



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES OCTOBER 2019

The GT conservation team received 144 new cases in England and one case in Wales during October, 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, 62 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

| SITE | COUNTY | GT REF | GRADE | PROPOSAL | WRITTEN RESPONSE |
|-----------------|--------|----------|-------|---|--|
| ENGLAND | | | | | |
| Birdcombe Court | Avon | E19/0943 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing light industrial units and installation of 5no. residential park homes together with a touring caravan and tent park. Birdcombe Farm, Tower House Lane, Wraxall BS48 1JR. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, CAMPING | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.10.2019 Thank you for consulting Avon Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a grade II* Listed House and its grounds. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust agrees wholeheartedly with the comments made by Historic England and the Conservation & Heritage Officer of North Somerset planning department. To quote the comments made by Historic England, 'The setting of Birdcombe Court, positioned on the Tickenham Ridge overlooking the valley of the Land Yeo River below, is essential to its significance'. The proposed development will cause substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and the unregistered park and garden. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------|-----|--|---|
| Stowe | Buckinghamshire | E19/0853 | I | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for a mixed use development comprising use classes B1a / B1b / B1c / B8 / C1 / C2 / D1 / non-retail promotional automotive display (sui generis) / social hub (sui generis) (25,500 sqm) including parking and access arrangements, associated landscaping, supporting infrastructure and ancillary works, and demolition of existing structures. MAJOR HYBRID</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We agree with Aylesbury Vale's Heritage Officer that it is regrettable and surprising that there is no Heritage Impact (HIA) accompanying this application. Whilst the applicant may have submitted one with previous applications or as part of the pre-app process, we feel that there should be one accompanying this application given the importance of the landscape at Stowe, internationally renowned since the early C18, and included on the Register at Grade I, and as such identified as of exceptional historic interest.</p> <p>We have studied the application in relation to the Sarah Bridgeman 1730s map and considered the distance of the application site from the RPG at Stowe. Given that the racing track and associated structures are beyond the Park, as far as we can tell due to the lack of an HIA for this application, we do not think there would be any further deleterious impact to the significance of Stowe. However, before determining this application we strongly urge the Council to ensure that the applicants demonstrate clearly that there is no further damaging effect to the major ridings as shown on the Bridgeman 1730s plan.</p> <p>We are struck by the sheer volume of applications for this site and the regular lack of consultation with both the GT and BGT. We very much hope that your officers will make an effort to ensure that any applications which might potentially affect the RPG at Stowe are sent to us as statutory consultations as a matter of urgency in future.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Mentmore Towers | Buckinghamshire | E19/0856 | II* | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed grain store to store crops grown by M & J Gaymer. Mentmore Park Farm, Mentmore, Buckinghamshire LU7 0QN. AGRICULTURE</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|----------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation accompanying this application, and have no objection as long as your officers include a condition that that the grain store is screened with appropriate planting from the Cheddington road lined with the Grand Avenue to complement the historic character. We would advise a narrow belt of mixed trees in the field along the outer (west) side of the present clipped hedge parallel with the Cheddington road and continuing in the field wrapping around the south side of the buildings. It should be informal, in two staggered rows, and comprise a mixture of suitable, historically appropriate species (ideally immune to currently prevalent pests and diseases) which should include a mix of something like sycamore, Scots pine, common oak, field maple and walnut. Initially we suggest these be planted at final mature spacing, interspersed with poplar as a nurse crop that will be removed once the main species are maturing. The trees will need management to ensure they achieve an attractive form. We suggest that AVDC tree officer advises on the practical detail of choosing and mixing species, siting, spacings, pruning during maturing, etc. and ensures completion of this.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Stowe | Buckinghamshire | E19/0865 | I | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Partial Change of Use of former stables to micro-brewery, demolition of former store, associated patio, parking and access, and separate staff canteen (Retrospective). Blackpit Brewery, Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire MK18 5LJ. HYBRID</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. This application is the third retrospective application for this application site and the Gardens Trust is submitting comments to the other two applications as well.</p> <p>The GT/BGT were grateful for the opportunity to visit the site in early October 2019 which was extremely helpful for us to understand the layout and current condition of the application site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Historic Context</p> <p>The application site lies within the northern section of the Grade I listed Stowe Park. The Historic England register entry describes Stowe as an “Extensive and complex pleasure grounds and park around a country</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>mansion. Main phases C18 and early C19, utilising late C17 base, with early C18 work by Charles Bridgeman, Sir John Vanbrugh, James Gibbs and William Kent, and mid C18 work by Lancelot Brown. Stowe was supremely influential on the English landscape garden during the C18.”</p> <p>The listing goes on to mention this northern section away from the formal gardens immediately surrounding the house :-</p> <p>"The pleasure grounds are surrounded by the parks, now farmland. At its most extensive (1868) the designed landscape and woodland covered c 250ha, increased from c 200ha in 1727. The park is bounded to the north by the major woodland, Stowe Woods, laid out with a network of formal rides, some of which may date from the early C17. This area is partly affected by Silverstone Race Circuit north-east of the Wood. The Fallow Deer Park links the woodland and pleasure grounds. Its backbone is the straight Roman Road which runs diagonally across the site from south-west to north-east and forms the west boundary between pleasure grounds and park."</p> <p>We will endeavour to comment specifically on this particular application but some of our comments relating to the other two applications regarding the wider landscape are reiterated here for consistency.</p> <p>Firstly we welcome how much of the original layout of the Grade I parkland remains and, away from the application site, appears to be well managed by the current owner.</p> <p>This leads us to our first recommendation which is that the applicant should commission an historic landscape character survey by a recognised landscape historian. We do not think any works should be considered retrospectively or commenced without such a survey and that the survey will provide the informed advice for the applicants to assess the current condition of the application site as well as their plans for the application site and for the future management of the wider undeveloped area.</p> <p>Our strong feeling is that the original layout and plan should be maintained, there should be no further creep into the designed landscape and, where possible, the designed landscape should be reintroduced right up to the boundary of the current developed area - there should not be any sacrificial areas between the designed and the developed landscapes. There should be no further creep into the undeveloped area whatsoever. The conversion of the late-20th century stables into a micro-brewery and staff canteen have been carefully considered and have been executed with respect for the setting and history of the application site. The Gardens</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>Trust has some concern about the patio area to the east of the brewery building and the picnic area alongside Blackpit Pond. The Gardens Trust would like to ensure that development is contained within the boundary of the built area and there should be no creep into the wider landscape. The GT/BGT also have some concern about the wider access issues and, whilst they are not specifically detailed in this retrospective application, they are relevant to these works. Therefore can we reiterate the following :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing road and car park surfacing should be broken up to reduce the impact and more sympathetic materials should be introduced where possible 2. External lighting must be introduced with caution 3. The west wide of Castle Riding Avenue should be replanted with appropriate native species trees 4. The diagonal avenue which runs from Silverstone Great Riding towards Blackpit Pond should be reintroduced as far as the boundary for the current developed site <p>These measures should help to mitigate the impact of the patio and picnic area but we would strongly recommend that the planning authority ensure there is no further spread beyond the application site.</p> <p>With this in mind, The GT/BGT therefore support approval of this aspect of the retrospective application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Stowe | Buckinghamshire | E19/0866 | I | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of former indoor Riding School building and outdoor menage yard for sui generis use for the storage of plant hire equipment, ancillary workshop and offices; demolition of front and rear bays of the building, associated infrastructure, external lighting, circular vehicular route to access the site and building, and site access. (Retrospective) Land At The Former Indoor Riding School,</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting this site which sits within a Grade I landscape on the Historic England Register of Parks & Gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding these applications.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust are grateful for the opportunity to visit the site in early October 2019 which was extremely helpful for us to understand the layout and current condition of the application site and the surrounding area. We have addressed the above two applications together as we believe that it is not possible to assess either individually without considering the impact on the wider site therefore this is a single response to both of these applications as follows:</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire. HYBRID</p> | <p>Historic Context</p> <p>The application site lies within the northern section of the Grade I listed Stowe Park. The Historic England register entry describes Stowe as an : 'Extensive and complex pleasure grounds and park around a country mansion. Main phases C18 and early C19, utilising late C17 base, with early C18 work by Charles Bridgeman, Sir John Vanbrugh, James Gibbs and William Kent, and mid C18 work by Lancelot Brown. Stowe was supremely influential on the English landscape garden during the C18.'</p> <p>The listing goes on to mention this northern section away from the formal gardens immediately surrounding the house : "The pleasure grounds are surrounded by the parks, now farmland. At its most extensive (1868) the designed landscape and woodland covered c 250ha, increased from c 200ha in 1727. The park is bounded to the north by the major woodland, Stowe Woods, laid out with a network of formal rides, some of which may date from the early C17. This area is partly affected by Silverstone Race Circuit north-east of the Wood. The Fallow Deer Park links the woodland and pleasure grounds. Its backbone is the straight Roman Road which runs diagonally across the site from south-west to north-east and forms the west boundary between pleasure grounds and park."</p> <p>We note that both applications are retrospective.</p> <p>Firstly we welcome how much of the original layout of the Grade 1 parkland remains and, away from the application site, appears to be well managed by the current owner.</p> <p>This leads us to our first recommendation which is that the applicant should commission an historic landscape character survey by a recognised landscape historian. We do not think any works should be considered retrospectively or commenced without such a survey and that the survey will provide the informed advice for the applicants to assess the current condition of the application site as well as their plans for the application site and for the future management of the wider undeveloped area.</p> <p>Our strong feeling is that the original layout and plan should be maintained, there should be no further creep into the designed landscape and, where possible, the designed landscape should be reintroduced right up to the boundary of the current developed area - there should not be any sacrificial areas between the designed and the developed landscapes. There should be no further creep into the undeveloped area whatsoever.</p> <p>With regard to the development site, as these applications are retrospective, some damage has already been done. We understand that,</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>the site was formerly developed to provide equestrian facilities and, whilst this was apparently short-lived, some of the buildings and structures on the site were erected as part of that venture. Therefore, some of the structures have planning permission already.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust consider that these existing features are detrimental to the registered park and garden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proliferation of single storey modular office buildings • external lighting • the extensive car parking area and the choice of materials used for this parking area • the planting immediately in front of the manege building • the tarmac road surface following the route of an original riding • the earth bund <p>The Gardens Trust believe that the manege and adjacent former riding school building and the two storey substantial central office building are also detrimental to the site but we understand that they have previously received formal planning consent.</p> <p>Whilst the Gardens Trust note that some attempt has been made by the applicant to minimise the impact of many of the alterations to the site, the Gardens Trust have also noted the comments of the Heritage Officer to these applications and would support those comments and the Heritage Officer's recommendation that these proposals are refused retrospective consent.</p> <p>In the spirit of trying to find a way forward, we would also recommend the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing riding school building is substantial and does make a detrimental impact to this Grade 1 listed registered park. However, as an equestrian building, it is an appropriate use. However, the Gardens Trust is concerned about the conversion of this structure into further office space because <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. it would extend the office use into the rural landscape further ii. there is so much office space already at the application site. <p>Nonetheless, proposals to reduce the size and scale of the riding school building would be welcomed providing that it maintains a discreet external appearance in the landscape.</p> <p>The insertion of extensive door and window openings and the installation of new external lighting should be discouraged/refused. The current materials blend into the setting so careful thought should be given to</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>finding similarly appropriate materials if this is to be changed.</p> <p>2. The existing planting currently acting as a screen to the manege and riding school building should be removed as it is inappropriate in this setting</p> <p>3. The Gardens Trust would support a limited amount of new planting to mitigate the impact of modern structures around the site however;-</p> <p>a. the planting should be low and temporary so as not to create new landscape features</p> <p>b. all new planting should be native species and should reflect historic planting</p> <p>4. The existing road and car park surfacing should be broken up to reduce the impact and more sympathetic materials should be introduced where possible</p> <p>5. Planting could be used to break the hard surfacing up further but with caution to our points above regarding points 3a and 3b above</p> <p>6. The west wide of Castle Riding Avenue should be replanted with appropriate native species trees</p> <p>7. The diagonal avenue which runs from Silverstone Great Riding towards Blackpit Pond should be reintroduced as far as the boundary for the current developed site</p> <p>8. The hedgerows which encroach on to the Silverstone Great Riding should be removed</p> <p>9. If the planning authority is minded to grant retrospective consent for the current structures on the site, the Gardens Trust would recommend that this be subject to a time limit which requires that they be removed in the future and that the landscape be returned to its historic condition.</p> <p>10. The historic buildings and the contemporary stable block, which is well-designed, enhance the setting</p> <p>Therefore, in conclusion, with regard to the following applications, the Gardens Trust objects to the retrospective applications in their current form and would welcome revised proposals which take into consideration the points we have made above.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust would like to reiterate again that the primary starting point for these applications would be to commission an historic landscape assessment and to base revised proposals on those findings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|----------|----|---|---|
| Stowe | Buckinghamshire | E19/0867 | I | PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of temporary modular offices, external lighting, associated parking, hard and soft landscaping including earth bund, infrastructure works and access, for a period of 10 years (retrospective) [Units 1, 2, 3 installed during 2015/16; Units 4, 5, 6 were installed 2018]. Land At Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL | TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2019 As E19/0866 above |
| Claydon | Buckinghamshire | E19/0899 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of four existing estate barns into B1 employment use and the erection of one new storage and maintenance barn, including associated alterations, a bin store, landscape and access works and car parking. Buildings At Farm Courtyard, Claydon Estate, Steeple Claydon Road, Middle Claydon, Buckinghamshire MK18 2EX. CHANGE OF USE, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING | TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have looked at the online documentation and liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) but unfortunately due to lack of staff capacity, we have not been able to make a site visit so are unable to offer any comments other than those below. The Heritage Impact statement confirms that the walled garden and southern lodges (and therefore everything that lies between - although this is not mentioned) will be the most affected by these proposals. To mitigate, they are proposing tree planting to screen the farm buildings from the walled garden, forming a more defined boundary between the garden and farm buildings than the grass verge alone. They are also proposing to remove and replant a hedge at the entrance site which defines the boundary of the Estate and directs sightlines and the approach to the Estate to the south entrance framed by the lodges on either side. We have no objections to this. We would however suggest that any new fenestration is confined to the internal-facing courtyard. It is regrettable that the fenestration style as seen from the RPG has to be changed. Since the new conversions will be for employment use only we hope that light emittance will be limited as the offices will be mainly day lit only. We would also ask that non reflective glass is used. We do have some concerns with regard to the new barn E, as it pushes the built area into the planted area nearer to the pond and |

| | | | | | |
|---------|-------|----------|----|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>therefore extends the built area to the full length of the rear elevation of the stables. However, it is a storage and maintenance space only, so we assume there will be no need for fenestration etc? We are glad to note that there are timber doors and that the rest of the structure echoes the other buildings in style.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Cadhay | Devon | E19/0868 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Agricultural storage building. Land At Cadhay Lane, Ottery St Mary. AGRICULTURE</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2019 Agricultural storage building. Land At Cadhay, Cadhay Lane, Ottery St Mary Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Cadhay, an historic designed landscape of national importance, 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 planning applications affecting all sites on the Historic England Register. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have visited Cadhay inn several occasions previously and in response to the current application. We have viewed the Historic England map and entry and have studied the planning application documents on your web site. The proposal is to build an agricultural storage building to the south west of the south west corner of the walled garden. In this discreet location, we consider that the proposed agricultural storage building would not cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset of Cadhay. We therefore do not object to the proposal. Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p> |
| The Hoe | Devon | E19/0954 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Statue to commemorate Lady Nancy Astor. Grassed Area In Front Of 3 Elliot Terrace, Plymouth PL1 2PL. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which affects The Hoe, an historic designed landscape of national interest which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We are happy to support the proposals. Yours faithfully</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------|----|--|---|
| | | | | | John Clark Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust |
| Riffhams | Essex | E19/0919 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Entrance gate. Good Graces, Graces Lane, Little Baddow, Chelmsford, Essex CM3 4AX. ACCESS/GATES | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.10.2019 I am commenting for the Essex Gardens Trust on behalf of The Gardens Trust. The design of the entrance and gates is now much more sympathetic and suitable for the context. The gates would look better still if more permeable with an open top with rails. David Andrews |
| Woodchester Mansion | Gloucestershire | E19/0946 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Permission for a new visitor toilet block. Woodchester Mansion, Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Stonehouse. VISITOR FACILITIES | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2019 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that have an impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has notified the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. The replacement toilet block has approximately the same footprint as the existing block, but the drawings are somewhat sparse regarding constructional detailing, and what the Woodchester Trust's intention might be in dealing with screening and the associated storage clustering round the existing building. GGLT considers it important that these ancillary uses, including service structures and storage, are carefully pre-planned and sited, as they are within the curtilage of a Grade 1 Listed Building, as well as set within a very significant sweep of Grade 11 parkland. GGLT does not wish to raise objection to this proposal, but would suggest such additions and replacements are considered within a rather more strategic plan for the setting of the Woodchester Mansion. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT). |
| Danson Park | Greater London | E19/0947 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition and replacement detached 4/5 bed detached house with associated landscaping. South Lodge, Danson Road, Bexley. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL | TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have studied the online documentation and have serious reservations about the dominance of the proposed very large new house over the Grade II registered Danson Park and Memorial Garden (RPG). We would have expected to have seen a Heritage Statement outlining what effect this |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>new structure would have on the setting and significance of the RPG. The Planning statement focuses upon the impact of the proposal upon Metropolitan Open land and the Green Belt but completely ignores the RPG. There is no statement of significance for the RPG and mention of how this proposal might affect its setting and so is not compliant with NPPF para 189. We also feel that the applicant has not demonstrated how this application which, in our opinion, inflicts a degree of 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, provides any public benefit (NPPF para 196). We would suggest that reference is made to Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 2 : Managing Significance in Decision taking in the Historic Environment. The Government published an updated Historic Environment section of the Planning Practice Guidance on 23rd July 2019 which places increased emphasis on early consideration of significance in the development of proposals (Para : 008 Reference ID : 18a-007-20190723) and also 18a-009-20190723 which states that 'Applicants should include analysis of the significance of the asset and its setting, and ... how this has informed the development of the proposals.' In our opinion this aspect has been entirely ignored, which is important as the development site lies within the RPG itself.</p> <p>Whilst there are plans showing the vastly increased footprint of the new house (just short of 3 times the current size), we were not able to find any reference to the height of the existing house. The new house is extremely tall at 9.95m, so it is hard to compare the proposals with Photographs 1 in the VIA Appendices, which shows the visible roofline of the existing South Lodge in relation to the 'Sylvan skyline' from across the park. We would like to have seen a photomontage of the new proposals in relation to a view from the same place and also a comparable existing photograph of the current house taken from the Memorial Garden (as per Illustration A18224-P-106-C showing the new house towering over the Peace Garden. The VIA 3.32 states that the current building is a noticeable built form in close distance view and to a lesser extent in middle distance views. There is apparently no current view of the site from the Grade I mansion house or II* stable block which is on slightly elevated ground across the parkland above the height of the existing property. Will this change if the new 9.95m tall house is permitted? We would have liked a photomontage of this, as clearly if the new structure would be visible, then the setting of both these listed buildings also needs to be taken into consideration. The 'approximately 2m high continuous beech hedge (which) provides an</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|----------|----|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>important contribution to screening the application site from the Peace Garden and immediate parkland surroundings' (VIA 3.10) will have negligible screening impact upon a structure almost 10m high immediately behind it, either from close by or far away.</p> <p>We agree that the current house is of no particular merit but feel that the proposed new structure is too tall and we would feel more comfortable with a less dominant house of similar height to the existing property. We do not feel that the application documents sufficiently address the impact that this enormous new property will have on the registered Grade II Danson Park and Peace Garden. Until this has been clearly demonstrated by the applicant we do not feel that your officers will be able to decide this application.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust objects to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Hall Place | Greater London | E19/0962 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of model railway and clubhouse, children's play area, new bridge, new paths, new signage, covered seating area, human sundial, new window in visitor centre. Hall Place, Bourne Road, Bexley, Kent DA5 1PQ. HYBRID</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.10.2019</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has had the above application brought to our attention by Historic England. We are disappointed that Bexley failed to consult us in our capacity as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per 19/01949/FULM. We would be grateful if you could please ensure that the Gardens Trust is notified in future : consult@thegardenstrust.org. We have liaised with our colleagues in the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT) and would be grateful if you could take these as our joint comments for consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT appreciates the difficulties Bexley Council faces due to funding constraints and it is clear that much thought has been given to finding a sustainable future for the Grade II Hall Place registered park (RPG).</p> <p>We welcome proposals for a new bridge and improvements to paths. The proposed new play area will also not impinge on any major views. The arrangement with Welling & District Model Engineering Society (WDMES) is a novel and inventive method of encouraging an alternative use within the less historically significant area of the park to the south of the River Cray, albeit there is no historical precedent or particular planning justification for it either.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>However, the introduction of these new attractions will have a permanent impact on this Grade II historic landscape and whilst it may increase the communal value of the site for some, it may also reduce it for others. During Pre-application advice, the LPGT were informed that the primary source of additional income would come from introducing a new charge to access some of the gardens. This charge would be levied at the visitor centre, so would not be paid if using other attractions on the site – i.e. the tea room, the new shop, model gardens, orchards, glasshouses, Butterfly Jungles and Jambs Owls. The charge for the gardens would enable visitors to access a new children’s playground area, funded via the Council’s capital programme, on an ‘invest to save’ principle. The proposed entry fee is minimal and would be introduced upon completion of the playground capital works (hopefully Easter 2020). The price for entry to the gardens will be £4 for adults and £2 for children (5-16) with a 50% discount for residents of the borough and family tickets and annual season tickets will also be available. Nonetheless, many poorer and deprived communities will be deprived access.</p> <p>Whilst charging for a site is not a material consideration in the planning process, the Trust considers that these proposals are being driven by a desire to generate income despite the, likely permanent impacts on this site which will alter its feel and character. In addition, we consider that tranquillity is one of the key components for current community appreciation of the site, this will also be affected by the proposals currently put forward. We dispute the Heritage Statement 7.13 “Few people currently use this area compared to other parts of the landscape and few people enjoy a character of tranquil parkland. The communal value of this area would, therefore, be considerably enhanced by the activity and visual interest proposed”. We acknowledge that there is background traffic noise, but would refer the planning committee to reports from CPRE showing that people strive for tranquillity to ensure wellbeing and further loss of this would be unfortunate in an area intended as Green Belt.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT could not view the visitor survey material on the planning portal at the time of writing, and there was no evidence supplied of community consultation for these proposals. Had there been demonstrable overwhelming support for the new proposals, provided in the full knowledge of loss of tranquillity and new charging arrangements, that might go some way to mitigating our concern over the probable community impacts.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------|-----|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>We of course acknowledge that Bexley faces an extremely difficult task in maintaining the RPG with ever decreasing funding but share Historic England's concerns about visual clutter and also the audible backdrop (already noted to be impacted by traffic but which would be increased should this proposal be allowed). The option presented is seeking to strike a reasonable and pragmatic balance to ensure the future maintenance and sustainability of Hall Place but we do urge greater caution particularly with the introduction of the model railway which we believe to be inappropriate for this Grade II site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Land off Crossway, Welwyn Garden City | Hertfords hire | E19/0142 | N | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of equestrian building for existing use for the storage of timber, carpentry/Joinery workshop. Change of use of existing equestrian building to class B1(a) Light Industry B2 (General Industry) or B8 (Storage & Distribution) with associated vehicle parking. Land off Crossway, Welwyn Garden City. MISCELLANEOUS</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. We have read the Acoustic Survey and Report and do not wish to make any amendments to our previous comments which still stand.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p> |
| Panshanger | Hertfords hire | E19/0264 | II* | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Detailed planning application for the erection of 254 dwellings, associated parking, landscaping and amenity space along with vehicular and pedestrian access from Thieves Lane and Welwyn Road. (HERT3) Land West Of Thieves Lane, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2EJ. RESIDENTIAL</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.10.2019</p> <p>The area of this proposal was historically part of Panshanger Park, registered Grade II* on the HE Register and on the HAR. Development here causes substantial harm to the setting of this heritage asset, and thus to its significance. Despite this, little effort seems to have been made in this plan to mitigate this harm, with the Visual Assessment appearing to consider that the lack of a 'grand house in the park' renders this less valuable in heritage terms. This complete lack of understanding of the views, setting and heritage value of the site means that insufficient buffers are proposed between the housing and the historic woodland, little attention has been given to the designed access to the parkland, which may well result in widespread damage to the ancient woods and their ground flora. There is also little attempt to provide an adequate buffer zone along the B1000, being far too</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------|-----|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>narrow .</p> <p>We object to this application on the grounds of harm to a designated heritage asset.</p> <p>If planning permission were to be granted for this development, we consider that mitigation measures for the harm to be caused to the registered parkland, both by the development itself and the extra footfall in the park from new residents be seriously addressed, including amendments to this application and CIL or S106 provision.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p> |
| East Herts Local List of Validation Requirements | Hertfords hire | E19/0576 | n/a | LOCAL PLAN Consultation on Revised Local List of Validation Requirements for Planning and Listed Building Consent Applications | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member.</p> <p>The 'Heritage Statement' requirements are incomplete.</p> <p>We concur that applications for Listed Building Consent and where the development would affect a heritage asset need an HS but also for any development within the setting of such an asset as the setting forms part of the significance of a heritage asset.</p> <p>We would suggest that the level of detail of a Heritage Statement should be in proportion to its significance, not its 'importance'.</p> <p>We note that detail is given on requirements for architectural and archaeological assets but not for historic parks and gardens. Historic parks and gardens are heritage assets and any development within them or within their setting also needs to have the level of detail required for other assets.</p> <p>Further, the impact of development of a listed building or structure should also take into account the impact on adjacent historic parks and gardens. The importance of views in the setting of heritage assets is detailed in Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3.2). These should also be considered .</p> <p>Proposals which may cause harmful impacts should also be required to submit mitigation measures, both for harm of the asset, and its setting, whether architectural, archaeological or historic designed landscape.</p> <p>The NPPF (194) requires clear and convincing justification for harm to any heritage asset (alteration of the asset or development within its setting). This should also be provided. The NPPF (196) states that harm should be weighed against public benefit. Proposed public benefit should also be</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|--|--|
| | | | | | included Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust Conservation and Planning |
| Bush Hall, Hatfield | Hertfords hire | E19/0911 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition to 4 (Tree Protection) and 18 (Drawings) on planning permission 6/2018/3054/MAJ. Bush Hall Hotel, Chequers, Hatfield AL9 5NT. MISCELLANEOUS | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2019 We have studied the documents included in this variation of conditions 4 and 18 applications and have no objections. Kate Harwood |
| Crossway, Welwyn Garden City | Hertfords hire | E19/0959 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to allow for flexible use class of B1c Light Industry, B2 General Industry and B8 Storage & Distribution with associated vehicle parking. Land off Crossway, Welwyn Garden City. LIGHT INDUSTRIAL | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust , of which HGT is a member. Our comments on the applications 6/2019/0810/FULL and 6/2019/0811/FULL made on 24 May 2019, still stand. As part of the former parkland designed by 'Capability' Brown we consider industrial and storage use of the land to be inappropriate. Kate Harwood |
| Tylersley Farm, Newgate Street | Hertfords hire | E19/0973 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 3 x dwellings with associated works to include garages, landscaping with woodland planting and improvements to public footpath following the demolition of existing buildings that comprise of kennels, stables and a bungalow. Tylersley Farm, Tylers Causeway, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8QN. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.10.2019 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic landscapes on the Historic England Register. We note that the site is within the Green Belt and adjacent to a wildlife site. However, we consider that development on this site would not severely harm any historic landscapes (designated or undesignated) or their settings within the area. Kate Harwood |
| Stevenage Heritage Local List | Hertfords hire | E19/1011 | n/a | LOCAL PLAN Nomination buildings of historic interest from around the town that are considered worthy of being added to a Local List of heritage assets. | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2019 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on the proposed List of Local Heritage Assets. We have no comments on any of the buildings or archaeology included in it. However, we are very disappointed that historic parks and gardens are not mentioned at all. These are heritage assets and recognised as such by HE and other bodies. The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, is a |

| | | | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|----|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens and HGT comment on planning issues affecting both on nationally and locally designated gardens. You will know that HGT have prepared Lists of Locally Important historic parks and gardens for many on the LPA in Hertfordshire, which have been included in SPD and other policy documents in their Local Plans.</p> <p>We are aware that Stevenage has some old sites which may contain traces of history - Rook's Nest, Shepall Bury, the avenue by Thomas Alleyn's school etc, and also the New Town public gardens themselves are now of historic interest.</p> <p>We would welcome the inclusion of historic parks and gardens within your proposed Heritage Local Listing. HGT would be happy to help you compile a list of suitable gardens and discuss this with you</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p> |
| Lever Park | Lancashire | E18/1049 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of landing structure to replace existing forming part of the Go Ape Ropes course. Go Ape, Rivington Lane, Rivington, Bolton BL6 7RZ. VISITOR ATTRACTION</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>LGT gave its views on the initial Go Ape Course proposals at the time of the first planning permission in 2008, and we expressed serious concerns about the appropriateness of this development in the Lever Park. These concerns were summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lever Park is a Registered Historic Park and Garden Grade II, and as such is a fragile and sensitive resource which can be easily damaged beyond repair. The Park was created by an important benefactor of national renown working in conjunction with a recognised designer; • Great House Barn is a listed building Grade II and its setting would be adversely affected by the proposals; • Potential conflicts with existing Park users, at a location where there is a major access route for walkers (including mobility impaired users) to gain access to the lakeside walk; • Concerns about effects of Course being fixed to trees, with nails and bolts in trunks, and particularly in the light of a lack of management plan for the |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>wider Lever Park;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The possibility of later intensification and enhancement of Course facilities, requiring for instance, a larger car park or flood lighting. <p>However, planning permission was granted, subject to conditions notwithstanding the objections received. Therefore, LGT's concerns remain unresolved, and are still relevant to any further proposals.</p> <p>In the earlier applications, and Section 12 of the current Application Form, it is stated that there are no protected or priority species affected, and that no designated sites, important habitats or other biodiversity features are affected. This disregards the Chorley Local Plan Map, which indicates that the whole area of Lever Park is a Biological Heritage Site, and accordingly ecological issues should have been addressed in the earlier applications and the current application.</p> <p>We requested in the October 2008 letter (and reiterated subsequently) the need to undertake a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan for Lever Park, to address the long term care of the historic features of the Park, within which parameters will need to be set for the continued operation of the Go Ape Course. It is recognised that the undertaking of this work is principally a task for the land manager, United Utilities, rather than Adventure Forest Ltd, (T/A Go Ape) however, it is the LGT's view that no further planning permissions should be granted until this matter has been addressed between the various agencies.</p> <p>Current Proposals</p> <p>There are many unanswered questions posed in the current application which are raised in detail in the two consultation representations from Friends of Lever Park, which we do not need to repeat here, but which we endorse.</p> <p>The Landing Zone is bounded on the south and west by a stone wall which is progressively being lost by dislocation and stone removal. This historic feature requires to be rebuilt where it abuts the landing zone, to match the more intact lengths to the south. This detail should be shown on the detailed drawing for site 3 which is totally devoid of any context.</p> <p>It is disappointing to see that the CBC arboricultural officer has no comments on the application. Having regard to the matters raised by Friends letters, the proposals appear to require further implied work to existing trees, and we would expect this 'no comment' conclusion to be reviewed, as well as outstanding matters on the other parts of the course</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>already completed. We raised concerns about nails in tree trunks in 2008, the use of which appeared to be inconsistent with the methodology described within the original (2008) application documentation. Subsequent Design and Access Statements supported the use of nails in order to fix the sacrificial battens to the living trees. The LGT would welcome clarity on the best practice to which this work should be undertaken.</p> <p>Signage - This should be reduced to a minimum.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We have fundamental issues with this proposed development including issues with each of the previous applications. These concerns are summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lever Park is dedicated to the People of Bolton, and the public generally, as set out in the provisions of the 1902 Liverpool Corporation Act. The greater part of the Go Ape Course is within the Lever Park, as defined by the Act, and it is Registered as a Historic Park and Garden Grade II. • The setting of the listed Great House Barn is adversely affected by the Course. NPPF places importance on the setting of a heritage asset, and the harm done to it by traffic and busy thoroughfares. NPPF 2019 Para 189 states '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'. This comment applies equally to the Lever Park RPG. • The current application fails to acknowledge the existence of the Biological Heritage Site. • An Arboricultural Assessment is required in respect of the existing course as well as the proposed works. The method of attachment of fixings to tree trunks requires to be addressed. • A Conservation Management Plan is required for the whole of Lever Park. • The prospect of intensification due to the increased use of the course has been confirmed by experience, as evidenced by numerous subsequent planning applications. Attention needs to be given to find a more appropriate and less sensitive location for this intensive recreational facility, as over time the adverse impacts will be greater and longer lasting. It is also regrettable to see that a veteran beech tree has recently been severely lopped and pollarded adjacent to the course entrance cabin. Has this been subject to any scrutiny or approval? <p>If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------|----|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>conservation@lancsgt.org.uk Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p> |
| Langton Hall | Leicestershire | E17/1625 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of low energy dwelling and landscape proposals submitted under paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Land Off West Langton Road, Langton Hall, West Langton, Leicestershire. RESIDENTIAL OUTCOME Refused APPEAL LODGED 04.09.2019 To be decided by hearing</p> <p>04.09.2019 Request to assist Harborough DC to defend appeal</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2019 (APPEAL) The GT has read the further documents submitted on behalf of the applicant for the Appeal Hearing and we have little further add to two our original submissions. It is apparent from the old OS maps that the application site 'The Paddock' was originally part of the designed landscape rather than a shelter belt with some randomly planted trees. Our objection to the scheme relates to concerns that approval could set a precedent for further development within the RPG in future and that the modern house with its intrusive solar panels would not be in keeping with the remaining estate buildings and would diminish the parkland atmosphere. Mr Crawford in his Hearing Statement, Part 1, states (5.4.3) that 'other than from the private estate drive, and the houses immediately to the south of the site, there will be no view of the appeal site from the south or west.' Your Officers will of course be aware of Historic England's advice that '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' and it goes on to say 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.' This is directly relevant to Mr Crawford's comment (6.1.10) that 'the design quality of the houses build around Langton Hall in recent decades has been poor..... (and) It will thus provide a benchmark for other schemes' – a somewhat concerning statement. We agree that the other development around Langton Hall is not as sensitive to the site as the current proposal, but further development here will not, in our opinion, enhance the setting. 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset. We hope these further comments will be helpful. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|----|--|--|
| | | | | | Conservation Officer |
| Boultham Park | Lincolnshire | E19/0880 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Realignment part of footpath, restoration of stone edges to the lake and installation of water aeration equipment and bank side cabinets (3no. compressors each at two locations on the lake edge). Installation of platform for access for boating, a viewing deck, 2 no. fishing pegs, 5no. pieces of art and 5no. associated interpretation boards. Boultham Park, Lake, Boultham Park Road, Lincoln, Lincolnshire</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.10.2019</p> <p>This HLF funded lake restoration seems to be both sympathetic and comprehensively thought-through for the benefit of both the park and the local community park users. We are delighted that boating will once again be available to the public.</p> <p>The information/interpretation signage proposals seem innovative, attractive and well-positioned in reasonable sites and not too many in quantity. We trust the quality of the art installations chosen will suitably reflect the quality of the setting and in sympathy with Boultham's historic park design and surviving veteran trees, since this attractive and peaceful, well-watered landscape park has now become a valued public park.</p> <p>Steffie Shields MBE Chairman Lincolnshire Gardens Trust</p> |
| South Ormsby Park | Lincolnshire | E19/0920 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Internal and external alterations including an external flue and repairs to the existing gamekeepers store to provide a private meeting room. ORMSBY HALL, BRINKHILL ROAD, SOUTH ORMSBY, LOUTH LN11 8QS. BUILDING ALTERATION</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.10.2019</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT), a conservation and education charity, considers it necessary and appropriate to comment on this planning application. As a member of The Gardens Trust (GT, formerly the Garden History Society) LGT works closely with the national GT, the statutory consultee for all planning and development proposals affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. LGT advises the TGT thanks to local knowledge and, on occasion, comments on their behalf. I write to express LGT's concern re the proposed heating flue. While LGT trustees have supported most ongoing restoration initiatives in the park and garden at South Ormsby, we feel this proposal for a modern heating flue in close proximity to the historically significant and attractive early 18th century Grade II Lion Gates would be inappropriate, and out of place. The metal flue will stick incongruously above the coping in this SW corner inside the walled garden and, when viewed from inside the walled garden, will be particularly obvious in the winter when the lime avenue trees have shed their leaves. More importantly, on the main approach from the garden south, the view towards the Lion Gates will be adversely affected by the flue being visible beside the Lion Gates leading to the old lime avenue, both significant features in this part of the garden to the west. We hope another solution can be found towards heating the renovated garden store for the gardener's use with less impact on the setting, in order to maintain the ambience and important aspects of this historic garden's</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------|----|---|---|
| | | | | | heritage. Lincolnshire Gardens Trust object to this proposal. Yours faithfully, Steffie Shields MBE |
| St Mary's Hospital, Stannington | Northumb erland | E19/0772 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from public open space to enclosed garden. 6 Rothley Gardens, St Mary Park, Morpeth, Northumberland NE61 6FZ. GARDEN | TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. It has been very difficult to pinpoint the exact location of the application site, 6 Rothley Gardens and to position in relation to the Grade II registered park (RPG) of St Mary's Hospital, Stannington. The location map included with the application documents is very unhelpful in this respect. There is no mention whatsoever within the 3 documents online, of the site's proximity to the RPG and how the encroachment of a private garden with its domestic paraphernalia might affect the significance and setting of the designed landscape, particularly if other new home owners in the development follow suit and apply to extend their gardens. We assume the property has not yet been built as local estate agents' notices suggest that this is a new development still under construction and we cannot find it on Google Maps. We are concerned about the principle of chipping away at agreed public open space within the RPG and surviving designed landscape. The applicant must have been aware of the boundaries of their garden when purchasing the property, and the GT/NGT do not support this proposal. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer |
| Buckden House | North Yorkshire | E19/0820 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a replacement low ropes assault course. Buckden House, Outdoor Education Centre, Buckden BD23 5JA. SPORT/LEISURE, EDUCATION | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We also on occasion give advice on non- |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>registered sites. About fifteen years ago Buckden House was included in a joint research and recording project between the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.</p> <p>Buckden House is listed grade II with entrances from the village located close to its northern and southern boundaries. The site is bounded by a stone wall, enclosing mature trees.</p> <p>Most attractive gardens were laid out in the mid C19 by Sir John Charles Ramsden and an extensive country park was laid out across the valley by his son. Some alterations were made in the late C19 by Colonel Compton Stansfield, who purchased the Buckden Estate c. 1879. These included moving the northern entrance further north, with a section of part of the original northern drive becoming a path from the House to the boundary wall, separating the existing south lawn from a new northern section. The southerly view from the house, across an ornamental circular pool and the south lawn to the valley beyond, formed the principal vista from the house. This is well illustrated in a set of Francis Frith 1955 postcards of Buckden House.</p> <p>Our understanding is that the proposal is for play equipment in the southern area of the garden to be replaced by more extensive and higher structures of up to 4.8m. However, we consider this would cause some harm to the designed landscape as it would be clearly visible over the lowest section of the boundary wall around the southern entrance, especially as part of the fabric is to be coloured red. It would also lead to the loss of part of the historic lawn as the surface under the proposed equipment would be a mulch. In our view this proposal would cause some harm to the setting of Buckden House and the principal southerly vista from the House.</p> <p>The Buckden Conservation Area Appraisal refers to the existing climbing frame and how it is not in keeping with the characteristics of the settlement. The area for the proposed replacement low ropes course is near the historic main southern entrance and we query whether a more suitable location could be found, especially as this proposal would result in the area around both entrances being unsympathetic to the character of this beautiful rural village.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above we have strong reservations about this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust |
| Tupgill Park | North Yorkshire | E19/0846 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for erection of extensions and roof terrace to provide toilets and storage area for the Bell Barn. Tupgill Park, Coverham. BUILDING ALTERATION | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We also on occasion give advice on non- registered sites. This is a non-registered site. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust note that the Design and Access Statement for the Forbidden Corner, Tupgill Park Estate mentions that '... The Corner Café extension has a deck which can be used for tables in fine weather and which enjoys a south west aspect and gets a lot of sun, even though it is surrounded by taller structures and roofs which shelter and hide it from external views...' We have not visited the site, have no further comment to make and refer you to the advice of your authority's Conservation Officer. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman of Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust |
| Fishpond Wood, Risplith | North Yorkshire | E19/0902 | N | PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping. Land Known As Fishpond Wood, Risplith, North Yorkshire. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2019 The Yorkshire Gardens Trust has been notified of this planning application by other local organisations and some of our members, and has been asked to look at the historical aspects. As you know the Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We appreciate that the area of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood is not on the register nor as far as we know designated by Harrogate BC as of local historic importance but we would like to advise you of our concerns. The application site is situated on land just off the B6265, c.9km to the west of Ripon, within the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>(AONB). The landscape shows signs of historic design with its sinuous lakes which have been dammed, high gritstone cliffs and accompanying careful planting and boathouse. We understand that the lakes may have been medieval fishponds for Fountains Abbey which is located c.5km to the east. The Yorkshire Archaeology Society Record Series Vo CXL, The Fountains Abbey Lease Book, 1981, pp168-9; '23 January 22 Henry VII [1507]. Lease by Marmaduke, abbot of Fountains to Emmota Lemyng, widow, and Maurice her son, for a tenement with appurtenances in Evestone....'</p> <p>Also p168: 'Land Rental income totalled 28s in 1456/7 and 30s in 1535. The monastery was working a quarry in Eavestone in the mid 15th C.' The Yorkshire Archaeology Society collection has further deeds and Tithe Awards for Eavestone in the Grantley MSS dated from 1586 until the 19C. (See 'A Guide to Historical Sources for Ripon and District', pub Ripon Records Project 1994 by Ripon Historical Society and Ripon, Harrogate and District Family History Group.)</p> <p>It appears that in the 18C Lord Grantley had design work carried out to make this a more picturesque area of his extended pleasure grounds and to include distant views of Nidderdale to the north and north-west. The Ripon Gazette 28th June 1877 published an account by Forester, 'A Ramble by the River Skell from its Rise to its Outfall' which includes:</p> <p>'...near the hamlet of Eavestone, are some fine ponds occupying the side glens on the southern slope of the main valley. They were formed about a century ago by Sir Fletcher Norton, 1st Lord Grantley by making dams across the narrowest parts and throwing back the water. One of these is of considerable size and is known as "Grantley Lake". and filled the upper part of it with water, at the same time clothing the lower extremities and surrounding hills with plantations of timber trees. ... it has the appearance of a genuine mountain lake.... Though the length is not more than a third of a mile, and the breadth much less, its curvilinear shape prevents the whole of it being seen at once and gives it an appearance of more extension than it really possesses. At the upper end are groups of lofty gritstone rocks of considerable height, rising directly from the water, one of them bearing the name of the "Raven Crag", which adds much to the variety of the scene. ...'</p> <p>There are obvious similarities to Plumpton Rocks (HE Register, grade II*) laid out a few years earlier by Daniel Lascelles: both have rivers dammed to produce lakes with towering gritstone outcrops and planted to increase the picturesque experience. It is possible that Plumpton Rocks could have been</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>the inspiration for Lord Grantley.</p> <p>The 1st edition OS map (published 1854) and 2nd edition OS map (published 1890) give further evidence for the manipulation and embellishment of the site. Comparing the two editions indicates that by the end of the 19C there were footpaths all round the southern side of Eavestone Lake, and the western end notated as 'Fishpond' has been modified and extended with a piece of land between it and the main lake. There is also a 'waterfall' marked and it appears that pedestrians could walk towards the waterfall and "Ravens Crag". The Crag and waterfall would be seen from the path on the opposite side of the lake (northern side) as the Crag is today; the path being part of the Ripon Rowel Walk. The boathouse and small footbridge are marked on the 2nd edition OS map. This area of the Nidderdale AONB has been used by generations for quiet walks taking in its hidden beauty and tranquillity where there is no traffic just an exquisite landscape with its wildlife habitat.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed development has the potential to severely disrupt the tranquillity of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood; a precious resource. Although the proposal describes itself as a low impact eco-retreat set within existing woodland there will be more permanent features in the site warden accommodation, hard-standing and access, in addition to a fairly large number of people impacting on the site with their accompanying decking, fire-pits and lighting. There will also be, we assume, maintenance and cleaning personnel and their vehicles. We also note that the site plan indicates the north-western boundary of the proposal is near the lakeside.</p> <p>We are not convinced that this proposal complies with NPPF, section 15. "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment" paragraphs 170 and 172, or the Nidderdale AONB; the statutory purpose of which is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty.</p> <p>The Planning Design and Access Statement at 6.11 writes that 'the development of this site for a leisure and tourism provision will support the health and well-being of those that wish to use this facility as well as the site making effective use of the land and improving biodiversity while using natural resources prudently. The yurts can be accommodated on site without harm to the natural form of the valley side, the loss of mature trees within the site, any change to the lake or change to the perceptual characteristics of the valley. It is also considered the provision of this facility will also assist in supporting growth and innovation.'</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|----------|----|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>In our view the development is likely to damage the area, the tranquil experience and perceptual characteristics of the valley and its biodiversity and will not be counterbalanced by further development of rural tourism. We note that the National Trust has received a National Lottery Heritage Fund grant for the River Skell project which may also have a bearing on considerations for this planning application.</p> <p>We trust that our comments are helpful and will be given full consideration in determining this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p> |
| Lilleshall Hall | Shropshire | E19/1015 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Addition of safety rails to the existing terrace balustrade voids. Lilleshall Hall, Lilleshall Hall Drive, Lilleshall, Newport TF10 9AT.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2019</p> <p>Further to our telephone conversation this afternoon regarding the above proposal(s), I have read the Historic England response to the proposals and agree that, for those 'high risk' areas where a less intrusive solution would not be possible or appropriate, we would prefer to see a single vertical element used as recommended in the HE response, as this would be less intrusive than the crossed arrangement currently proposed, especially with the rather prominent 'ball joint' between the two. The use of a single vertical would also be easier to install and much less damaging to the existing fabric.</p> <p>We discussed also the colour of the metal uprights, and I suggested that rather than opting for the 'default' 'black' solution, which may not be the most recessive colour to use in those locations, these might look better if they were painted a colour to match the existing stonework. It might be necessary to trial different colours on site, to see which works best.</p> <p>Regards Chris Gallagher</p> |
| Redlynch Park | Somerset | E19/0977 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application to vary condition no. 2 (approved plans), 6 (silo removal), 7 (Aviary wall restoration) and 8 (materials) of approval 17/00634/FUL to allow substitution of plans and changes to timescale of development. The Aviaries, Redlynch Road,</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2019</p> <p>Further to our telephone conversation this afternoon regarding the above proposal(s), I have read the Historic England response to the proposals and agree that, for those 'high risk' areas where a less intrusive solution would not be possible or appropriate, we would prefer to see a single vertical element used as recommended in the HE response, as this would be less intrusive than the crossed arrangement currently proposed, especially with the rather prominent 'ball joint' between the two. The use of a single vertical would also be easier to install and much less damaging to the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|---|--|
| | | | | Pitcombe, Bruton BA9 8JD. (GR:368796/132014) | <p>existing fabric.</p> <p>We discussed also the colour of the metal uprights, and I suggested that rather than opting for the 'default' 'black' solution, which may not be the most recessive colour to use in those locations, these might look better if they were painted a colour to match the existing stonework. It might be necessary to trial different colours on site, to see which works best.</p> <p>Regards Chris Gallagher</p> |
| Sheffield General Cemetery | South Yorkshire | E18/1656 | II* | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of warehouse and erection of 10no dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) with associated parking. 67 Stalker Lees Road, Sheffield S11 8NP. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 20th September regarding further amended plans and information on this planning application which is on the northwest boundary of Grade II* registered Sheffield General Cemetery and in close proximity to the Grade II* listed entrance gateway in addition to being an important part of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We previously objected to the earlier schemes which would have seriously impacted on the General Cemetery and the entrance gateway. These amended plans are an improvement; the units have been reduced from 10 to 9 with the plot at the junction of Stalker Lees and Cemetery Avenue now becoming garden ground. We consider that this does significantly open up and improve the setting of the cemetery gateway and lodges. The Cemetery Avenue elevation of the western-most property has been amended to break it up and soften the overall appearance; again, an improvement.</p> <p>Looking at the wider context, by opening up the space there may be scope for some tree planting along the Cemetery Avenue boundary of the site to continue/restore the avenue from Ecclesall Road. (We noted the old photograph of the pollarded street trees in the Heritage Statement). And consideration could be given to some additional tree planting to the south of the development site to maintain some screening from the cemetery and to give a succession of different ages of tree for the future.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust removes their objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------|-----|---|---|
| | | | | | Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust |
| Sandbeck Park and Roche Abbey | South Yorkshire | E19/0955 | II* | PLANNING APPLICATION Improvements to be carried out to the dam head/embankment of the Upper Lake due to requirements identified under the Reservoirs Act 1975 (as amended) for safety reasons at Upper Lake, Sandbeck Park, Sandbeck Lane, Maltby. MISCELLANEOUS | CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.10.2019 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Sandbeck Park and Roche Abbey are on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade II*. The fourth Earl of Scarborough engaged Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in 1760 but as he was himself noted for his great taste for the fine arts, particularly architecture and planting, it is likely that he contributed to Brown's designs for the landscape. The Upper Lake at Sandbeck Park; the subject of this planning application, lies close to the Hall and east lawn but situated to the north east and was probably the subject of Brown's first contract with the Earl. The dam head embankment is at the eastern side separating it from the Lower Lake; the two lakes forming a sinuous and pleasing feature in the park and an important part of the designed lands cape. The dam head embankment includes an open weir at the south east corner which controls the level of water in the Upper Lake and a sluice gate control near the middle of the embankment. We understand that due to the Upper Lake's capacity (over 100,000 cubic metres of water) that it falls within the Reservoirs Act 1975 and particularly with the currently greater incidence of sudden high rainfall, that there is concern that the dam may be overtopped/ breached and flooding occur across to the A60 and land and property to the east. We have not visited the site for several years but the Design, Access and Heritage Statement gives an analysis of the situation and the various proposals and we agree that proposal 3d would not be the hard engineering solution which would be at odds with the historic designed landscape, but that the 3d proposal will have the least impact on the landscape whilst at the same time fulfilling the IE's requirements for the Upper Lake to reach the flood standard required. We note that the text says, "It has been accepted that this is the favoured option which has the least impact on the landscape". However, it doesn't indicate whether |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>Historic England has been consulted. Looking at the documents on the Planning Portal we have not seen any response from Historic England as we would have expected for a Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>The OS 25" scale map, Yorkshire Sheet CCXCI.13 (Surveyed 1891, published 1892) shows a circuit path around the edge of the Upper Lake. Part of this path is on the top of the dam (the embankment'). However, the mid-19th Century 1st Ed OS 6" scale Yorkshire Sheet 291, shows neither the path around the edge of the lake and only a few scattered trees on the dam itself so it is difficult to judge whether the path is an original historical feature. We are unsure whether the regrading of the top of the dam allows for a path along the top of it. But a path could be of practical value as well as being a probable historical feature.</p> <p>There is a detailed ecological appraisal with some photos which show the woodlands at the edges of the lakes and the 25" OS 1892 shows the dam covered with trees. Research and translation by a YGT member have revealed that Sandbeck went into a substantial, many-volume and well-known 18 century guidebook to Great Britain by Johannes Volkmann published for German travellers. Volkmann's account, published in 1782, indicates that he visited in 1761, and he describes the lake in some detail, with trees planted singly and in clumps along the banks. He says that 'sometimes trees stand so thick that they throw a black shadow over the water', and concludes: 'in a word, one must admire the beautifully tree-planted lake edge.' If Brown started work there in 1760, either the trees were there before the lake was created, or more mature trees had been planted. Volkmann may have plagiarised the well-known work by Arthur Young, A Six Month Tour through the North of England, in four volumes published in 1770 and 1771 but the description is indicative of the significance of Sandbeck.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application but trust that Historic England has been consulted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust REF: Johannes Jacob Volkmann: 'Neueste Reisen durch England', vol. 4, Leipzig 1782. Volkmann is said (ref: German dictionary of national biography) to have</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------|----|---|--|
| | | | | | visited England in 1761. His four volumes about England appeared in 1781-82. He did acknowledge many sources - and wanted to produce a thorough guidebook, really an early version of Baedeker, and could not single-handedly have visited all locations. He was more of a cultural historian who drifted into writing/adapting guidebooks covering many countries. |
| Shugborough | Staffordshire | E19/0957 | I | PLANNING APPLICATION The creation of a temporary all weather buggy turning area complete with associated landscaping. Shugborough Park, Lichfield Road, Shugborough. MISCELLANEOUS | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Staffordshire Gardens Trust (SGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and appreciate the damage that the buggies bringing visitors to the Mansion House have been causing when they turn on the grass verge. We also appreciate that turning in the car park gateway could also pose safety risks. We therefore raise no objection to the proposed works, which will not have a lasting impact on the appearance of the historic landscape or cause harm to its aesthetic or historic significance. We would suggest that if your officers approve this application consent should be time-limited to five years.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Mowbray Park | Tyne and Wear | E19/0757 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary change of use of Mowbray Park and erection of temporary buildings and structures, to allow for the Festival of Light to operate for a number of days annually between 1st October-31st December for a 5 year period. Mowbray Park, Burdon Road, Sunderland. VISITOR ATTRACTION | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The above application is extremely similar to a previous application (18/01349/LP3) to which the GT/NGT responded on 11th August 2018. As before, whilst we applaud the principle of the annual Festival of Light we would like to highlight our concerns that the annual 3 month Festival does not damage the designed landscape and/or the amenities of this historic registered public park. As at Roker, the lighting assessment is extremely thorough but the Heritage Statement merely states that there is 'no need for permanent interventions such as concrete pads or lighting columns'</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------|----|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>and that 'wear of the greenspaces will be renovated or allowed to recover.' The GT/NGT would like reassurance that there will be root protection areas around all Category A & B trees, and that once the Light Festival is finished, any damaged is replaced by new turf which is allowed to fully establish before public access during the summer months.</p> <p>We assume as before, that no significant historic features of the park will suffer any permanent damage due to the Festival. Our concerns stated above need to be delivered as part of a mitigation strategy attached to the Heritage Statement and can be easily addressed by your officers and satisfied before any decision is made, and not as post-approval discharge of a planning condition. If these concerns are addressed the GT/NGT wishes the Festival every success. Should this not be possible we would be grateful if you could please notify us so that we can make further comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Garden at 1 Castle Hill (formerly Wantage) | Warwicks hire | E19/0298 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of a single storey 1 bedroom dwelling to the grounds of 1 Castle Hill, Kenilworth CV8 1NB. RESIDENTIAL</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for informing us of this application. We hope that you will consider this response to be in time considering that the notification was only sent to us on 15 October.</p> <p>We are writing this in consultation with the statutory consultee, The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>We wish to reiterate the response which we made in June. The availability or not of parking does not affect the damage to the heritage asset (the registered garden) created by this application. We therefore reiterate that the application is contrary to paragraphs 193, 194, and 196 of the NPPF, as well as to policies HE1 and HE2 of the Local Plan and to the Kenilworth Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Christine Hodgetts Conservation Secretary</p> |
| Warnham Court | West Sussex | E19/0892 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replace existing stone roof on 1920's lean-to with clay tiles to reduce weight and prevent collapse (Listed Building). Salmons, Robin Hood Lane, Warnham, Horsham.</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2019</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have studied the documents submitted with the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------|----|---|---|
| | | | | BUILDING ALTERATION | <p>application. The application site lies just within the boundary of Warnham Court, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. Ideally, to minimise any adverse effect on the significance of Warnham Court, it would be good to see a solution with the existing stone reused, but this stone may itself have deteriorated and suitable quality newly quarried Horsham stone may not be available. It is unlikely that the proposed clay tiles will have a material adverse impact once they have weathered in. SGT therefore has no objection to approval of the application. The salvaged stone may be of use on other buildings within the estate or elsewhere.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust. Copy to: The Gardens Trust</p> |
| Lawnswood Cemetery | West Yorkshire | E19/0843 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of Lawnswood Tea Rooms. Lawnswood Tea Room Tearoom, Lawnswood Cemetery And Crematorium. DEMOLITION</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on Historic England's (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on their behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Lawnswood Cemetery, registered grade II, was designed by the Leeds architect, George Corson, assisted by the landscape designer, William Gay of Bradford on land that was part of existing woodland called Lawns Wood. It was opened in 1875. In 1849 William Gay was appointed superintendent of Leicester General Cemetery before moving to Bradford. He designed cemeteries and public parks up until the 1870s. Lawnswood Cemetery is a good example of a High Victorian public cemetery and an early-C20 crematorium/garden of remembrance for a provincial city. The flowing Picturesque layout of the cemetery unusually encloses areas of woodland within the path system as a key design feature, these being at the heart of the burial areas. The Cemetery includes a number of listed buildings, some fine trees and an artistically notable variety of monuments to Leeds worthies.</p> <p>The Delegation Report indicates that this application seeks approval for the demolition of a single storey building located near to the entrance of Lawnswood Crematorium. It is now vacant but was last in use as a shop, café and WC in association with the crematorium. It borders one of the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------|----|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>access roads through the site. The building is set amongst existing trees. We note that there are unlikely to be bats and the building does not have any architectural merit. The Delegation Report recommends conditions with respect to the trees and we trust that the trees will be safeguarded and protected, and left unaffected after the landscaping has been completed.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p> |
| Temple Newsam | West Yorkshire | E19/0941 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Application to install lighting to path from Temple Newsam house to the house car park; lighting columns to parking area and installation of lighting system timing controls. Temple Newsam Park, Templenewsam Road, Halton. EXTERNAL LIGHTING</p> | <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on Historic England's (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on their behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Temple Newsam House is a Grade I listed building, with early 16th century origins sitting within its historic gardens and designed landscape which is registered at Grade II. The parkland is significant as a partly completed relatively early design of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown; A Plan for the intended Alterations at Temple Newsam, 1762. Although Brown is known to have been consulted at fourteen sites in Yorkshire, very few plans or documents are known to have survived. Temple Newsam and park have been in the ownership of Leeds CC for more than 60 years and the access path and car parks that are the subject of the application sit to the north west of the House and were created in the mid-20th century to provide public parking for visitors. The car parks are screened from Temple Newsam house by tree planting that predates public ownership (pre-1922). Additional trees were planted and grassed banking created at the time of the car park installation. To the south of the car parks is the golf course; an area reclaimed following mid- 20th century opencast mining.</p> <p>We appreciate the need to install lighting to improve the safety of facilities for existing visitors and staff and to install electric vehicle charging points and we are pleased that the plans are proposed within the context of the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|----------|----|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>need for a more long-term fully comprehensive conservation plan for this historic estate. We trust that the conservation plan is making good progress as it is something which the Yorkshire Gardens Trust and the Gardens Trust have tried to promote with the officers and councillors of Leeds City Council for a number of years. It is fundamental to understanding the significance of the whole heritage asset and enabling good management and infrastructure decisions to be made which will secure the significance, whilst supporting management and public enjoyment in the future.</p> <p>We note the Heritage, Design and Access Statement at 5.1 that the proposal will seek to conserve the landscape and respect the historic fabric and known developmental history of the landscape and that in the preparation of the proposals there has been consultation with the local Senior Conservation Officer, Clare Wallace. 5.5 notes that the installation of the lighting bollards will have some visual impact on the view along the flag path from the north face and motor court of Temple Newsam House. But that the lighting bollards will not be visible from the principle vehicle access route from the north. The 'Pilzea' lighting columns will be visible within the car park. Our concern is that the lighting columns may impact on the wider landscape and we trust that light spill will be minimised to reduce any such impact. We support the fact that there will be timing controls to the lighting systems in order to restrict the additional lighting to working hours and to be able to switch off overnight to minimise impact on the local environment.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not wish to make any further comment on this planning application, but again would like to emphasize the need for a long-term and fully comprehensive conservation plan for the grounds and landscape at Temple Newsam.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Neil Redfern, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p> |
| Lydiard Park | Wiltshire | E16/1043 | II | PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed residential development of 48 dwellings, with public open space, associated access, infrastructure and landscaping. Land south of | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.10.2019</p> <p>The above application has been drawn to the attention of The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, within the last few days. As the proposal site directly adjoins the boundary of the Registered Park & Garden at Lydiard Park (Grade II), as Statutory Consultee for all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest,</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Tewkesbury Way, Swindon, Wiltshire. RESIDENTIAL OUTCOME 16.11.2016 Withdrawn</p> | <p>The Gardens Trust would have expected to be included in the consultation process. We are surprised and extremely disappointed to have been left off the consultee list shown on Wiltshire Council's website. I am attaching a copy of our recently published leaflet The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks & Gardens – Guidance for Local Planning Authorities for your information. We would very much appreciate it if in future you could make sure that The Gardens Trust is not omitted.</p> <p>It is particularly unfortunate to have heard about the application at such a late stage as it gives us very little time to research this important site with the thoroughness it deserves. It is clear from the close proximity of the site to the RPG that new houses only 40m away (D&A 4.2 p.16) from its boundary will unavoidably have a significant impact on the setting of this heritage asset. It is proposed that detailed planting proposals for impact mitigation upon the RPG is deferred as a future planning condition. The Gardens Trust feels that this is not acceptable for a site of this importance. The developer claims that due to the site being lower than Lydiard Park and the Grade I St Mary's Church and its numerous listed tombs, it will reduce the impact upon the larger landscape. The Gardens Trust disagrees with this statement. If anything it will have precisely the opposite effect. I visited the site yesterday, and the field for which the housing is proposed is not just very clearly visible from all along the main east entrance drive and when standing by the church, but is in fact the culmination of the view from these areas. The convergence of multiple public footpaths just to the south of the site (LVIA 2.16) leading directly to the Park and church exacerbates the problem. The Gardens Trust also understands that the lime avenue along the eastern main entrance drive which the developer states will screen the new housing, is due soon to be crown lifted, opening up even more than at present, the prospect from the church and car park and giving an even clearer view of the housing to the many visitors to Lydiard Park. The developer makes numerous references to the group value of the mansion, medieval church and garden structures. It follows therefore that harm to any aspect of these will inevitably affect the significance of the whole. In particular it is extremely unfortunate that this application has come at the same time that the church is undergoing a major conservation project and is applying for HLF funding. Any impact on the significance of the church by an ill-conceived application such as this, will have a correspondingly detrimental effect on the possible success of the lottery bid. Pevsner described the church as "richer than any other of</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>similar size in the county” and having seen the exquisite wall decorations, tombs and 15th century glass, anything that might prevent the conservation of this unique and special place, would constitute cultural vandalism.</p> <p>We concur with our colleagues at Historic England that ‘The development would cause harm to the overall heritage significance of these assets by urbanising the rural context and open landscape that was chosen to identify these buildings as holding high status and important communal value. The development would further harm the historic association between the historic assets and land purchased in the 19th century, which provided an opportunity for ornamental grazing and extending the perceived extent of estate ownership towards the horizon.’ The field boundaries in the area to the north of the RPG appear unchanged since at least 1700 and represent historic pasture. Even though they are a later addition to the estate, they were obtained specifically to give the 4th Lord Bolingbroke greater control over these fields and add to the expansive rural setting of his estate. They are crucial to the significance of Lydiard Park and its setting, and not a C19th afterthought as the developer seeks to imply.</p> <p>Looking at local policies, what is immediately apparent is that this application directly conflicts with Wiltshire’s Core Strategy (p.5): ‘Due to the levels of growth being proposed for Swindon through Swindon Borough Council’s emerging Core Strategy there is no longer a need to provide growth on land to the west of Swindon within Wiltshire due to alternative proposals.’ Paragraph 4.15 is also relevant “...Development outside the settlement boundary will be strictly controlled. Relaxation of the boundaries will only be supported where it has been formally reviewed through a subsequent DPD or a community-led neighbourhood plan, which includes a review of the settlement boundary to identify new developable land to help meet the housing and employment needs of that community.’ NPPF para 129 with regard to the significance and setting of a heritage asset is also relevant here. Should this development in any way affect the HLF bid, then it would also be contrary to NPPF para 132 adversely affecting the conservation of a heritage asset, and finally, the application seems directly contrary to NPPF para.134.</p> <p>I was struck when reading the documentation online by the absolutely enormous correspondence from members of the public. No other application I have looked at over the past few years has generated such a</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>huge volume of comments. It speaks volumes about the great regard the local community holds for this designated Country Park. Despite Taylor Wimpey asserting that the neighbouring fields would be gifted to Lydiard Tregoze they have in fact chosen the most sensitive field out of this group to build on, and should the development go ahead, it will set a precedent for other development right up to the boundaries of the RPG at Lydiard Park elsewhere which is a sobering and unwelcome prospect. It was also unclear whether this 'gift' would have any covenants or limitations. The Gardens Trust strongly OBJECTS to this proposal that would clearly harm heritage assets with very strong community value locally. We would be grateful if Wiltshire Council would please notify us of all developments regarding this site so that we may make further comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |
| Marlborough College | Wiltshire | E19/0969 | II | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alteration and refurbishment of three existing adjoining buildings to provide level access to Marlborough College Science Department, including the Grade II Listed Science Block, within the Grade II Listed Park and Garden. Marlborough College, Science Block, Bath Road, Marlborough SN8 1PA EDUCATION</p> | <p>TGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2019</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. A colleague from the Wiltshire Gardens Trust (WGT) has done a site visit and based on this we would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The mound is very close to the back of the small buildings which are proposed for demolition. This will improve the visibility of the mound which is to be welcomed. Should your officers approve this application we would ask that great care is taken during the work to ensure the mound is not damaged. Once complete, in our opinion, this will be a positive change.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> |