example of Brown's work, an imaginative design conceived on an enormous scale, refined over several decades, and later praised by poets. Harewood, HE Grade I, is considered amongst the top surviving Brown landscapes both in Yorkshire and within the whole country. Several prominent artists including Gilpin and Turner have recorded the views of the Brown landscape with the water in the valley below the house. Indeed, the mystical experience tracing the passage of the lake waters through the Harewood estate featured in a beautiful Simon Warner video that was shown as part of the major contemporary photography exhibition in London 'Lenses on a Landscape Genius – Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-1783)' as part of the Capability Brown Tercentenary Festival in 2016.</p> <p>The GT understands that the new chain-link ferry-boat is 12m x 3m (39.37' x 9.84'). This is a considerable size of craft. The old 'Capability' boat, used for many summer seasons as a pleasure boat for visitors to enjoy the designed views of the park and house from the water, is 7.6m (24.93') long. This is the same scale as Lascelles' original 25 ft boat commissioned in 1780, (very likely the same boat featured in the Turner 1797 painting.) The proposed new boat would jut out into the lake by 12m even when moored, due to its design and will be all too prominent in the significant view standing on the dam.</p> <p>The lake circuit was specifically designed for visitors to take in the vista across the water which included the Temple of Venus (very much part of Brown's scheme, albeit executed by Carr) to ornament the wider landscape on view from the house and exploratory ridings. It may even be where Turner executed his iconic painting of Harewood from, but it would certainly have been on view from the dam end with the lake in the foreground for almost a century. The new boat is in our view detrimental, and intrudes disturbingly into the C18th sense of place and the peaceful beauty of the landscape. Currently visitors taking the lake</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>circuit and standing on the dam can if they wish, still use their imagination to understand the layers of landscape history and see how the wider landscape was embellished with a classical feature on the horizon to the south/south-east balancing the view to Almscliffe Crag to the west. The presence of an enormous boat jutting out will make it more difficult to affect this understanding and therefore will detract from significance of the landscape.</p> <p>The current 'Capability' boat used to be moored where the electric chain-ferry link is intended. Any further lake 'cruise' on the 'Capability' will presumably be considerably curtailed, perhaps even halved, in extent by the chain ferry effectively dissecting the lake. This would seriously impact on the scenic experience of visitors. In addition, if both pleasure boat and chain-link ferry are intended to share the same landing stage that, together with the newly-installed lighting posts already installed on the house side, which appear to be absent on submitted plans, will lead to a cluttered and distracting effect on the view. The attractive and tranquil view east across the lake from the 'Owl Seat' against the walled gardens' east wall will also be affected by both the over-sized chain-link ferry and distracting ferry terminus reflected in the waters.</p> <p>Work has also begun, it seems, on the second, western pier and associated new paths. This pier has been situated in what was originally a gated herb garden according to 1893 OS map evidence. HE's record mentions: "Railings attached to east run between lean-to and lake, have central gate with decorative central splat and cresting, spear-head rods with arrow-head dogbars set between." The GT is concerned as to what has become of this significant feature? Has listed building consent been received for their removal?</p> <p>At the time of the 1851 OS map, this former herb garden also appears to have been separate from the 71 ft long greenhouse/conservatory (now part of the site of the Rose Garden). The 1893 OS map indicates a path just outside this original herb garden leading down to the edge of the lake, presumably to a pier for the original ferry (no longer extant). Now, the main path from the walled gardens adjacent to this Rose Garden, one of the most popular gardens at Harewood when the old roses are in flower, leads to direct vistas of the new ferry terminal and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>railings rather than magnificent and uplifting views of the lake. We also understand that a temporary hut has also been erected in front of the Rose Garden as part of the Seeds of Hope project just when the roses are at their best.</p> <p>The picturesque Harewood Lake setting is recorded in a Cotman sketch (c1803, attached) revealing a noticeable neatness of Brown's Lake edge and a very attractive pleasure garden beside the lean-to glasshouse on the left. This principal view to Almscliffe Crag beyond the end of the lake was also enjoyed in 1800 when landscape gardener Humphry Repton came to give advice, when he and William Wilberforce took a boat trip together. According to Dr Jonathan Finch, Reader, University of York, Wilberforce remarked at the time that Harewood was: "one of the most beautiful landscapes in the land".</p> <p>18C correspondence between Harewood's owner Lascelles and his agent Popplewell contains specific references to gravel paths, including obtaining gravel from the river bed, which would have followed from Brown's advice on the subject as seen on other sites. However, it appears that tarmac has already been used for surfacing the new paths, and is also the proposed surface for the new jetties. This is not in keeping with the original design or sense of place.</p> <p>A £5,500 contract agreed at Harewood with Brown, makes Harewood the most significant Yorkshire estate in his portfolio, and a fine example of his drive towards aesthetically beautiful landscapes that were both useful, well-managed and worth the long-term investment. 18th century concepts of land stewardship and issues of beauty or profit remain relevant to the 21st century landscape including this latest proposal. It is, of course, to be applauded that easier access is being considered a key priority for handicapped visitors. The Gardens Trust would prefer a suitable ferry-boat to be the mode of transport, since the increased volume of visitors with a larger capacity chain-link ferry will in our opinion, cause irreparable damage to the fabric of the landscape.</p> <p>However, should the chain-link ferry project proceed, the Gardens Trust urge every effort should be taken to soften the impact on the significant lake-side setting, in order that views are not degraded, including the width and surfaces of paths, and that any engineering is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					hidden or at least disguised, or screened, in keeping with Brown's original designs and in keeping with his maxim: "Keep all in view very neat." Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust
--	--	--	--	--	--