



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JUNE 2020

The GT conservation team received 141 new cases in England during June, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 44 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Claverham House	Avon	E20/0110	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing building and construction of a new garage with solar panels to the roof. Claverham House, Streamcross, Claverham. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development, which would affect Claverham House, which is identified on Know Your Place as an unregistered park and garden. 'Other historic parks and gardens' are referred to by Policy CS5 of the North Somerset Council Core Strategy, January 2017. Further information on the garden is contained at:- <a href="https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/claverham-house-yatton">https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/claverham-house-yatton</a> . The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered and unregistered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust are grateful for the further information that it has received regarding the brick wall and the 'Ha Ha' boundary position. Consequently, the Trust has no objection to the proposal in this application. Yours sincerely,

					Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Ashton Court	Avon	E20/0303	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site to provide residential apartments including affordable housing (social rented and shared ownership) across five buildings between 4 - 9 storeys, townhouses, flexible retail/cafe space, public realm, landscaping including ecological mitigation measures, access and associated groundworks. Former Railway Depot, Clanage Road, Bristol.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.06.2020</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust has not been consulted with regards to the above application although it would affect the settings of a Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden, Ashton Court Park; two local historic parks and gardens, Bower Ashton and Greville Smyth Park, and the Sylvia Crowe designed landscape associated with Brunel Way / the Cumberland Basin, <a href="https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/cumberland-basin">https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/cumberland-basin</a>, of which no mention appears to have been made in the application documents. The Gardens Trust [GT] is a Statutory Consultee with regards to such developments. The Avon Gardens Trust 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>Avon Gardens Trust refers to the letter of objection from Historic England dated 4th April 2020 and fully endorses and supports the comments raised therein. The Trust considers that the proposed development, by virtue of its height and massing has the potential to have an adverse impact on the settings of Ashton Court Park, Bower Ashton and Greville Smyth Park, and the Sylvia Crowe designed landscape associated with Brunel Way / the Cumberland Basin, <a href="https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/cumberland-basin">https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/cumberland-basin</a>, of which no mention appears to have been made in the application documents. The Trust supports the view of Historic England that the visualisations of the proposed development which have been provided are inadequate and should have included further views taken from the road to Ashton Court Park from Bower Ashton, from the picnic area adjacent to the courtyard, from the lawns of the mansion ahead of its Southern entrance, and also a view from higher up in the estate, for example above the Summerhouse plantation. Visualisations should also be provided of Viewpoint 1 of Figure 11 and Viewpoint 6 of Figure 15, in order to assess the level of potential harm that could result from the proposed development to heritage assets.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers the proposed development has the potential to cause harm to the settings of a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Ashton Court Park, and the settings of two local historic parks and gardens, Greville Smyth Park and Bower Ashton. Avon Gardens Trust objects to the proposed development as it considers that insufficient</p>

					<p>information has been provided to carry out this assessment in accordance with requirements of paragraphs 189, 193 &amp; 194 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Please ensure that The Gardens Trust and Avon Gardens Trust are notified of the outcome of this application and that in future we are included in any consultations that concern Registered Parks and Gardens in the Avon area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Ros Delany (Dr)  Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Ashton Court	Avon	E20/0318	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed change of use from training centre (Use Class D1) to touring caravan site (Use Class D2), consisting of 62 pitches and associated buildings and works. Police Dog And Horse Training Centre, Clanage Road, Bristol BS3 2JY. CAMPING</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2020</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has been notified about the above application by the Avon Gardens Trust (AGT). In our role as Statutory Consultee, we would have expected Bristol City Council to have notified us about this application. We attach a copy of our Planning Leaflet with guidance for Local Authorities. This new application would affect not only the extensive Green Belt area, but in our opinion, cause unjustified harm to the nationally-significant, Grade II* Registered Ashton Court Park and Garden, the setting of the Grade I registered Ashton Court mansion and stables, the Avon Gorge, the Grade I Clifton Suspension Bridge as well as the setting of two local historic parks and gardens, Greville Smyth Park and Bower Ashton. Our colleagues in the AGT know the site well and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Significance of the Ashton Court Park and Garden as a heritage asset. Ashton Court is an C18/C19 park on an earlier deer park, laid out after designs by Humphry Repton, and formal gardens (late C19) around a former country house. It has national significance as a heritage asset, being on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. Only 28% of registered sites have this high grading, making it “particularly important, of more than special interest.” It also is the setting of the Grade I listed Ashton Court house, which is of “exceptional interest, only 2.5% of listed buildings are Grade I.” [Historic England].</p> <p>The GT/AGT are aware of the previous application in 2016. [No. 16/03774/F] where the application was refused because : ‘The development will harm the designated heritage assets of the Conservation Area and the adjoining registered Park and garden as set out in the Council’s Landscape and Conservation comments. Objections have been raised on the grounds that the proposal will have an adverse effect on the landscape character, Conservation Area and openness of the Green Belt. This is particularly the case on the southern part of the site, from local</p>

					<p>viewpoints. In addition, the development will erode the openness and visual quality of this site which acts as a landscaped buffer to the city to the east. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to conflict with NPPF guidance and policies BCS 22 and DM31 which seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings.”</p> <p>The setting of the Ashton Court park is largely characterised by open, green spaces. However, the unbuilt-on land to the east of Clanage Road is especially significant as it lies between the park and the city of Bristol, and provides open green space as the setting of the park and the foreground of public views of it on rising land behind. The Bower Ashton conservation Area was designated to protect the setting of the park, and the land to the east of Clanage Road (the southern, unbuilt-on part of the Training Centre, plus the sports ground and the allotments to the south) is included in the Conservation Area in order to protect its character and appearance as open green space.</p> <p>It is proposed to use the Police training centre as a touring caravan site, involving the unbuilt-on southern part of it (currently a field and a ménage) being laid out in a grid pattern with all-weather caravan pitches and a service road. The site would be used throughout the year and would be likely to have a high occupancy due to its proximity to the city, and especially if it is a replacement for the extremely popular site on the Docks. It is proposed to remove twelve of the thirty-six trees currently on site and lower the walls and hedging around the entrance to the site. No doubt there will be an entrance sign large enough to be seen by traffic, passing on the approach road. There is one particular photograph in the application, taken from the Suspension Bridge over the Avon Gorge, which clearly indicates this triangle of green grass surrounded by woods. An arrow indicates the position of the site within the green triangle. If this plan goes ahead, there will be a third less trees to screen the view from the bridge, and the green grass so clearly illustrated in the photograph, will be a measured matrix of 62 caravan parking bays, occupied by a variety of caravans.</p> <p>The proposed caravan site itself is located within Flood Zone 3, which means that the site has a high probability of flooding, which we note was one of the reasons not to select the site in 2016.</p> <p>Ashton Court is unusual in celebrating its relationship with Bristol in terms of views over the city as the Smyths wanted to embrace the view from their estate over the city that supported their wealth. Most</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>landowners/estates at the time were much more concerned with privacy and containing/controlling their views. In addition the wonderful 'wedge' of green (mainly trees, but also open fields/parkland) from the Suspension Bridge down to the river on the west of the gorge, is part of the setting and iconic arrival views of Bristol itself, with the Clifton terraces on the opposite side.</p> <p>In summary, the GT/AGT strong OBJECT to the proposed change of use to a touring caravan site of 62 pitches with associated buildings and works.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Reading Tree Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan	Berkshire	E20/0237	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Consultation on Tree Strategy and Biodiversity Action	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed Council strategies affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire, an important part of the history of Reading. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the draft new Reading Tree Strategy.</p> <p>We have read the Tree Strategy with great interest as the Registered Historic Parks and Gardens in Reading and a number of locally historically important parks such as Palmer Park contain a number of trees, in some cases either veteran or ancient trees, which are of considerable value to the Borough. These trees are invaluable in their own right but also in contributing to the history and aesthetic appearance of the Borough. We would like to make the following comments on the Strategy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mention is made of the trees in the Registered Historic Parks and Gardens under 1.6 but we ask that those trees which are located in locally important historic parks and spaces such as Palmer Park, Eldon Square and others are also noted for their contribution to the historic capital of the Borough;</li> <li>2. Overall the role of trees in our historic parks and gardens is under represented within this document. This puts at risk those trees found</li> </ol>

					<p>within the historic parks and gardens, for example in the context of new urban development, despite the existence of policies such as Local Plan Policy EN1;</p> <p>3. The environmental benefits of trees under 1.11 do not include the contribution made by trees to the historic environment. Under 1.12 the document does refer to the value solely under the title of 'aesthetic value'. These trees are often representative of the period that they were planted, of the taste of the time, of the designer's style and the evolution of the park or garden and should be recognised as such;</p> <p>4. We fully support your Part 2 Objectives 1 to 12 but we note the absence of an objective to retain, conserve, enhance and manage and plant trees for their historic value (over and above their aesthetic value), and in particular within the Registered and local historic parks and gardens. We note that Objective 7 is for bio-diversity. A similar objective for historic sites should be added;</p> <p>5. We also welcome the recording of the tree stock as identified in 3.3 but we request that where trees are found within historic parks and gardens that these are further assessed for their group value, and their historic and aesthetic value. A Conservation Management Plan for such sites would ensure the conservation and planning of a robust tree stock in keeping with the character of these sites. The retention and management of mature tree stock is invaluable in meeting the Borough's aims and objectives;</p> <p>6. We welcome the inclusion of objectives and action for ancient and veteran trees. However, although NPPF includes the reference to the cultural and historic value of these trees (your para 3.101) this is not covered in the Strategy. Such trees in historic parks and gardens should as a matter of urgency be recorded and assessed for their environmental and aesthetic value;</p> <p>7. We note that the Action Points specifically refer to achieving a bio-diversity objective but there are no action points which seek to achieve the overall objectives of the Strategy in the context of the historic parks and gardens, with particular reference to Local Plan policy EN1;</p> <p>8. Some areas of poorer canopy cover are in wards that include the Borough's historic parks and gardens. The historic parks and gardens have an important part to play in building up the canopy, using appropriate species as proposed in the Strategy, and this should be identified within the Strategy.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We therefore request that the Strategy is reviewed and amended to ensure that proper regard is had to the trees within the historic parks and gardens and that objectives and actions are put in place to ensure that these trees continue make a positive contribution to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment; and that new planting respects the historic character of the sites, both Registered and of local value.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Bettina Kirkham  Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI  BGT Chair.  cc: The Gardens Trust</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed Council strategies affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire, an important part of the history of Reading. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the draft Reading Bio-diversity Strategy.</p> <p>We have read the Bio-diversity Strategy with great interest and would like to submit a couple of comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under Section 6 you include a list of Designations but the Registered Parks and Gardens are not covered. Many of these have valuable habitats (trees, hedgerows, meadows) which contribute to the bio-diversity of the Borough. We suggest that these should be included and surveyed, assessed and recorded to ensure their continuing survival and contribution to the natural and historic environment;</li> <li>2. Under Section D we request that actions should be identified for both trees and hedgerows as well as the woodlands to meet your objectives. These landscape features are equally important features of the natural and of many historic parks and gardens within the Borough;</li> </ol> <p>We welcome the link with the Reading Tree Strategy but we would like to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>see greater cognition of the role played by many historic parks and gardens in contributing to the bio-diversity of the Borough.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI  BGT Chair.  cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E20/0208	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Proposed conservatory adjoining to the master bedroom. Gayhurst Park, Newport Road, Gayhurst, Newport Pagnell MK16 8LG.  BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and 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. Gayhurst Court (formerly Gayhurst House), a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) is an 18th century landscape park with mid c19 formal gardens around an earlier house. The gardens are attributed to Lancelot Brown c1750-60 with modifications by Repton c. 1793. This application relates to a recent house on the east park boundary near Park Farm. We have studied the online documentation and note the absence of analysis of the effect of the new structure on views from the surrounding registered landscape of Gayhurst Park. The two open faces of the conservatory, with a large proportion of plate glass, are elevated to first floor level and face both the park to the south-west and the important pleasure ground, Digby's Walk, to the north-west. While we are unable to make a site visit at present, from prior knowledge we believe that the park topography rises to the south-west beyond the application site so that the shorter south-west elevation will be largely obscured from the wider park and distant views including relating to the mansion. We are more concerned however, that the longer north-west elevation of the proposed elevated conservatory will be visible from Humphry Repton's early C19 Digby's Walk leading to the river beyond the road, particularly in winter. Views are particularly important on the approach to the impressive Gothick focal tunnel entrance some 150m north-west of the building. This is the highlight of the 800m long pleasure ground walk from the mansion. In this case the ground between the walk to the tunnel and the house/proposed conservatory is less steep and in a dip. It is only possible to judge this effect on site. Should the windows be judged to be significantly visible from the approach to the tunnel, then an acceptable</p>

					<p>mitigation would be to plant screening with appropriate early C19 woody species. This could be done either against the boundary of Digby's Walk, choosing species from the palette already in the walk, particularly yew, or using parkland species present in the park, scattered in parkland style in the open area between the Walk boundary and the building, positioned to ensure adequate filtered screening.</p> <p>In the absence of an objective and rigorous visual impact appraisal of this aspect of these two areas of the designed landscape we object to this proposal. If the council obtains such analysis from the applicant, with suitable mitigation, we would be pleased to reconsider this proposal. If this information is not forthcoming we would urge the Council to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E20/0265	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Prior notification for the proposed erection of a steel portal framed grain store for agricultural use. Park Farm, Filgrave To Gayhurst Road, Tyringham. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (GT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation in relation to the Grade II* Tyringham Registered Park and Garden (RPG). It is unfortunate that there is no historic impact assessment to indicate the level of harm, or otherwise, of the proposal on the adjacent Registered designed landscape. Without such a document or the opportunity for a site visit, it is not possible to assess whether the 10m high building is elevated to be higher than adjacent buildings, and if so from which aspects of Tyringham Park this addition might be visible. Whilst it is situated on the side of the farm away from the core of the Tyringham designed landscape, former avenues and other important features, it is unclear whether it will be visible from areas of Tyringham park or the Grade II Gayhurst Court riverside landscape RPG. The potentially damaging effect is particularly likely within the Tyringham RPG from the north-east section which heads north along the section just east of Long Plantation, as it might be visible.</p> <p>Unless the applicant can demonstrate that the proposal is not significantly visible from the RPG via an objective historic impact assessment, including</p>

					<p>photographs, the GT/BGT object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/0343	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of outbuilding and shed (Part Retrospective). Hygge, Main Street, Dadford, Buckinghamshire MK18 5JY.</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and 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 welcome the native species hedge, aka 'rural interface', shown on the landscaping plan - although the D&amp;A photos demonstrate that it does not effectively conceal the structure which remains clearly visible, but just reduces the impact of the two openings.</p> <p>In our last letter relating to application 20/01120/APP for this building, we said this regarding the doors to the structure : '... the large openings overlook the gateway to Stowe Home Farm and the kitchen garden and are highly damaging to the setting of that entrance. We strongly object to the structure in its present form. To use it as garage in our opinion is certainly not acceptable. The structure appears to be designed as a garage but attests to be a home office and gym. If it is to be used as a home office and gym, the two openings should be reduced in scale to create smaller window openings in order to substantially reduce the amount of reflection and light emittance from the building when in use.' We note that, on comparing the south elevation as shown on PA-05 Rev B dated 12.3.20 (previous application withdrawn) to PA-03 dated 24.6.20 (this application) the two enormous garage door style glazed openings appear to have been removed and replaced with two slimmer full-length vertical openings. We would encourage this change and believe that, combined with the planting plan, this will go some way to mitigate the impact in the landscape. However, we are unable to find any reference or confirmation as to this proposed change anywhere else in the application, and the Design and Access Statement (D&amp;A) still shows the larger openings. Therefore, our position remains the same.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Eaton Hall	Cheshire	E20/0191	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 3m high fencing to the rear boundary, new tarmacadam footpath from the front boundary to the main entrance of the school building and alterations to front boundary to provide new pedestrian gate. The Catholic High School, Old Wrexham Road, Chester CH4 7HS. BOUNDARY, EDUCATION</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The above application has a material impact on the significance of Eaton Hall a historic designed landscape (RPG) which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II*.</p> <p>We write to object to the erection of a 3m high perimeter fencing to the rear boundary, a proposal which if permitted, in our opinion will cause degradation of the historic landscape, landscape character and the southern approach to Chester.</p> <p>We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) who have visited the site. The designated Grade II* landscape encompasses the park and gardens around Eaton Hall and the drives radiating from the property. This proposal impacts upon the north drive, Duke's Drive, which links Eaton Hall with the city of Chester.</p> <p>The significance of Eaton Hall's RPG lies in the continuity of ownership by the Grosvenors since the C15th; a family whose wealth enabled them to engage a succession of eminent landscape designers to develop the grounds. The estate contains probably the greatest concentration of listed buildings in the county. The Grosvenor connections with Chester, their influence and patronage, are part of the city's heritage – a city to which their estate was directly connected by the Duke's Drive. This drive is central to the green corridor of open spaces and woodland forming the southern approach to the heart of the city, the most attractive and verdant entrance to Chester.</p> <p>Duke's Drive, at 5km, is the second longest drive at Eaton. It was laid out by John Webb (1754-1826) who undertook work on the estate between 1802-1806. At Eaton Webb succeeded his mentor William Emes (1729-1803), who designed the landscape park in a style similar to that of Capability Brown. The Tithe maps c1842 and the First Edition Ordnance Survey 1871 show Duke's Drive passing through plantations and narrow tree belts, providing views through the trees to open areas of fields and parkland enclosed by woodland.</p> <p>The designed landscape of Eaton Hall is so extensive and important that it is the only estate meriting its own designation under the Cheshire West and Chester Landscape Strategy 2016, LCT 11 Estate Farmland, 11a Grosvenor Estate. 'The four formal wooded approaches to the Hall in this</p>
------------	----------	----------	-----	---	---

				<p>character area are very conspicuous within the surrounding field system with its low hedgerows. A mix of broadleaves and coniferous with beech, holly, hornbeam, lime, Scots pine and yew, they make up much of the woodland content of this character area. In the northeast the linear woodland along the Chester Approach dominates the edge of the Dee Valley. This area, a local wildlife site with a range of species indicative of older woodland, is managed as a public access area, a reflection of its location on the southern edge of Chester.'</p> <p>The impact of the proposal to erect a 3m high rear boundary fence will cause less than substantial harm to the designed heritage assets of Eaton Park Grade II* and the Curzon Park Conservation Area. However, the harm will come from the creation of definition and separation between features that were part of a single landscape composition, causing a dramatic change in landscape character, degradation to the city's southern approach, and physical damage to the historic planting. The alignment of the fence would subdivide a space which is all used for recreation and where public access has been established over many years. It would involve the loss of the 'soft edge' of long grass, wildflowers and overhanging branches, because the actual boundary (assumed to be the occasional remnants of chain link fence) lies up to 10m beyond the mown grass. This will damage the Local Wildlife Site and impede movement of species between woodland and grassland. The style of fence would increase the sense of urbanisation, destroying the sense of 'natural' landscape that has developed over time, a characteristic valued by local people for its accessibility and rarity within Chester.</p> <p>The applicant has undertaken no pre-application consultation and provides no justification for the proposal. The information submitted is limited. There is no Design and Access statement or Statement of Heritage Impact, and the application therefore fails to comply with NPPF Para 189 : 'local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance ...'. It is also contrary to NPPF Para 194, as there is no 'clear and convincing justification' for loss to the significance of the designated heritage asset which we feel would result from this application.</p> <p>The proposal is also contrary to several Policies within Cheshire West and Chester's Adopted Local Plan 2015 :</p> <p>- SOC 6 Open Space Sport &amp; Recreation – if permitted the proposal would</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>diminish the network of open spaces in south Chester;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ENV2 Landscape – this application would harm local character and distinctiveness as described in the Cheshire West &amp; Chester Landscape Strategy 2015 and as recognised in the Chester West &amp; Chester Green Belt Study;</li> <li>- Policy ENV3 Green Infrastructure – this would be degraded by the proposal</li> <li>- Policy ENV4 Biodiversity and geodiversity – a local wildlife site would be negatively impacted</li> <li>- ENV5 Historic Environment – This proposal does not ‘respect’ or ‘respond positively’ to the designated historic assets of either the RPG or Curzon Park Conservation Area and their settings, or indeed even acknowledge their presence. If permitted this proposal will cause harm to their significance.</li> </ul> <p>There is no explanation or justification for this proposal which will have a detrimental impact on the historic landscape, local amenity and the school environment, making the school feel more like a prison than a place of education.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p> <p>cc – Sue Bartlett, Cheshire Gardens Trust Conservation Co-ordinator  Chris Mayes, Historic England – <a href="mailto:chris.mayes@historicengland.org.uk">chris.mayes@historicengland.org.uk</a>  Razia Daniels – <a href="mailto:Razia.daniels@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk">Razia.daniels@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk</a>  Neil Sullivan – <a href="mailto:neil.sullivan@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk">neil.sullivan@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk</a></p>
Auckland Castle Park	County Durham	E20/0096	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Works to existing structures and grounds within the curtilage of Auckland Castle. Auckland Castle, Market Place, Bishop Auckland DL14 7NR.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2020</b></p> <p>Further to our original response to the above applications on 21st May 2020, we have had email correspondence with Pip Morrison the landscape architect, which has helped us to understand how the history of the site, its views and setting has informed his design work. The GT/NGT feel that the original scheme is broadly acceptable, and due to the sensitivity and experience of Mr Morrison and his willingness to engage, and the likely DCC archaeological condition and the views of its officers, the project is moving forward constructively towards a better-informed end result. As things stand, we do not formally object now to this proposal, but should DCC planning officers not recommend the inclusion of an archaeological</p>

					<p>condition (see below) in any planning permission, and this be approved by Members, the GT and NGT would regrettably have to formally object to the application.</p> <p><b>THE WILDERNESS AND THE WIDER PARKLAND: VIEWS INWARD AND OUTWARD</b></p> <p>The Wilderness is the only element in the proposed landscaping works that is set outside the walled confines of the Castle. It thus plays a role in the wider parkland landscape, especially its specific contribution in framing and softening views outwards from the castle to the park, and views inwards to the castle from the park's drives, paths and vantage points. The full historical investigation of the parkland (development, content, viewpoints, etc) must precede any future TAP landscape plan. That investigation will draw on a number of existing significant, often detailed appraisals and there may be merit in all parties agreeing what those studies are. In this, the GT/NGT are very keen to play a practical and constructive role, not least because local NGT membership includes some who have authored such studies. We welcome both Durham County Council officers' and Pip Morrison's keenness to engage on this topic, trusting TAP officers feel the same. A possible on-site walk, once current restrictions allow, would seem a good place to start.</p> <p>That full study will be lengthy and for the medium term. To inform the present Wilderness proposals requires an element of that wider work to be brought forward now, to ensure that the current size and form of this important group of trees achieves the role for which it was originally planned and planted. This relatively short and focussed study should proceed forthwith to inform, confirm or amend, the final scheme, indeed Pip Morrison has evidently made a start on it. As with the wider parkland study, both the GT and NGT remain keen and available to discuss the brief for such a study. Should such a short study not be forthcoming, both NGT and TGT reserve the right to formally object to the proposals in due course.</p> <p><b>ARCHAEOLOGY</b></p> <p>The GT/NGT welcome the proposed DCC archaeological condition requiring a written scheme of investigation to be agreed with your archaeology team. As we understand it this will set down what The Auckland Project (TAP) will do both before and during the proposed works. There will presumably be a pause after the initial archaeological investigations to see if the design of the scheme needs adjustment in view of the findings. There should be no sense of just going through the motions with the initial</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>investigation and then blindly continuing with the original scheme irrespective of new evidence. The archaeological investigation may well inform, and improve, the scheme, so modifications may need to be made and this possibility should be built into the programme.</p> <p>We very much appreciate being part of the ongoing dialogue.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2020</b></p> <p>Further to our original response to the above applications on 21st May 2020 and second letter of 1st June, the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) would be happy with the application if Pip Morrison's 'parkland views' comments (sent in an email to the GT/NGT) which NGT felt answered our concerns very satisfactorily, could be put into a short report which was accepted as additional information and added to the planning application. We also would need reassurance that DCC planners fully accept the archaeological investigation etc recommended by their archaeology team and that an archaeological condition will be added to the planning officer's recommendation.</p> <p>If these conditions are acceptable the GT/NGT would withdraw our holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Auckland Castle Park	County Durham	E20/0181	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conservation repairs and maintenance to the Robinson Arch. Robinson Arch, Auckland Castle, Market Place, Bishop Auckland DL14 7NR.</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and 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>We have studied the online documentation and clearly this is a fairly major repair, possibly involving complete dismantling and rebuilding of the clock tower over the arch (final methodology to be agreed after further investigation). This may be necessary because of major splitting of stonework by the corrosion iron camps. On completion of the repair the arch will look exactly as now, and there will be no changed impact on the</p>

					<p>parkland.  We are confident that the repairs proposed for the Robinson Arch will have no significant impact on the registered landscape, so welcome this necessary repair work.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Raby Castle	County Durham	E20/0218	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Refurbishment and alterations to Riding School (UID 1121778).  Raby Castle, Raby Park,  Staindrop, Bishop Auckland DL2 3AH. EQUESTRIAN</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and 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. We have studied the online documentation and the NGT is familiar with the site, despite being unable to visit at present, and their local knowledge informs this response. The walled garden, service and farm buildings and estate houses area of the Raby Castle form an island in the extensive parkland that surrounds the medieval castle. Much of this area is well screened by trees but as it is laid out on gently rising ground, the visual impact of buildings and features both bordering and within its boundary can impact upon views from the wider parkland. Designed landscapes, particularly those principally laid out in the C18, put enormous emphasis on the visual impact of views and vistas. With regard to the impact of the proposals seen from the parkland we would not object per se, but we do have some mitigation suggestions in relation to the car parking area, to ensure that it is fully screened at its extremities.</p> <p>The proposals for the conservation and reuse of historic buildings, the creation of the new visitor centre and the overall planting proposals represent a very welcome proposal that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the castle and its landscape. They are potentially attractive proposals that respect their location.</p> <p>However, in one area – archaeological investigation - we feel the overall project lacks information, analysis and investigation, which we suggest needs to be looked at prior to implementation. If this important and outstanding work is not undertaken ahead of implementation, there is the risk of significant heritage loss and thus, despite this scheme’s evident qualities, we would wish to object to the proposals. These concerns are set</p>

					<p>out below. In relation to the site archaeology, we have benefited from the detailed comments of Harry Beamish, chair of The Northumbria Gardens Trust, which we fully endorse. These insightful comments we believe will assist those developing the Raby proposals, and are given in full below (indented italic text).</p> <p><b>SITE ARCHAEOLOGY</b></p> <p>The gardens at Raby Castle were among the finest in County Durham and for some two centuries they were at the forefront of horticultural practice. The legacy of this activity is a complex of surviving elements which reflect this long period of development.</p> <p>While understanding the wish to develop the site for new uses as part of the Raby Rising proposals it would be a great loss for the garden history of the region if the demolitions and alterations on such a scale as proposed were not accompanied by a proper programme of research and understanding of what is to be removed. Despite the almost overwhelming volume of information provided with the application it seems that very little detailed information has been provided on the development history of the gardens, other than in outline, and there is very little information on the survival of features within the gardens and any real detail showing that they have been properly recorded and understood, or will be as part of the project planning. The rapid desk based cultural heritage survey by NAA sets the wider cultural heritage context effectively but is a first step only (as its disclaimer statement points out) and is far from providing a sufficient assessment to decide on significance and make conclusions on the future of those parts of the site which will be lost by development.</p> <p>The walled gardens are not simply an empty box of listed boundaries, which are acknowledged as requiring preservation, but a complex palimpsest. This is acknowledged to an extent by the recognition of curtilage value, but even where they are in decay it is likely that the ancillary structures, described simply as “the rear rooms” and “potting sheds” will retain much information which would enhance knowledge and understanding of form and function and should be fully recorded before demolition or adaptation removes that information forever - these were after all the engine rooms which drove the horticultural excellence displayed in the gardens themselves.</p> <p>The island site was developed in the years after 1755 when Joseph Spence first recommended moving the stables, gardens and service buildings away from the entrance to the castle. Precise dating is uncertain but Carr’s new</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>stables are likely to have been completed by 1770 when the old castle stables were converted to the servants' hall. However, the island site is much older as it overlies the area of the medieval village of Raby which, also on Spence's recommendations, was cleared away after 1755 and eventually relocated to the east at New Raby, completed 1781.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment does begin the process of describing and understanding, providing tantalising glimpses of early plans of the site (presumably from the extensive archive held at Raby) - the Wright/Spence plan [Image 5] appearing particularly interesting (not least as it shows A Nursery for Pines, confirming early pineapple production, indicated by correspondence in 1738 which mentions that 'Mr Baine at Raby Castle is building a stove for pine apples...' ) and potentially useful to any subsequent archaeological study of the standing and potential buried remains, though the 1812 and 1839 plans suggest that the glass layout along the north wall of the walled garden may have evolved in a different form. The 1842 and undated later C19 plans show a further extension of the glass provision. Section 2.2.1 refers to evidence for heating flues in the thickness of the walls. There is also a passing reference (p.38) to "archaeological interest in the redundant heating flues in the south facing wall, as well as the scars in the walls from lost glasshouse structures". This indicates that evidence for early furnace and flued hot wall heating systems survives in the standing fabric, reinforcing the need for proper recording both of the north wall and the shed range behind which may retain evidence for the furnace arrangements and no doubt later circulating hot water heating systems. The buried footings of the glasshouses themselves may well survive on the south side of the north wall. Although the various comings and goings of the central conservatory in the twentieth century are described it seems apparent that the proposed replacement will require substantial below ground disturbance in this area and as this seems to have been the focus for glass provision since the early C18 it is to be hoped that detailed archaeological recording and investigation will accompany the works.</p> <p>A second area of potential high archaeological interest must be the site of the proposed visitor reception building in the former frame yard, rather dismissed in the Heritage Impact Statement [4.2.8] as "always a back house area" but where again there are tantalising references to a "cucumber frame or other glasshouse structure" and a pinery (perhaps that described in the horticultural literature of the day as newly erected in 1868) and that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>“evidence may remain below ground”. HIS 7.1.5 describes “removal of the remaining plinth walls and other base structures to the lost glasshouses and frames”. These production areas were integral with, and vital to the success of any large walled garden and evolved with advancing horticultural techniques, so again if surviving information is not to be lost a full programme of archaeological recording is surely essential. The Raby archive would no doubt provide much valuable additional information on these areas and their management over their long period of use.</p> <p>The High Garden Vinery range, although a later development, represents a second great phase of expansion of the productive garden provision at Raby and is another area where there must be a high potential for survival of information, both in the standing fabric and below ground. The Heritage Impact Statement [4.5.2] mentions “internal divisions, remains of heating stove, fireplace installations and the like” but gives no further detail. Image 82 shows a row of close set corbels internal to the shed range but their function is not described. The Vinery demolition plan provides a further tantalising clue to the survival of significant remains here as it refers to horticultural boilers by the great C19 and C20 regional producer of glasshouses and associated equipment, Richardson &amp; Co. of Darlington and a Richardson’s ventilation winder appears as Image 83 suggesting that they supplied the vinery range too. The boilers are suggested for retention for display purposes (in the cafe) but there is no mention of their context and how they related to the vinery range which they served. Recording of such remains in situ, is again vital if form and function of the vinery range and the “back shed” functions are to be properly understood.</p> <p>Development on the scale proposed at Raby has been seen at other major walled gardens in the region, notably at Alnwick in Northumberland, where a programme of archaeological research, recording and excavation accompanied the developments and has resulted in an excellent publication: ‘Parterres Bright with Flowers’ - A History of the walled gardens at Alnwick Castle as revealed through excavations and standing building survey, by Victoria Ridgeway and Jennifer Proctor [Pre-construct Archaeology Limited 2018]. At Auckland Castle the major developments as part of The Auckland Project have similarly been accompanied by detailed archaeological recording, resulting in a much-improved understanding of the evolution of the walled gardens at that site. Raby have an opportunity here to achieve a similar advance in the understanding of this significant part of the designed landscape and combine documentary research from</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>the archives with recording of the remains on the ground, in line with the stated ambition to “share its rich and varied history with a wider audience”.</p> <p><b>CAR PARKING</b></p> <p>We would agree that the location cannot be questioned, as it is the only real option for an extensive area in this fairly exposed parkland landscape. It will enable visitors to feed into the site from the N, taking advantage of all the essential (but often visually messy) facilities while, ensuring the principal heritage asset, the castle itself, remains totally unaffected. The car parking is on slightly rising ground and so, while there is good existing tree cover for much of the area, there would seem to be potentially unscreened views at the W and SE ends that might mean cars are visible when looking from, respectively, the SW and SE of the parkland. We suggest that the applicant considers bulking up the peripheral tree planting at the ‘ends’ of the parking area? Very little more might be needed at the SE corner, where there is already a copse, but we are concerned that coaches and overspill at the west end might be visible from the path descending from Garrett’s Gothic Seat / Temple to the castle.</p> <p><b>PLAY AREA</b></p> <p>Again, the siting seems sensible if you accept that all such venues now need a play area. Generally, we think if they can be fitted in without physical or visual damage to the historic landscape, they are a bonus for a family day out and the siting here - on plan at least – seems logical. We worry about visibility from the park to the S (as with the car park). The slope is much steeper here, hardly ‘gentle’ as illustrated in the site section in their report, and for a while the timber roofs may rise above the young tree plantation, but in a few years they will hopefully be overtaken by the tree canopies. We would welcome some reassurance regarding the impact of the playground from the wider parkland, and if necessary, some landscaping reassessment.</p> <p><b>VIEWS OUT FROM THE SITE</b></p> <p>Historically, the island site had a ha-ha on all sides bar the eastern entrance side. The justification for this feature is, of course, that on the N, W and S sides there was a peripheral footpath from which to view the wider landscape free of containment by fence or wall. But do we know what were the intended features to be viewed in this vista? The southern path is formalised into a terrace beside the stream and looks to the castle. The northern and western paths run through woodland and while views from</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the former will clearly now be compromised by the car parking, we would welcome some comment on the western footpath. Is this a public route that will still be enjoyed or is it within the private garden areas of the estate houses here (Castle Keeper's, Park and Butler Houses). And what were the intended features in the landscape that were the focal points of the views – are there specific parkland buildings or estate houses out to the west?</p> <p>We would welcome an assurance on the important matter of the site archaeology and hope that both the County Council and Raby Estates will agree on a written scheme of investigation before work commences. Without such assurance, we would regrettably have to object to the application.</p> <p>We would welcome the applicant's comments on the matter of the car parking, play area and westward views out from the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Creedy Park	Devon	E18/1516	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline for the erection of up to 65 dwellings, public open space, ancillary works and associated infrastructure, including access. NGR 282727 100936 Higher Road Crediton Devon RESIDENTIAL OUTCOME Refused</p> <p>APPEAL LODGED 19.02.2020</p> <p>Appeal Ref APP/Y1138/W/19/3242101</p> <p>To be determined on the basis of a hearing</p> <p>Amended 18.06.2020 Appeal to follow the Written Representations procedure</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2020</b></p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust is against the appeal proposals. The appeal affects the heritage assets of Creedy Park, an historic designed landscape included on the Devon Gazetteer of parks and gardens of local historic interest.</p> <p>However, Creedy Park is also of national interest. Devon Gardens Trust asked that the site be should be included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest but Historic England declined to do so but added Creedy Park House with its formal garden features including terracing, balustrades, steps and water features and the Game larder and drying-lawn wall to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest at Grade II in January 2020.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust have asked Historic England to reconsider their decision not to add Creedy Park to the Register and submitted a Register Review Request on 20 March 2020. The assessment of the historic landscape by Historic England was based on a partial inspection of the site which, in the opinion of the Devon Gardens Trust and its historic landscape advisors, may have led the Inspector not to see several important elements of the designed landscape and which may have resulted in the factual errors and lack of understanding of the designed landscape. The Trust is awaiting the results of the Register Review Request.</p>

					<p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations on its behalf in the county of Devon.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust have visited the site of this application and have studied the planning application documents on the Mid Devon District Council web site.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust is against the appeal proposals and would ask the Planning Inspector to consider the following comments:</p> <p>Crediton is a market town retaining historic features and nestling in rolling Devon countryside, its setting, particularly from the east and north is enhanced by three historic designed landscapes. The attractive approach from Exeter along the A377 passes the historic designed landscape of Downes. Set on a ridge overlooking both the River Creedy and River Yeo, Downes is a 17th century country house, remodelled in the 18th century which was the birthplace of Sir Redvers Buller whose family were lords of the manor of Crediton. To the north of Downes lies Shobrooke Park, which is a Grade II Registered park and garden, known until 1845 as Little Fulford, the house was destroyed by fire in 1945, and its replacement sits on the mid C19 terrace constructed for the previous house. To the north west of the application site, and originally adjoining Shobrooke Park to the west, is the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park, situated in a secluded valley between Crediton and Sandford to the north.</p> <p>The three parks were developed over a similar period in the C18 and C19 in the English landscape style with later Victorian elements. A key feature of these parks is their inter-visibility in that they were designed to ‘borrow’ each-others’ landscapes enhancing the vistas within each. The three gentry sites have ‘group value’. The setting of Downes and Shobrooke Park has already been compromised by development in the Lords Meadow area of Crediton. Further development incursion would erode the historic, geographic and social significance of the parks irrespective of its impact on the setting of Crediton itself.</p> <p>Both Creedy Park and Shobrooke Park were laid out with extensive woodland on the perimeter hillsides to provide shelter from the prevailing winds, to screen the houses and parks visually from public view, and in several cases were designed to provide walks and drives with key views, some, like Long Plantation, are still used today. Both estates were developed from deer parks and have extant features of an historic</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>designed landscape: lodges, carriage drives, formal gardens near the house, pleasure grounds with fine specimen trees, open parkland with both specimen and clumps of trees, lakes with a boat house, and walled kitchen gardens. Both estates were designed to share each other's landscapes with designed views. Crediton expanded up the steep hillsides in the 20th century, but did not extend beyond Higher Road, a country lane acting as an 'outer by-pass' to Crediton. The lane is narrow with high Devon banks containing mature oak trees. Higher Road runs along and then just below the ridge of the hill.</p> <p>The application site, which is the subject of the Appeal, is a field approximately 500m long and 65m wide, The land falls from west to east, and is on higher ground than the 20th century houses to the south of Higher Road, as can be seen from the contours on the OS Map.</p> <p>The application site is to the north of Higher Road, which forms the southern border of the site. The northern border is Long Plantation, shown as Ancient Woodland in the Mid Devon Local Plan. The 1869 Estate Map (see Appendix) shows that the Long Plantation with its walks/rides and vistas from the western edge was, and remains, part of historic designed landscape of the Creedy Park estate.</p> <p>The site is not allocated for development in the Mid Devon Local Plan for obvious reasons.</p> <p>To the north east of the application site is the Creedy Park estate , situated in a secluded valley between Crediton and Sandford. The mansion was built in 1846 by William Burn for Colonel H R Ferguson-Davie replacing an earlier house, but was destroyed by fire in 1915 and rebuilt in 1916-21 by Walter Sarel for Arthur Ferguson-Davie. Creedy Park House is now subdivided, it and other parts of the estate are in divided ownership. Creedy Park House with its formal garden features including terracing, balustrades, steps and water features designed by W A Nesfield in around 1850, the Game larder and drying-lawn wall probably dating to the mid-C19 were added to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest at Grade II in January 2020. The East Lodge, West Lodge, and Kerswell are listed Grade II. Rafters and The Stable are listed (Grade II) as Stable (formerly listed as stable Blocks at Creedy Park).</p> <p>Creedy Park House was rebuilt to the designs of the Scottish architect William Burn (1789-1870), who had rebuilt Cliveden in the 1820s. Contemporary commentators noted the 'frequent' alterations to the house, and an 1850 engraving of Creedy Park by J T Wood shows the house</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>much as previously depicted on maps and in illustrations. The formal gardens at the front of the house were laid out by William Andrews Nesfield (1793-1881) who worked regularly with Burn and at that time was at his most influential.</p> <p>Between 1916 and 1921 the house was rebuilt to designs by the London architect Walter Sarel (Henry Walter Molyneux Sarel, 1873-1941) by the contractors Dart &amp; Francis. Nesfield's formal gardens were retained, creating an architectural setting for the new Arts &amp; Crafts house.</p> <p>The mansion was converted into thirteen residential units by Lucas, Roberts &amp; Brown, architects of Exeter c1982. and 15 acres of communal woodland was retained. The remainder of the park was split into different ownerships.</p> <p>Like many estates in the C18, the age of improvement, Creedy Park was laid out in the English landscape style with extensive woodland plantations on the perimeter hillsides, sheltering the house and screening it visually from Crediton to the south and Sandford to the north. The stone boundary walls of the park survive, although in need of repair in places. There were two carriage drives from the East and West Lodges;</p> <p>the principal approach was from the East Lodge but today the approach is along the secondary carriage drive from the West Lodge; the drive from the East Lodge can still be discerned. There is open parkland with specimen trees and small clumps within the park boundary and also beyond the boundary wall of the park to the west, below Long Plantation, that was once part of the estate. The circular rides/walks can still be enjoyed in the boundary plantations. There were vistas from several viewpoints, including the western edge of Long Plantation. There are specimen trees such as veteran sweet chestnut, oaks, pines and Wellingtonia in the parkland and Poundhill Plantation, whilst in the pleasure grounds to the north of the house (The Wilderness/Rookery) there are, for example, oaks (cork, rubra) and a large Cedrus atlantica. There is a further distinct designed area to the west dating from the eighteenth century containing a pool with a former cottage ornée thatched fishing lodge (now Kerswell, listed Grade II). All these features remain today.</p> <p>Polwhele noted in 1793 that it '... is delightfully situated in a large park which is surrounded by a strong wall.' Three years later Revd John Swete visited Creedy and wrote that, 'The situation at Creedy is fine, surrounded by what was a park, but what had been converted by the late baronet, who was a great practical agriculturist, into pasture grounds. The whole</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>consisting of [-] acres he had surrounded by a wall at a vast expense, which rendering the grounds more compact and less liable to being trespassed on did not add to the picturesque; there was not much variety in the disposition of the lawn, and though there was a good deal of timber wood and many clumps dispersed about it, yet there was something in the general appearance, which betrayed neglect or inattention which is not usually met with around seats of similar consequence.’ White (1850) noted that it was, ‘... delightfully situated on the west bank of the River Creedy . . . The mansion, built by the first baronet, has been frequently altered, and has still a modern appearance.’ While Stockdale described it as, ‘... a handsome spacious mansion very delightfully situated on a gentle eminence, in an extensive park about 3 miles in circumference.’</p> <p>In 1852 Lady Davie allowed for Crediton Fancy Fair to be held at Creedy Park House, and it was noted in the press that the beautiful grounds had French, American and English gardens with conservatories, fountains and gardens from designs from the 1851 Great Exhibition.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust disputes the conclusion of ‘The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’ accompanying the planning application for the proposed development of the land at Higher Road, Crediton:</p> <p>“The assessment has shown that landscape impacts would be largely as a result of the addition of built form on the Site. Due to the scale, location and nature of the development it is not considered that this change will result in an important impact on the character of the wider study area or the more sensitive local landscapes such as the Shobrooke Park and Creedy Park to the north and east. Due to these factors, along with the proposed scale of the development, impacts are not considered important at a regional level.”</p> <p>‘The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’ includes a map showing Creedy Park and Shobrooke Park, which is Grade II on the Historic England Register. But the impact of the proposed development on these historic landscapes is not evaluated in the Zones and Visual Influence section of the Assessment, save for a mention of the view from a footpath in Shobrooke Park (Viewpoint 18: Users of permitted footpath on Shobrooke Estate, Figure 2). Long Plantation is visible from the historic carriage drive to Creedy Park and we are concerned that the applicant fails to acknowledge the potential impact on this designed landscape. Photographs taken in January 2019 from the carriage drive in the vicinity of Sandford Cricket</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Club show that the proposed development would be visible through the Long Plantation in winter.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust would draw your attention to the photograph illustrating Viewpoint 14 - Users of PRow Credition Footpath 10. This clearly shows that the existing houses in Higher Road Crediton are on the skyline to the north of Crediton. Therefore, the proposed 65 new houses, being on higher land, would be on the skyline from the other side of the hill looking toward Crediton including when viewed from the carriage drive to Creedy Park, where the development would be seen through the Ancient Woodland of the Long Plantation from November to March/April.</p> <p>We share the concerns of The Woodland Trust about the Long Plantation and would further argue that trees have a limited life and are subject to weather conditions and climate change. The Great Storm of 15-16 October 1987, when hurricane force winds (up to 120mph gusts) decimated huge swathes of woodland across England, having a disastrous impact on many historic designed landscapes across the south of England. This 'once in 200-year' storm was repeated on 25-26 January 1990 which had a more dramatic impact on the south west. Climate change is a factor that must be borne in mind and more major storms must be anticipated. If Long Plantation were to be lost, in whole or in part, the proposed houses at Higher Road would form the skyline to Creedy Park, causing substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets of Creedy Park.</p> <p>Under the National Planning Policy Framework, it is a core planning principle to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations' (para17 NPPF). When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.</p> <p>The application site is not allocated for development in the Mid Devon Local Plan. Part 3 Development Management Policies of the Local Plan, adopted October 2013, states:</p> <p>Development affecting heritage assets Heritage assets and their settings are an irreplaceable resource.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Council will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Apply a presumption in favour of preservation in situ in respect of the most important heritage assets.</li> <li>b) Require development proposals likely to affect heritage assets and their</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>settings, including new buildings, alterations, extensions, changes of use and demolitions, to consider their significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness, and the opportunities to enhance them.</p> <p>c) Only approve proposals that would be likely to substantially harm heritage assets and their settings if substantial public benefit outweighs that harm or the requirements of paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met.</p> <p>d) Where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, that harm will be weighed against any public benefit, including securing optimum viable use.</p> <p>e) Require developers to make a proportionate but systematic assessment of the impact on setting as set down in the guidance from English Heritage: "The Setting of Heritage Assets",</p> <p>5.1 The historic environment is an asset of great cultural, social, economic and environmental value. It contributes significantly to our quality of life and to the character of the district, representing a non-renewable resource that once lost is gone forever. Heritage assets are defined as those parts of the historic environment that have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest over and above their functional utility and covers both designated and non-designated assets.</p> <p>5.4 Proposed development that would lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset will be assessed against national policy, which requires that such proposals should be refused unless there are substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm. NPPF paragraph 195 states that, '... where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.' We consider that the proposals would not constitute substantial public benefit to outweigh the harm to the significance of the setting of Creedy Park. The NPPF defines 'conservation' as the process of managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains, and where appropriate, enhances its significance. The proposed development would considerably harm the significance of the heritage assets and therefore should not be permitted. We would advise that the proposal for the erection of up to 65 dwellings, public open space, ancillary works and associated infrastructure, including access, on land at NGR 282727 100936 Higher Road, Crediton, would harm</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the significance of the heritage asset of the nationally important historic designed landscape of Creedy Park and the setting of the following Grade II listed buildings: Creedy Park House with its formal garden features including terracing, balustrades, steps and water features, the Game larder and drying-lawn wall, East Lodge, West Lodge, Kerswell, Rafters and The Stable.</p> <p>In conclusion, the proposed development would clearly conflict with the policies of the adopted Mid Devon Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to the conservation of the historic environment and therefore we ask the Inspector to dismiss the Appeal.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark, Dipl TP(Dist)(Leeds) Conservation Officer</p>
Mid Devon Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	Devon	E20/0152	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and its Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on your Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document. The Trust congratulates Mid Devon District Council on this excellent document but would ask you to remove the broken green lines with the words CREEDY PARK SETTING, SHOBROOKE PARK SETTING and DOWNES PARK SETTING, from the illustration on page 24 of Volume 2 Designing for Landscape and Built Form, please. We advise that the inclusion of this notation on the plan is inaccurate and misleading. The Gardens Trust is the acknowledged expert on historic parks and gardens. The Devon Gardens Trust works in partnership with the Gardens Trust, formerly the Garden History Society, to ensure that your Council, as the local planning authority, receives authoritative specialist advice on planning and conservation matters regarding historic parks and gardens and their setting.</p> <p>The attractive approach from Exeter along the A377 passes the historic designed landscape of Downes. Set on a ridge overlooking both the River Creedy and River Yeo, Downes is a 17th century country house, remodelled in the 18th century which was the birthplace of Sir Redvers Buller whose family were lords of the manor of Crediton. To the north of Downes lies Shobrooke Park, which is a Grade II Registered park and garden, known until 1845 as Little Fulford, the house was destroyed by fire in 1945, and its replacement sits on the mid C19 terrace constructed for the previous house. To the north west of the application site, and originally adjoining Shobrooke Park to the west, is the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park, situated in a secluded valley between Crediton and Sandford</p>

					<p>to the north.</p> <p>The three parks were developed over a similar period in the C18 and C19 in the English landscape style with later Victorian elements. A key feature of these parks is their inter-visibility in that they were designed to ‘borrow’ each-others’ landscapes enhancing the vistas within each. This group value of three gentry landscapes is unusual and has already been compromised by development in the Lords Meadow area of Crediton. Further development incursion would erode the historic, geographic and social significance of the parks irrespective of its impact on the setting of Crediton itself.</p> <p>Both Creedy Park and Shobrooke Park were laid out with extensive woodland on the perimeter hillsides to provide shelter from the prevailing winds, to screen the houses and parks visually from public view, and in several cases were designed to provide walks and drives with key views, some, like Long Plantation, are still used today.</p> <p>Both estates were developed from deer parks and have extant features of an historic designed landscape: lodges, carriage drives, formal gardens near the house, pleasure grounds with fine specimen trees, open parkland with both specimen and clumps of trees, lakes with a boat house, and walled kitchen gardens. Both estates were designed to share each other’s landscapes with designed views.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust have visited Downes, Shobrooke Park, and Creedy Park and have assessed their setting in considerable detail, and photographs clearly illustrating this are attached.</p> <p>We would draw your attention to The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) by Historic England which states:</p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that the extent of the setting of a heritage asset ‘is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve’ (NPPF, Annex 2: Glossary). All of the following matters may affect considerations of the extent of setting:</p> <p>Extensive heritage assets, such as historic parks and gardens, landscapes and townscapes, can include many heritage assets, historic associations between them and their nested and overlapping settings, as well as having a setting of their own.</p> <p>Many heritage assets have settings that have been designed to enhance their presence and visual interest or to create experiences of drama or surprise. In these special circumstances, these designed settings may be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>regarded as heritage assets in their own right, for instance the designed landscape around a country house. Furthermore they may, themselves, have a wider setting: a park may form the immediate surroundings of a great house, while having its own setting that includes lines-of-sight to more distant heritage assets or natural features beyond the park boundary. Given that the designated area is often restricted to the 'core' elements, such as a formal park, it is important that the extended and remote elements of the design are included in the evaluation of the setting of a designed landscape. Reference is sometimes made to the 'immediate', 'wider' and 'extended' setting of heritage assets, but the terms should not be regarded as having any particular formal meaning. While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary. It can include: land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it land which is not part of the site but which is adjacent and associated with it because it makes an important contribution to the historic character of the site in some other way than by being visible from it, and land which is a detached part of the site and makes an important contribution to its historic character either by being visible from it or in some other way, perhaps by historical association. We would be happy to meet you on site at Shobrooke Park and Creedy Park to further explain why we consider that the broken greenline showing CREEDY PARK SETTING, SHOBROOKE PARK SETTING and DOWNES PARK SETTING should be removed from the illustration on page 24 of Volume 2 Designing for Landscape and Built Form We look forward to hearing from you. Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Westonbirt	Gloucestershire	E20/0254	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a greenhouse at Westonbirt House, Westonbirt, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8QG. GLASSHOUSE	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.06.2020</b> The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning applications that might impact on Listed gardens and parkland, has referred this application to the Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) for comment. Having considered some while ago a very comprehensive Lottery funded</p>

					<p>restoration project, that at that time included the reconstruction of the Victorian greenhouses in the context of the Walled Garden, GGLT is rather surprised to consider this proposal.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the quality and sensitivity of this setting, GGLT is of the opinion that to site this utilitarian greenhouse on a very prominent area of lawn within the full view of the South elevation of Westonbirt House is unfortunate.</p> <p>One assumes that there are functional reasons why this site had been selected. However, although this is a minor and possibly short lived structure; owing to the sensitivity of Westonbirt House and its setting as a heritage asset, GGLT is of the opinion that this utilitarian greenhouse should be sited elsewhere, ideally located within the walled garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Stancombe Park	Gloucestershire	E20/0314	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a ground mount solar array. Stancombe Park, Park Lane, Stancombe, Dursley. SOLAR Miss</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.06.2020</b></p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have impact on Listed or Registered gardens, parks and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>The location selected for the construction of the proposed ground mounted solar array is well screened from wider landscape, and should have little aesthetic impact.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Barnsley House	Gloucestershire	E20/0319	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and extension of existing conference suite into three guest rooms and development of heritage centre at Barnsley House Hotel, Barnsley, Cirencester, Gloucestershire GL7 5EE. HOTEL/HOSPITALITY, VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. This is a joint response from the Gardens Trust and the Gloucestershire Gardens &amp; Landscape Trust.</p> <p>I have a particular interest in this planning application as I am personally very familiar with the gardens at Barnsley, having worked for Rosemary Verey full-time when the garden was at its peak during the late 1980s with the two other full-time gardeners. I did my year's sandwich placement for my horticulture degree there and continued to work for her, on and off for the next 11 years until she died, looking after her private area of the garden when she handed over the rest to her son Charles. I was subsequently allowed access to her private papers by her family for my</p>

					<p>Masters Dissertation on the legacy of Rosemary Verey.</p> <p>It is heartening that Calcot Health and Leisure have taken great trouble to ensure the continuation of Mrs Verey’s legacy, making it the guiding factor in the way they promote Barnsley House hotel. Change to an iconic garden such as this is difficult, and whilst the gardens have inevitably changed considerably since Mrs Verey stopped being in charge, and the planting is now very different, they have done this with a relatively light hand.</p> <p>The conference/cinema conversion to three additional bedroom suites seems perfectly sensible. I can also see the reasoning behind the creation of the Heritage Centre and its placement on the site of the tennis court is suitably discreet. The main vista from it looks out onto the ancient ridge and furrow which the hotel has partially cultivated, which I feel to be a well thought out and attractive addition to the original garden. The Crittal style windows, whilst attractive, are very much the current fashionable look for windows, and I have a slight concern that they will look dated soon, at variance with the timeless appeal of the Grade II* Barnsley house itself and the other listed garden features. I appreciate that this may have been chosen to appeal to the particular clientele they wish to attract, and the Heritage Centre is a more attractive building than the existing conference centre (especially in the glazing), but I cannot help think that when Rosemary Verey added her conservatory, her eye for detail and aesthetic sense, does not entirely tally with that proposed for this new building or the existing conference centre for that matter. The windows for the Heritage Centre would be rather more sympathetic with both the site and R.V.'s aesthetic judgment if made of hardwood. The planting along the east path ‘with a border of locally found hedgerow flowers including primrose, sweet woodruff, wood anemone and English bluebell’ is a nice thought but perhaps better suited to another wilder part of the garden. Her planting palette was for layers of shrubs, perennials and bulbs displayed in a series of seasonal colour sequences – more labour intensive but far truer to her planting ethos.</p> <p>There are minor niggles but since Calcot is going to so much trouble to sustain Mrs Verey’s legacy, they are I think worth pointing out.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Victoria Embankment Gardens	Greater London	E20/0163	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The temporary use of five areas of Watergate Walk for the placing of 42 tables, 168 chairs and two serveries in connection with Gordon's Wine Bar. 47 Villiers Street, London, WC2N 6NE.</p> <p>CATERING</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The online documentation for this application is fairly sparse, and we can appreciate the fine line that needs to be taken between making sure the neighbourhood is not disturbed and catering for tourists (in normal times). Gordon's Wine Bar has long had umbrellas and tables outside which pedestrians walking along Watergate Walk must negotiate. This application promises no hot food cooking, which we would oppose. The Rolfe-Judd Planning Report states that a Heritage Statement by Paul Velluet is one of the Supporting Application Documents and contains the phrase [it] 'will not harm the character of the surrounding conservation areas or the setting of any listed buildings or structures.' This may well be correct but as the Heritage Report is missing from the online documentation, we are unable to check. There is also no Heritage Impact Assessment which would demonstrate what effect in particular the awnings will have on the Grade II* Victoria Embankment Gardens, from where they will certainly be visible. However, as there already lots of buildings on the north-west side of Watergate Walk, this will probably not be an issue. I was unable to find any clear detail on the awnings – no sections, for example, showing how high they would be, we would hope no taller than the umbrellas. There also appears to be no detail as to whether they are fixed to the building in any way or freestanding.</p> <p>We would hope your officers are able to read the missing Heritage Report to satisfy themselves whether this application will be detrimental to the heritage assets including the Registered Victoria Embankment Gardens.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Syon Park	Greater London	E20/0214	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for enclosure of the Coach house with glazing to create a Cafe (Use Class A3) facility including repairs to the existing fabric. COACH HOUSE, SYON HOUSE, SYON PARK,</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and have no objection per se to the use of the Coach House as a café space. However, we consider the</p>

				BRENTFORD TW8 8JF. BUILDING ALTERATION, CATERING	<p>application documents to be incomplete. There is nothing to indicate where the kitchen and toilet facilities are sited; the previous application for this was refused following objections from Historic England about the 'pods' which were to contain these facilities. There is also no Historic Environment Impact which we would have expected as the application site is within a Grade I registered landscape (RPG) which spreads out just the other side of a hedge from the coach house. We would anticipate that a café serving the garden centre would also require extraneous paraphernalia such as external lighting, umbrellas, heaters etc, all of which would be very obvious from the pleasure grounds. There is no indication of what landscaping or mitigation measures might be necessary to minimise any harm to the RPG.</p> <p>Without full documentation to fully explain the proposal, it is not possible to make an informed response. The Gardens Trust therefore would like to put in a holding objection until such time as the missing documents are supplied and we can satisfy ourselves as to the impact of the proposals on the setting and significance of the Grade I RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Canons Park	Greater London	E20/0224	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of existing public car park to provide new residential accommodation (Use Class C3) of 118 units across three 7 storey buildings. Provision of a TfL Cycle Hub (Use Class Sui Generis), and the re-provision of a 60 space public car park and four residential wheelchair accessible parking spaces together with associated access, cycle parking, public realm works and landscaping. Canons Park Station Car Park, Donnefield Avenue, Edgware, HA8 6RL. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>I have looked at the online documentation with some difficulty; your planning website is by far the most awkward to negotiate of all the ones I look at, which I do on a daily basis. The 2013 Harrow Local Plan (see Site H17, commentary Paras 4.44 &amp; 4.45) does allocate the site for development but it suggests 17 houses not 118 flats.</p> <p>Currently the approach to the Grade II registered Canons Park (RPG) via Donnefield Avenue has no housing on the western side and the buildings are set back round greens on the east, giving a spacious feel to the approach to the RPG, and thus its setting and significance. The application site affects the setting of the RPG and the northern part of the proposed development lies within the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area (CA). The height, a 7 storey building, and bulk of the flats will tower over any mature trees, let alone juvenile replacements if necessary, and cause harm</p>

					<p>to the views and setting of the Registered Park, contrary to the NPPF. This is also likely to adversely affect the setting of the Grade I St Lawrence Church which was rebuilt by Chandos as a private family chapel.</p> <p>In our opinion there is too little screening of the flats, most of the trees being along the railway edge, little along Donnefield Road where the flats are sited too close to the road, and none at all where the bulkier northern side of the development abuts the RPG. Such screening as there is relies on those trees on the eastern side of the road being retained.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy and confusion as to the exact reduction in numbers of parking places. The Travel Plan shows 160 spaces down to 60 but elsewhere the stated reduction is 102 car parking spaces, down from 156 to 54. Whichever is correct, it will lead to far more on road parking, especially as this assumes that all commuters will come either on foot, cycle or bus, which seems unrealistic. Until there is an extensive cycle network for commuters to cycle to the station, this will exacerbate an already poor situation.</p> <p>In summary the GT objects to the application. We consider the proposed flats represent an overdevelopment of the site which is out of scale both with the character of the surrounding area with low rise housing, and harms the setting and views of the RPG. It will alter the skyline and bring extra noise, lighting and road traffic, contrary to the guidance in Historic England's GPA Note3.2, Setting of Heritage Assets. We consider the site is more suited to the development agreed in the Local Plan or could be suitable for some flats of perhaps 3 storeys in height, of a more sophisticated design with more screening and with more consideration being given to their siting as regards their effect upon the RPG and the CA. Should your officers decide to approve this application we would hope to see conditions imposed which would benefit the management and upkeep of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2020</b></p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LPGT). The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LPGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk">www.londongardensonline.org.uk</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Canons Park is included as grade II in the HE Register, added in 1998, and contains a number of significant listed structures. The park is principally of significance as the surviving fragment of the great C18th landscape garden laid out for the Duke and Duchess of Chandos. The estate is so-called after the Augustinian canons of St Bartholomew in Smithfield, who owned the Manor of Stanmore in 1086. The estate ad various subsequent owners, notably Sir Thomas Plummer, who is thought to have sought the advice of Humphry Repton on the landscape. The last private owner was Sir Arthur du Cros, for whom formal Arts &amp; Crafts style gardens were laid out by Charles Mallows. The estate was eventually broken up in the early C20th, with part of the land acquired by Harrow Council as a public park and 85 acres sold for The Canons Park Estate which has retained features of the earlier landscape.</p> <p>This application seeks permission for the redevelopment of the existing public car park serving the train station to provide new residential accommodation of 118 units across three 7-storey buildings. Also provision of a TfL cycle hub, and 60 public car park spaces and four residential wheelchair spaces to serve the new development.</p> <p>According to the test dictated by NPPF2019, p196 – any development causing less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset must still have that harm weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The site is presently undeveloped but given the fact there are low-rise maisonnettes already opposite the site and a single house and small lodge adjacent, we can appreciate the precedent for residential development. However, the proposed buildings are significantly higher than anything in existence and will loom over the top of the tree canopy making them highly visible across the historic landscape. Even more so at night the light from high floors will dominate the park landscape and potentially impact on wildlife, especially when added to the large increase in vehicle</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>movements during the day. Overall, the impact of the development on the quiet, historic character of the site will be significant and to some extent harmful.</p> <p>This harm could be mitigated greatly by reducing the height and footprint of the buildings and reducing the number of households and their cumulative needs. In addition, the design of the buildings, their constituent materials, outline and construction are also completely out of keeping with the existing character and again this harm could be ameliorated by more sensitive architecture more responsive and accommodating of the existing surroundings.</p> <p>The LPGT objects to this planning application on the following grounds: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The height, bulk and outline of the proposed buildings will have a harmful impact on the historic character of the park and be visible from many key locations within the park</li> <li>• The loss of the parking spaces serving the station will throw greater parking pressure on the surrounding area and potentially impact on the use of the park</li> <li>• Although we are not averse to a contemporary approach, the design of the proposed buildings is unsympathetic to the surrounding existing architecture and harmful to the present character.</li> </ul> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group planning@londongardenstrust.org c.c. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust c.c. Alison Allighan, Conservation Casework Manager, The Gardens Trust</p>
Ladbroke Estate	Greater London	E20/0243	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of rear lower ground, glazed, timber-framed sliding doors with glazed, metal-framed bifolding doors; alterations to the rear garden layout. 93 Blenheim Crescent, LONDON, W11 2EQ. BUILDING ALTERATION, GARDEN</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and there is no mention that the application affects the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Ladbroke Estate, which comprises 16 mid C19 private communal gardens, together forming the Ladbroke Estate. They were laid out largely to the plan of Thomas Allason in 1823. Works to any of the individual properties</p>

					<p>backing onto the communal gardens needs to be sensitively handled in order not to disrupt the setting and therefore significance of the whole ensemble. We would have liked to have seen a reference to the RPG within either the D&amp;A or Planning Statement, and indeed NPPF Para 189 requires a statement of significance or description of how the application affects the setting of the RPG. This has not been included within the online documentation. The Design and Access statement informs us that the garden of 93 Blenheim Crescent is lower than adjacent properties, and as such, in our opinion the use of solid timber cladding rather than trellis will have the effect of closing off the garden of No 93 in a rather claustrophobic manner. We would prefer that climbers were used on the existing trellis to give more privacy from neighbours. Since there is no photograph of the view from the communal garden into that of No 93 it is difficult to know whether the proposed black Crittal windows will be visible and if they would strike a discordant note.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Primrose Cottage, Hatfield	Hertfords hire	E19/1172	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of three dwellings and formation of new access following demolition of existing dwelling and buildings. Primrose Cottage, Kentish Lane, Brookmans Park, Hatfield AL9 6EE. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p> <p>OUTCOME 06.03.2020 Approved</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The comments we made on the previous application 6/2019/2838/FULL still pertain. We do not have any comments to make on the addition of a basement floor as contained in this application.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Northaw Place, Northaw	Hertfords hire	E20/0253	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of new vehicular access following removal of existing close-boarded fence and erection of post and rail boundary fence and hedge with timber gate. Northaw Place, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NQ. ACCESS/GATES, BOUNDARY</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Garden History Society of which HGT is a member. Northaw Place is on the HGT List of Parks and Gardens of Local Historical Interest and part of the network of historic landscapes in Northaw. The proposal seeks to re-instate the historic approach to the house from Coopers Lane . We have no objection to this proposal and consider that the proposed boundary treatment and wooden access gate are in keeping with the rural character of the area.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>

Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/0284	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion and alterations to openings. The Rowans, 13 Beningfield Drive, London Colney, Hertfordshire AL2 1UJ. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.06.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the conversion of the garage but do have concerns about the increase in size of the windows where the garage door is currently. Napsbury Hospital is a Historic England Registered Park & Garden. The housing laid out in the grounds, now part of the history, has a distinctive character which includes the fenestration on the street facades. We consider that the insertion of these large windows, as opposed to keeping the original size, would destroy this overall character. We would suggest that the window size be retained. Kate Harwood
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/0317	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Screening Opinion - Development of up to 200 dwellings, 50 unit elderly persons accommodation, doctors surgery and open space. Land North West Of Napsbury Park, Off The Drive, London Colney, Hertfordshire.RESIDENTIAL	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2020</b> The area covered by this proposal lies wholly within the Registered parkland of Napsbury Hospital, considered by Historic England of national historic interest. The area was the orchard and farm paddocks and parkland of the Middlesex County Asylum and a key part of the treatment of mental illness at the time. Much of the landscape of the hospital has already been developed but enough remains of this area to understand the historic design and intent. The NPPF (Section 16) states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved and enhanced. This proposal would destroy them. This is also contrary to St Albans DC policy which seeks to protect these landscapes as follows: 'Development which would destroy, damage or adversely affect the character, appearance or setting of an historic landscape, or any of its features, including both designated and undesignated historic parks and gardens, will be refused.' We OBJECT to this proposal as it will destroy an HE Registered landscape. Kare Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
32 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0236	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension. 32 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HQ. BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.06.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments regarding the proposed extension but are concerned that there are no landscaping details for the northern side, abutting the gardens forming part of the original Unwin-type Gateway, a key part of the Arts & Crafts heritage of the town landscape. We would be concerned if the extension is visible in the oblique views across Gateway and a condition on the height of the boundary hedge to protect these

					views is advisable. Kate Harwood
5 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0357	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell a row of Cypress Conifer trees; Fell 1 x Holly tree. 5 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JW. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application, we have no objection to the removal of these conifers. Kate Harwood
15 Pitsfield, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0358	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 1 x Hornbeam Tree by 5%. 15 Pitsfield, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7SJ. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. As only a tree location sketch has been provided online, we are unable to comment on this application Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
6 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0359	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree (T1). 6 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2020</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that the application is to fell one oak tree for subsidence reasons. However, none of the supporting documents listed on the planning application form are online so we are unable to assess the applicant's evidence. We are concerned that a number of applications to fell trees in Densley Close have come forward recently and that the character of this area of the historic Sherrard's Wood is adversely changing. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
East Park, Hull	Humberside	E20/0178	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Reinstatement of East Park paddling pool involving provision of new plant room within enclosed area plus new toilet, office, and concession stand building, plus other works. East Park Splash Pad, Holderness Road, Kingston Upon Hull HU8 8JU. PUBLIC PARK, HYBRID	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2020</b> 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 – in this case East Park, Hull is registered grade II. 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. Our apologies for the slightly late response. As you will know from my e-mail sent on Wednesday 3rd June, we were unable to access the documents on-line but have done so this weekend. East Park is a significant and well-loved park and the largest park in Hull. Designed by Joseph Fox Sharp, the Borough Engineer for Kingston-Upon-Hull and opened in 1887, it is reminiscent of Pearson Park to the north of

					<p>the city and includes a carriage drive around its perimeter. There have been many 20C additions and changes to the park including the addition of land for the boating lake to the north of the park which was presented by the businessman and philanthropist Thomas Ferrens in 1913. Further land was added in the 1920's and although much of the original layout of the park has been retained, parts were adapted during the second half of the 20C.</p> <p>The area of the East Park paddling pool was an irregular shaped pond infilled in the late 1950's and has long been associated with water features. This area has been disused for several years.</p> <p>In general, the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not object to the remodelling of this area however we are disappointed not to find a Design and Access Statement and information about the landscaping in this planning application for one of Hull City Council's important registered historic parks.</p> <p>There should be a landscape/planting plan for this area that includes the existing planting/trees, their treatment during and after the development, and proposals for new planting. This would ensure that the work is well-integrated and sympathetic to the heritage asset which is East Park. We note the Conservation Officer's advice which we support, but would point out that a 'green roof' although a beneficial addition will require some maintenance to keep it in good condition. This includes cutting it back in about July, depending on the season, to reduce the vigour of the grasses and allow sufficient light for any flowering plants to compete with the grasses again the following spring. We also note the Arboricultural Officer's advice which we support.</p> <p>From the lack of documentation regarding the overall landscape for this proposal, it would appear that there may have been insufficient consideration of the exterior of the new buildings, which as shown, will be rather alien to the historic park. We consider in particular that the boarded perimeter of the plant room is unsympathetic and should be softened and integrated by means of evergreen and some deciduous shrub planting. We suggest the following could be used in the overall scheme for the development:</p> <p>Hollies (golden and silver hollies were used in 19C parks), Viburnum tinus, Portugal laurel, Garrya elliptica, Cotoneaster frigidus, Cotoneaster microphyllus, Mahonia aquifolium, Lonicera fragrantissima, Berberis aquifolium, Choisya ternata etc - and historically and aesthetically</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>appropriate plants that were grown in the park.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application but strongly propose that there is careful landscaping and planting to integrate the new work into this historic park and expert advice is sought from you Authority's horticultural/parks officers.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Nevill Holt	Leicestershire	E20/0201	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a haha, Nevill Holt Hall, Paddock Lane, Nevill Holt, Leicestershire. BOUNDARY</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has studied the online documentation and it is apparent that the owner, David Ross, has taken great care during his major 20-year restoration project, to employ the most skilled architects and craftsmen. This has enabled the estate to emerge from the c70 year institutional era which followed its Edwardian heyday under the Cunards.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement (HIA) makes it clear that the view outwards to the south and east from the elevated position of Nevill Holt house and stables has always formed a major element of its setting. Both the Planning Statement (PS) and the HIA concentrated on the impact of the proposed Haha on this crucial setting. Looking at the plans supplied, the Haha follows the contour lines of the land which increases in steepness as the Haha turns northward. The proposed Haha is unlikely to detract from the setting, even if it is slightly visible from the public footpath. We are pleased to note that it will be faced in stone 'in keeping with surrounding materials and vernacular' (PS 6.20). It is appropriate for an historic country estate, and neater than the current barbed wire fence, and certainly better than hedging or other obstructions which would obscure the view and is clearly a pragmatic solution. It cannot be seen when looking outwards from the house and gardens around the theatre and front of Nevill Holt house.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust therefore has no objection to these proposals</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

High Road, Gorleston	Norfolk	E18/1761	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of one single storey detached dwelling and creation of access to High Road. High Road, Gorleston, GREAT YARMOUTH NR31 OPB. RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2020</b></p> <p>On behalf of Norfolk Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust I wish to bring concerns about the above development that was refused by Gt. Yarmouth Borough Council and which is now the subject of an appeal.</p> <p>On the 1st April, 2019 I sent an email for the attention of the planning officer at Gt. Yarmouth Borough Council. You will see that I raised concerns about the development. I trust that you will have a copy of this email on file, a further copy is attached.</p> <p>On Thursday 11 June, 2020 The Gardens Trust alerted me that they had received details of the appeal and asked me to respond as I had done so on 1 April 2019. On further investigation I have information that a previous owner of Koolunga House - a Mr. Eric Parkinson, who died in 1981 had expressed a wish in his will that the house and 1.22 acre garden be presented to the borough of Gt. Yarmouth on condition that the property could be put to some sort of public use. At the time the council rejected the offer and the property was placed on the market. The historical significance of this site and the possible remains of an Augustinian Priory are matters that should be investigated. I also understand that some mature trees dating back to the 1820's, subject to TPO's have been damaged, by poison, each tree could attract a fine of up to £20,000.00.</p> <p>This is serious matter that the Borough Council should investigate as it could be a blatant attempt to remove trees which would stop a successful planning application.</p> <p>Koolunga House and the garden site are in a designated Conservation Area in the heart of Gorleston which provides a haven for flora and fauna and acts very much as a 'green lung' in an otherwise built up area.</p> <p>Norfolk Gardens Trust would be keen to support that this former Georgian Garden and remains of the possible Augustinian Priory be registered with Historic England and offered some form of protection. I therefore urge the planning inspectorate to refuse any development on this important site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Peter Woodrow (Treasurer/ Planning Representative Norfolk Gardens Trust)</p>
Chillingham	Northumb erland	E20/0161	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of replacement building to provide visitor shelter,	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

				<p>shop and reception, new package treatment plant and new access track. Land North Of St Peters Church, Chillingham, Northumberland. HYBRID</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and 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>It is disappointing that the documents supplied by the developer appear to make no mention of the Registered parkland at Chillingham [National Heritage List Entry No.: 1001045]. There is similarly little or no discussion of the evolution of the landscape in this part of the park.</p> <p>The immediate site of the proposed development appears to have been part of an open area (Parcel 94) to the north of the church and east of the Vicarage on the First Edition of the Ordnance Survey 1/2500 plan [Northumberland Old Series Sheet XX.12, surveyed 1860, published 1866]. By the Second Edition O.S. plan of 1897 a building of similar dimension to the existing shelter appears in what is now Parcel 107, with a short path running up to it from the track below. Is this perhaps the origin of the “Bandstand” name? By the Third Edition O.S. plan of the early 1920’s [Northumberland New Series Sheet XXI.4, revised 1922, published 1924] Parcel 107 is shown as mixed woodland, with conifers predominant, but a reduced open area has been maintained in front of the “Bandstand”.</p> <p>A posting by Angus Collingwood-Cameron on the Wild Cattle Association website in May 2019 states that “the plan is for the old bandstand to be completely renovated, incorporating more suitable facilities”.</p> <p><a href="https://chillinghamwildcattle.com/2019/05/new-facilities-at-chillingham-park/">https://chillinghamwildcattle.com/2019/05/new-facilities-at-chillingham-park/</a> The current proposal indicates replacement of the bandstand/shelter. If the building is indeed a late Victorian bandstand (albeit a country version!) as in the Auty Series postcard view, titled Chillingham Shelter, as the Heritage Statement suggests, it would perhaps merit some appropriate recording as a condition of the planning permission, as an interesting survivor of the social history of the Chillingham community? The HE Archive holds an Auty postcard titled “A view looking towards Chillingham Shelter” Ref PC38035 a halftone postcard, postmarked 1907, presumably the same view.</p> <p><a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/photos/item/PC38035">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/photos/item/PC38035</a></p> <p>It appears that the replacement of the existing shelter with an enhanced visitor facilities building and associated improvements to the infrastructure for access and circulation arrangements will be effectively screened by existing woodland from most internal views within the park or external views of the park. The choice of materials should sit well in a rural context.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The GT/NGT support this application as the impact of the proposed enhanced visitor facilities for the Wild Cattle Association are not felt to be likely to have a significant impact on the historic landscape of Chillingham Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cragside	Northumb erland	E20/0251	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent to refix and realign roof slates including some replacement; renew lead work to roof and chimneys; lift ridge and hip tiles and rebed including some replacement; part repointing to external walls; part repointing and rebuilding of chimney stacks including some new stonework; fit new LPG tank and boiler and new flue opening; alter and repair existing electrical system including installation of extract fans. Burnfoot Lodge, Cragside NE65 7XJ. REPAIR/RESTORATION, ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2020</b></p> <p>The above application has been brought to the attention of The Gardens Trust (GT) by Historic England. The GT is a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application, so we would have expected to receive notification from yourselves. 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>Burnfoot Lodge is a former entrance lodge to the Grade I registered garden (RPG) of Cragside. It is apparent from Google Streetview (see below) that the lodge garden is open to view from the B6344, which is the approach to Rothbury and Cragside for a large number of visitors, and that the proposed siting of the new LPG tank would be clearly visible from the road . Despite the fact that the Lodge is quite well tucked away down in the dene and any impact to the Grade I Registered landscape from these proposals would be slight, we would suggest that it would perhaps be better if the tank could be installed as a below ground installation, or at least effectively screened from the roadside view?</p> <p><a href="https://www.google.com/maps/@55.3090373,-1.8907729,3a,75y,8.87h,88.35t/data=!3m7!1e1!3m5!1sC4p_y3SsGWBeCB5ITPes6A!2e0!6s%2F%2Fgeo3.ggpht.com%2Fcbk%3Fpanoid%3DC4p_y3SsGWBeCB5ITPes6A%26output%3Dthumbnail%26cb_client%3Dsearch.revgeo_and_fetch.gps%26thumb%3D2%26w%3D96%26h%3D64%26yaw%3D318.9867%26pitch%3D0%26thumbfov%3D100!7i13312!8i6656">https://www.google.com/maps/@55.3090373,-1.8907729,3a,75y,8.87h,88.35t/data=!3m7!1e1!3m5!1sC4p_y3SsGWBeCB5ITPes6A!2e0!6s%2F%2Fgeo3.ggpht.com%2Fcbk%3Fpanoid%3DC4p_y3SsGWBeCB5ITPes6A%26output%3Dthumbnail%26cb_client%3Dsearch.revgeo_and_fetch.gps%26thumb%3D2%26w%3D96%26h%3D64%26yaw%3D318.9867%26pitch%3D0%26thumbfov%3D100!7i13312!8i6656</a></p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Duncombe Park	North Yorkshire	E20/0051	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for erection of agricultural storage building at</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site</p>

				Duncombe Park, Helmsley. AGRICULTURE	<p>included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens – Duncombe Park (grade I). 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.</p> <p>The designed landscape at Duncombe Park, 1718-30, is internationally significant as a key development in the English natural style which emerged a little later and who’s best known designer was arguably Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown (1716-83).</p> <p>The site of this planning application is in woodland (Spring Bank Wood) across Park Plain to the west of the mansion and within the registered boundary. There will not be any new access and the proposed new building will adjoin the existing Nissen hut on an existing concrete platform. We understand that the Nissen hut dates from the World War II when the park was occupied by the 30th Armoured Brigade. There is woodland to the rear of the proposed site and the area is not visible from Duncombe Park mansion.</p> <p>The documents submitted indicate that the proposal will not have any harmful impact on the registered park or other heritage assets.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Moreby Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0234	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed building consent for conversion and extension of former garage. Moreby Hall, Moreby, Stillingfleet. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Moreby Hall, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above applications, at grade II. 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.</p> <p>This single storey garage probably dating from towards the end of the 19th C is constructed of brick with a part hipped roof and is immediately east/south east of Moreby Hall and its Service Wing. Although unlisted it is within the curtilage of the grade II* listed Moreby Hall and located within</p>

					<p>the grade II registered historic park and garden and within the Green Belt. The Design and Access including Heritage Statement, Section 3, notes that it may have had a storage function or been used for livestock or as a fodder store.</p> <p>Moreby Hall was erected on the site of an earlier house for the Preston family, well-known merchants and bankers from Leeds, in 1828-33. It was only the second country house by renowned architect Anthony Salvin (1799-1881), designed shortly after he had gone to live in London where he worked for many years with his brother-in-law the significant landscape gardener William Andrews Nesfield, and the architects John L Pearson and R Norman Shaw.</p> <p>The garage is highly visible on the approach to Moreby Hall from the current access point as well as along the public road and from within the parkland. The extension will more than double the footprint of the existing building and the design bears no relationship to the existing structure or any part of Moreby Hall. The large area of flat roofing, alien building materials and the odd shaped form of the extension all contribute to harm being caused to this curtilage building as well as upon the significance of Moreby Hall and the parkland. The large area of glass on the south eastern elevation will also result in the structure being highly visible within the parkland and from the public road, the B1222. There will be light pollution from artificial light from inside the building which would draw attention to the structure and during the day there may be reflections from the sun. We are also very concerned that the proposal to create a dwelling will result in additional harm to the setting with a garden area, play equipment, bins, washing lines, boundary treatments and car parking. In our view this is totally unacceptable in the curtilage of a Grade II* listed building and in Grade II parkland.</p> <p>We completely agree with the report from your Authority's Conservation Officer. Regarding Local Plan Policy ENV 24 the conversion and extension would have an adverse effect on the architectural and historic character of the building and its setting, Moreby Hall and its setting and the registered parkland. We do not consider that this full and listed building planning application complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) paragraphs 189, 193, 194, 195, 196.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined we strongly object to these applications for the former garage at Moreby Hall and suggest that the building is repaired to return to a storage or garage function in the future plans for Moreby Hall.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Bestwood Pumping Station	Nottingha mshire	E20/0306	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of two single storey ancillary annexes (one staff annexe and one storage and backup generator annexe) to support the main wedding venue, bar and restaurant on site. Lakeside, Mansfield Road. HOTEL/HOSPITALITY	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.06.2020</b> 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 as per the above application. We would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The application site lies within the grade II registered parkland of Bestwood Pumping Station (List Entry Number: 1001333). This is one of two registered parks associated with Nottingham Waterworks Company pumping stations designed by Thomas Hawksley, which form an internationally significant group. Bestwood pumping station itself is grade II* listed and other components of the site, the walls, estate houses etc are also separately designated as heritage assets. The application is accompanied by a design and access statement that considers the impacts of the proposals on the heritage of the site. The report states that 'the proposed annexes will be located to the west end of the site and will not be visible from the main road'. We would dispute the assertion that it will not be visible from the road and remind the LPA that views from within the designated park are also of very considerable importance. It is clear that the proposed new building will be very visible from many aspects within the site, and cannot be sensitively hidden from view due to the confined nature of the parkland. Regarding the proposed design of the building, the D&A statement suggests 'the proposed annexes are to be contemporary, clearly distinguishable from the historic elements on site and, 'of their time', while at the same time referencing the industrial identity of their context by being designed to look like workshops. They will visibly represent their ancillary function and they will be humble both in scale and materiality, as to not distract from the aesthetic value of the existing buildings and site.' We would again disagree with this statement. Due to the proximity of the proposed building to the grade II* pumping building and its highly visible location within the registered parkland we would have expected a scheme that harmonised with the very distinctive architecture of the site to be a starting point for any proposed new building. There are

					<p>ancillary buildings on the Papplewick Pumping station site (nearby and also by Thomas Hawksley) that demonstrate the type of architecture that should be considered here (see attached photos). The D&amp;A statement provides no indication that any attempt has been made to examine the option of designing the building in the same architectural idiom as the Research - Conserve - Campaign listed buildings on site. There are modern insertions on the site, some associated with the C20th Severn Trent water extraction, all of which demonstrate that poorly considered modern buildings, even of small scale, will cause harm to the setting of the pumping building and the set piece design of the parkland. The GT/NGT disagrees with the approach to the design of the proposed buildings as in our opinion it will not harmonise with the key aesthetic value of the designed parkland, and as a consequence will cause substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Fairmile Hospital	Oxfordshire	E20/0138	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Single storey rear extension and internal alterations to provide new bedroom and en-suite on the ground floor. 3 Reading Road, Cholsey OX10 9HJ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you so much for letting us know about the amendments to the above application further to our original response of 20th May 2020. The revised drawings are now acceptable and we withdraw our holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Henlle Hall	Shropshire	E20/0320	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Use of land part of existing golf course as a static holiday caravan site with associated roads, drainage and ancillary works. Henlle Park Golf Club, Henlle, Gobowen, Shropshire. CAMPING, HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2020</b></p> <p>We have received notification of the above application, which was forwarded to us from the offices of The Gardens Trust (formerly The Garden History Society), on June 26th 2020. The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee in planning matters relating to historic parks and gardens and we are responding on its behalf in this matter.</p> <p>What is now called Henlle Park may have had its origins in a park of the early- to mid-18th century, but was substantially altered and expanded in the later-18th &amp; early-19th century, at the time when the Grade II Listed Henlle Hall, then known as 'Preeshenlle' and afterwards as 'Belmont', was similarly extended and improved.</p> <p>Henlle Park itself is not itself a Registered Parks &amp; Garden within the</p>

					<p>National Heritage List, although it is linked historically and aesthetically to the Grade II Listed Henlle Hall and provides also its principal Setting. Henlle Park is however included on Shropshire Council’s own Historic Environment Record (HER Ref 07629). It was formerly listed in Appendix 2 of the publication ‘Shropshire’s Historic Parks &amp; Gardens’ (1997) as one of the Sites of Local Importance in the County Compendium for Shropshire. It is therefore qualifies as a ‘non-designated heritage asset’ within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, revised 2019), as stated also in the Applicant’s Heritage Statement.</p> <p>We concur with Dr. Stamper’s comments as published on the Shropshire Council planning website and note also the considerable weight of opinion against the proposed development.</p> <p>The Applicant’s Heritage Statement makes three significant errors both of fact and of judgement in its assessment of the likely damage caused by the proposed developments, to the Significance both of Henlle Park and of Henlle Hall.</p> <p>1. First, it appears to suggest (section 4.2) that even from its inception, Henlle Park had little intrinsic interest or significance, as notwithstanding that it ‘...was clearly designed to a plan with feature trees and undulations...’ it nonetheless ‘...did not contain any features, structures or artefacts that has any special interest.[sic]’. It then states that ‘...By the early 20th century the land past [sic] into agricultural use, was sold off and continued in farming in the mid-20th century...Over the 100+ years that it has not been in use as parkland it has changed its character and appearance...’.</p> <p>In fact, the historic map and aerial photography records indicate that surviving areas of Henlle Park are largely unaltered today from their appearance at the end of the 19th century, as attested to also by the many photographs of it on the Henlle Park Golf Club website and by Dr. Stamper’s own comments and report on the park, as recorded on the Shropshire HER.</p> <p>2. Second, the Heritage Statement incorrectly declares that Henlle Park ‘...no longer forms any element of the setting of the [Henlle] Hall’ (para.3.9). As outlined above, the Heritage Statement itself describes the process of design and layout of the park in tandem with that of the Hall, thus establishing the park as the principal element of its Setting. This physical and design relationship remains, even though the park is now in a different ownership to the Hall. Given this incorrect assumption, it is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>unsurprising that the Heritage Statement finds that there will be ‘no harm’ caused to that Setting or to the Significance of Henlle Hall by the proposed development.</p> <p>In our view, the proposed developments will harm the Setting of Henlle Hall itself, and that while the degree of harm will be less than substantial, it will nonetheless be significant.</p> <p>We also disagree with the Applicant’s statement that, as the proposed caravans are ‘temporary structures...’, it would in due course be possible ‘...to restore the site to its current condition’.</p> <p>3. Third, the Heritage Statement similarly finds that the Impact of the proposed development on the Significance of Henlle Hall Park itself will be only Minor (p.17), with no impact at all on its Setting. This is the inevitable consequence of treating the park as though it no longer functionally exists and thus has little or no significance to which harm may be caused. It is also in direct conflict with para.7.4 of the Heritage Statement which states that ‘...the nature and appearance of the application site...will change as a result of the proposed development...’.</p> <p>It is our view that the proposed development will cause physical harm directly to those parkland areas within the proposed development area and that the degree of harm will be considerable.</p> <p>The proposed development will also cause harm to the Significance of those areas of the historic park which will not be directly affected by the proposals, but which form part of its Setting.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is our view that the scale of the proposed development is wholly inappropriate and will cause unacceptable damage both to the fabric of the historic Henlle park itself, to its own Setting and to the Setting of the Grade II Listed Henlle Hall.</p> <p>We therefore strongly object to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Christopher Gallagher for Shropshire Parks &amp; Gardens Trust &amp; The Gardens Trust</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E20/0225	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed construction 2no. Day rooms. Marston View, Marston Bigot, Frome, Somerset BA11 5DB. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p>

					<p>When we responded to the original application (2019/1889/FUL) we commented upon the sparse documentation accompanying the plans and suggested that a Heritage Impact Assessment would be helpful since the site lies within the Grade II registered Marston parkland (RPG). There is still no such report with the online-papers for this 2nd application and even fewer documents than before. One of the reasons given for refusal of the original application in the Decision Notice, Para 1 (DNP1) was the 'harmful impact on the character of the area to include the Historic Park and Garden (Marston Park)'. It is therefore doubly surprising that the applicant has neither tried in this instance to show what impact the day rooms might have on the RPG, or demonstrated any awareness of the problem and possible ways of mitigation.</p> <p>The first reason given for refusal within DNP1 was 'by reason of their excessive size (floor area) and height'. Drawing 2496/1/Rev B states that the buildings have a 'drastically reduced area' of 5m2 – is 5m2 really 'drastic'? It is clear from comparing the drawings from the 1st and 2nd applications for the building plans : respectively 2496/2 dated June 2019, and 2496/2A also dated June 2019, that the only difference is that the kitchen is now 4.5m long as opposed to 5.5m and the bow window has been replaced with a flat window. The roof height has also been reduced by 600mm.</p> <p>In our opinion, the applicant has not shown any understanding of the impact upon the RPG at Marston, and has made only minimal amendments in order to get these plans approved.</p> <p>The GT/SGT therefore still OBJECT to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Henham	Suffolk	E20/0266	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Extension to Existing HaHa. Ilium House, Henham Estate, Henham, Beccles, Suffolk NR34 8AN  BOUNDARY</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The supplied documentation is very sparse. We would have expected to have seen a Heritage Impact Statement and a Design and Access statement with map regressions to enable us to ascertain what impact the proposals may have on the Grade II registered park (RPG) at Henham. Humphry Repton produced a Red Book for Henham in 1791 and the Historic England</p>

					<p>register entry mentions various maps including one by R Nicholson showing the layout of the park in 1699. There is nothing to indicate the purpose of the haha, where Ilium House is in relation to the new haha, and whether it follows the route of a now lost haha. It is not possible to see further details on Google Earth.</p> <p>The application does not comply with the NPPF para 189 as there is no statement of significance or description of how the application affects the setting of the RPG. Whilst we are not opposed to the extension of the haha per se, the documentation is incomplete. Until the applicant supplies the information necessary to fully understand the impact of the proposal we would like to submit a holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Royal Estate Windsor: Windsor Great Park, and Savill Garden & Valley Gardens	Surrey	E20/0247	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed extension to The Savill Building, new Toddlers' Play Garden and new Woodland Walkway. The Savill Building, Wick Lane, Englefield Green TW20 0UU. BUILDING ALTERATION, PLAY AREA, FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Historic Parks and Gardens. The Surrey Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on the GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>It is noted that some aspects of the proposals may be considered as permitted development but it is worthwhile that the full project is presented for comment.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement is extremely thorough and its assessments and conclusions as to significance and impact are broadly accepted. Certainly, for the Studio and Play Area there would be minimal impacts on the historic parks and gardens interests. The Woodland Walkway would be more substantial by its extent, height and complexity of linked units, and be more visible from a number of locations. However, it is accepted that the impact would be very moderate in the wider landscape and with mitigation from the proposed materials and new planting. The location of such an activity in close proximity to the Savill Building and car parks seems sensible.</p> <p>Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Kenilworth Castle	Warwicks hire	E20/0153	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed change of use from</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory</p>

				<p>stables and paddock, to agriculture with new poly tunnel, replacement building to provide farm shop and cafe, new building to provide office and store for social horticultural therapy garden. The Castle Pavilion, Castle Road, Kenilworth. HYBRID Helena Obremski 01926 456531</p>	<p>consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. We wish to object.</p> <p>The existing former sports pavilion, and now disused stables, back immediately onto the earthworks of the Brayes and is therefore adjacent to the boundary defined by HE for the designated Grade II* Kenilworth Castle registered park and garden (RPG). The land on which it sits is part of the Green Belt and forms an open green setting for the RPG.</p> <p>This is the latest of more than a dozen applications since 1990, of which only one, for conversion to stables in 2005, has been granted. We do not consider that any of the elements of this new application provide sufficient justification to reverse the recommendation for refusal which resulted in the withdrawal of the previous application (W19/0059).</p> <p>We do not dispute that the low grade and decayed building is not worthy of retention. The proposed replacement is innocuous in being similar in mass and footprint to the existing, but still needs to be judged in terms of the proposed use as a farm shop. It cannot be a farm shop as it is not a farm. Planning advice suggesting that development to assist in farm diversification should be supported is therefore not relevant here.</p> <p>Castle Farm has long ago been broken apart, with the nearest land being bought by the owners of the residences created in and around the former farm buildings in 2004. The application site, as offered for sale in 2017 is only 2 ha. A farm shop in green belt or a sensitive area such as this can only be justified if it primarily acts as an outlet for the land holding. It is apparent from the submitted drawings that more space in the proposed new building is to be devoted to meat, deli and homewares than to the fruit, vegetables and flowers which are proposed to be grown. In addition, there is to be a café with (presumably in normal times) six tables (24 covers). Even then, it seems unlikely that this smallholding would of itself provide enough produce and flowers (6 apple trees!) to supply the sales area. In terms of value, it seems likely that receipts from the market garden would contribute a minority of the turnover of the business.</p> <p>The application makes much of repeatedly referring to a previous use as a Farm Shop (continually in the Planning Report). This is evidently an attempt to establish that there is a precedent for this use. In fact, the three narrative reports (planning, design and access and heritage) offer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>conflicting information regarding previous uses, all with a large gap in the post-war period. We concur with the use as a clubhouse by Kenilworth Golf Club, which the club itself claims in its on-line history to have been built in 1902 to serve the course which they had occupied since 1889. They moved to their present site in 1937 and nothing is offered about the post-war history apart from a (clearly erroneous) proposed date for the building of c1960 and an indication (also evidently erroneous) that the building was built as a farm shop.</p> <p>Local report has it that the Farm Shop use was for one year only, in 1993, when it was the weighing and paying station for a Pick Your Own Strawberries enterprise. Even if the venture lasted longer than a single year, by 1995 an application for change of use to tearoom indicated that the farm shop was now closed. This demonstrates that the Farm shop use was for a very limited time and relates to a limited season and very much larger landholding.</p> <p>Included in the application, described as indicative concept drawings, there are layouts for the proposed market garden and surrounds of the building. The fact that they are included at all is evidence that similar layouts are proposed. This includes a paved terrace of considerably greater dimensions than shown on the layout plan, including space for seven tables of four, carts to display wares and formal plantings of clipped box, olives, and other shrubs. This assemblage is highly inappropriate for a site in the Green Belt which forms part of the setting for the RPG, and demonstrates a failure to appreciate the significance of the setting. A statement of significance is not included in the application.</p> <p>The areas of surfaced parking and the approach lane from the cattle grid would also be detrimental. It is unclear whether the passing spaces would be sufficient, and whether the roadway would be defined by kerbs or bollards to prevent damage to the grass. Also not mentioned is lighting to both the lane and the building and its surrounds. These are inevitable unless the site is only to be used in summer. All of these would also be detrimental to the setting of the park and to the Green Belt.</p> <p>The polytunnel is a large and incongruous object, which we would prefer not to see. We are unclear whether you have control over this feature, considering that this is only its second year of existence. We have concerns that it would be likely to be joined by others, which would be difficult to resist.</p> <p>As an addition to the offer proposed for the site in the previous</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>application, the current one also proposes to base a Social Horticultural therapy garden. This is to be served by a second building, which though smaller than the replacement of the existing pavilion, is still of significant size. It is evident that the aim of this activity is to bring forward an element of “public benefit” to offset the harm generated by the shop and café. We consider this to be window dressing only, which, if successful, will bring additional activity to the site in addition to a second building.</p> <p>We therefore request that you refuse this application on the grounds of the detrimental impact on the setting of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cowdray House	West Sussex	E20/0137	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 12 treehouses to provide tourism accommodation across 2 woodland sites within the estate (5 x 1 bedroom units at Lodge Wood and 7 x 1 bedroom units at High Field Copse), access and parking, cycle storage, drainage and biodiversity enhancements and woodland management. Cowdray Park, A272 Easebourne St to Heath End Lane, Easebourne, West Sussex. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.06.2020</b> Representatives of SGT have carefully studied the documents submitted with the application and concluded that the proposals will have limited impact on the significance of the Park. For this reason SGT does not object to the application, nor does it specifically support it.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Milton Mount Gardens (Worth Park)	West Sussex	E20/0270	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BUILDING WITH FLAT ROOF TO HOUSE WATER PUMPS TO PROVIDE NEW COLD WATER SERVICES TO MILTON MOUNT BLOCK OF FLATS VIA 2 X VERTICAL PIPEWORK RISERS. MILTON MOUNT, MILTON MOUNT AVENUE, POUND HILL, CRAWLEY. MAINTENANACE/STORAGE/OUTB</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2020</b> Thank you for notifying the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) of the above planning application. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT), a national statutory consultee, and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has also brought this application to our attention. Representatives of SGT know the site well and have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted. The existing tower block is an over dominant and intrusive feature which does not harmonise at all well with the setting of the park. Further ad hoc change such as that proposed here</p>

				BUILDING, ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	can only exacerbate the visual harm caused to the parkland landscape. Ideally, internal installation of the new water supply would be SGT's preferred option. If that is not feasible, while we recognise the benefits to the residents of the tower block, we would encourage the adoption of mitigation measures by way of new planting to lessen the visual intrusion. Please consult us again regarding such changes. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Pittshill and the Manor of Dean	West Sussex	E20/0313	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and repair of Old Laundry Building, alterations to roof on the North Elevation to reform hip end. Manor Of Dean, Dean Lane, Tillington GU28 9AP. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2020</b> Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. The application site lies within the boundary of Pittshill and Manor of Dean, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. Representatives of SGT are familiar with the site and have carefully studied the documents submitted with the application. The Old Laundry is characterful old building which adds to the charm of the garden and without such renovation the building would be lost to the detriment of the garden setting. The proposals appear to have been sympathetically designed and the conclusions on significance included in the documents submitted seems sound. Hence SGT welcomes and supports this application. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E19/1091	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Partial demolition and re-building of	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2020</b> Thank you for reconsulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed

				<p>Forge House including single storey extension to form offices (B1). Former Blacksmiths Workshop, Harewood Estate, Harrogate Road. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Harewood House is registered grade I. 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.</p> <p>Harewood House (listed grade I) was designed by John Carr for Edwin Lascelles in 1759. Home Farm lies to the west of the House and within the registered area. The former Blacksmiths Workshop, known as Forge House, (listed grade II), lies within the eastern section of the Home Farm at Stank, and was also designed by John Carr and in the style of a courtyard farmstead c. 1760.</p> <p>This estate yard is considered to be significant "because it was one of the first of its kind in a country house estate, illustrating not only architectural innovation but also a progressive attitude to the estate workforce". (Tatioglu, T. G., 2010. See ref below.)</p> <p>The adjacent courtyard/quadrangle farmstead to the north-west, designed by Peter Atkinson in the style of John Carr, was a later addition of c.1805. We refer you to our letter of 28th November 2019.</p> <p>The 21st May 2020 drawing indicates that the proposal remains for a large office in similar style and size to that on which we were consulted in November last. The orientation has altered to the new build now being at right angles to the existing building, York paving has been incorporated into the immediate setting, however tarmac remains the proposed surface for the parking bays.</p> <p>Although we note that Forge House is clearly in a very poor state of repair and we would like to support sympathetic proposals that would ensure its repair and long-term use, however despite the 'green roof' of the proposed contemporary extension, we are not convinced that such an extension as proposed is acceptable in this location given the importance of the estate yard at Harewood House.</p> <p>These new plans have not addressed our concerns in respect of the harm to the overall setting and to the significance of the imposing "Tower" building caused by adding an extension, especially as it would again be clearly visible from the historic route immediately to the south, both through the principal south-western entrance and above the southern boundary wall.</p> <p>We wish to stress the historic importance of the Estate Yard where Forge</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>House is sited and where every building is considered to have been designed by John Carr, so creating a unity of its architecture. "The nearness of the joiners, smiths and plumbers allowed for the movement of people, materials and ideas from one workshop to the next." (Tatioglu, T. G., 2010). The proposal would not only result in the loss of this unity of architecture but also create a central barrier between the workshops, which would be totally contrary to the original concept.</p> <p>Our concerns over the proposed new opening onto the main access road, which bounds the historic approach to Harewood House still remain. i.e. We consider it will be prominent and detrimental to the designed views and especially of the "Tower" and the attached archway entrance to Forge House. The proposed wide area of new paving in front of the doorway will augment this harm particularly should it be used to stand refuse bins. We note the roadway is stone cobbled but have concerns over the proposed tarmac for the parking bays, as it is inappropriate for an C18 historic landscape.</p> <p>We trust that your authority's conservation team are advising but we are not convinced that this application meets the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust REF: Tatioglu, T. G., 2010, PhD Thesis, Biographies of People and Place: The Harewood Estate, 1698-1813, University of York.</p>
Oulton Hall	West Yorkshire	E20/0182	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of replacement Pogona cabinet measuring 1230 x 400 x 1032mm with an APM5930 cabinet measuring 640 x 480 x 1200mm and an RFC5906 cabinet measuring 640 x 480 x 1600mm, and ancillary development thereto. Land Adjacent Wakefield Road, Oulton, Leeds. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Oulton Hall is registered grade II. 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.</p> <p>The park and pleasure grounds at Oulton Hall were laid out in part to designs by the nationally important landscape designer Humphrey Repton (1752-1818) in 1809-10 with mid 19C additions by W A Nesfield (1793-</p>

					<p>1881). Repton produced his Red Book for John Blayd of Oulton Hall in 1810. This site of this planning application is east of the Hall (listed grade II) immediately outside the boundary of the registered park near the roundabout on the Wakefield Road. The two drawings indicate that it is to be a modest replacement of one low level piece of telecommunications installation with another. The antenna is already there. The trees to the immediate west of the installation are important in reducing the impact of the antenna and other installations on the registered park and must be maintained. We would like to note that development on the boundary of a registered park and garden can harm the setting of the heritage asset and we are pleased to give advice.</p> <p>We strongly suggest that the new installation is finished in a dark colour. (We note that some of the existing installation is lighter grey and this would be less intrusive in the registered park setting and conservation area if it was a darker colour.) We note that the Steering Committee of the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Forum strongly support the cabinets to be painted black (matt finish) matching the lighting columns in the conservation area. We agree with their proposal.</p> <p>We have no objection to this planning application but trust that our advice is useful and will be incorporated into the development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Lotherton Hall	West Yorkshire	E20/0190	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of replacement drainage system with supplementary rainwater harvesting. Lotherton Hall, Lotherton Lane, Aberford. FLOOD RELIEF/DRAINAGE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the gardens at Lotherton Hall are registered grade II. 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.</p> <p>Lotherton Hall (and estate was bought by the Gascoigne family in 1825 when the house was a modest late Georgian House facing westwards towards the medieval Chapel of St James (listed grade II*). Colonel FRTT Gascoigne and his wife Laura Gwendolen enlarged the house first to the east (1896), then to the west (1903) and with new stables, motor houses</p>

					<p>and drive. Mrs Gascoigne was influential in the extension, design and planting of the gardens probably with advice from Ellen Wilmott (1858-1934) and other significant estate owners and gardeners in the Edwardian period and subsequently. The family presented the Hall, estate and an endowment to the City of Leeds in 1968. Lotherton Hall is a valuable heritage asset, museum and country park much enjoyed by the local and wider community. The village of Lotherton, which was served by the chapel, has been lost but underground archaeology remains along with remnants of medieval ridge and furrow.</p> <p>The existing drainage and soakaway system are no longer fit for purpose and have been giving problems for some time, so we welcome and support this planning application. We were pleased to be invited to meet Richard Kelly, Building Surveyor, Leeds City Council on site on November 5th 2019 and give verbal and written advice.</p> <p>Although the area of the proposed installation is outside the registered park and garden, we are concerned with its setting and that of the historic buildings, any potential effect on the front elevation of the Hall and the gardens there, and any archaeology on the site of the former walled garden now within the Bird Garden. As noted in the Design and Access Statement our main concerns are impact on the trees and archaeology which we understand will be mitigated by the arboricultural investigations and archaeology watching brief. We trust that there will measures in place to carefully repair any damage that accidentally occurs and we support the advice from Historic England.</p> <p>We have no objection to this planning application and hope that the work will give a good outcome.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E20/0193	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Application for removal of part of lawn to form paved area with new planting and widening of existing pathway leading to front entrance. 8 Butterwick, 3 Norwood Drive, Menston. GARDEN	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting High Royds Hospital, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. 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</p>

					<p>consultations.</p> <p>The former mental hospital, High Royds, (listed grade II), is a nationally important example of a Victorian asylum designed in 1884. It was deliberately placed in a rural setting with the grounds laid out in the style of a modified traditional country house estate. High Royds was closed in the early 2000's and converted to residential properties with a significant proportion of the original historic designed landscape remaining. The site of this planning application is one of the original asylum buildings which has been converted into a row of residential properties each with a plat of lawn forming the garden on the south elevation.</p> <p>The proposed works are in two parts: removing an area of lawn 1500x8000 immediately in front of the building and paving it instead, incorporating two 1m square planting areas. Secondly, widening the existing garden path to the front steps.</p> <p>We note the next- door property, No7, has an area of paving immediately in front of the building but as this building is set further back the paving is not so prominent.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposal may be detrimental to the overall landscaping of this row of residential properties. We question the widening of the path, as its present width would be related to the widths of the other paths to the houses in this block; linking them together visually and giving a rhythm of design.</p> <p>Although we understand the applicant wishes to have a patio area, we also question the extent of the proposed paving in front of the house. This would alter the look of the whole block due to its forward position in relation to the other gardens.</p> <p>The landscaping as laid out by the developer appears to have respected the ethos of the grounds, where the airing courts laid out adjacent to the wards were principally lawns. Therefore, we have concerns that this proposal as submitted could lead to yet more harm being caused to the condition of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden, which we understand has "extensive vulnerability problems".</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning  Cc. Charles Smith, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--