



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JULY 2020

The GT conservation team received 191 new cases in England and three in Wales during June, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 60 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Tyntesfield	Avon	E20/0350	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Proposed single-storey rear extension. Watercress Barn, Bristol Road, Wraxall. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development, which would potentially affect the setting of the Tyntesfield Estate and its Grade II* Registered Park & Garden.</p> <p>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>Watercress Barn, a former agricultural building historically might have formed part of the Tyntesfield Estate but given the substantial separation distance to the main estate there is virtually no tangible relationship and limited visual connection with the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Therefore, Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>

Sandleford Priory	Berkshire	E20/0341	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 extra care housing units (Use Class C3) as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150 sq m, B1a up to 200 sq m) and D1 use (up to 500sq m); the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access. Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2020</p> <p>Comments from Berkshire Gardens Trust</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 West Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the most recent planning application for Sandleford Park.</p> <p>With the high volume of documents, and numerous changes to these over the years, we have tried to identify the changes arising, following on from your refusal of the application in 2018. However it may be that we have missed information which would have helped us to understand how this scheme varies from the former, and whether our queries and objections have been addressed.</p> <p>I am aware that we are a bit late in sending in our response and hope that that it can still be considered. For ease of reference I have summarised our latest position below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are pleased to see the omission of the tennis courts and screen planting to the immediate west of the kitchen garden, forming part of the Sandleford Priory Registered Park and Garden, and the new proposals for grass and tree planting as shown on the masterplan; 2. We are also pleased to see that there have been no changes to the housing layout or adjacent the NEAP within the sightline of Sandleford Priory. These proposals were the result of earlier detailed discussions to ensure that the impact on the views from Sandleford Priory were minimised; and only very temporary whilst the proposed tree cover established to the south of the housing and NEAP. We were happy that the photomontages show that this could be achieved. We are pleased to see that the design of the NEAP with natural materials will ensure that there will be no adverse visual impact on views from the Priory; 3. We have raised considerable concerns about the impact on the trees along the path leading off Warren Road. We note that some buildings and playing fields are now shown south of the tree avenue but it is not clear
-------------------	-----------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>whether these important trees are all to be retained (I could not find a plan illustrating the trees to be retained/felled). It is also important that the alignment of the historic path still runs between these trees to avoid damaging the historic context of this route. The masterplan does not make this clear but it does show a path north of the playing fields with no trees along its southern edge. The position here needs to be clarified and the avenue and historic alignment retained;</p> <p>4. Finally, and most importantly, we have consistently raised concerns about the design of the valley crossing. The landscape and historic documents still maintain that this is a reserved matter. However, Appendix F of the Transport Assessment includes an indicative but clear idea of what is intended. This shows a wide highway of 2 x 3m carriageways; 2 x 2m footways; 2 x 3m cycle ways; a central reservation up to 4m wide and land taken to provide the side slopes of 1.33m each side – a total of 15.66 to 19.66m wide. Most of the crossing would now be on an embankment with a short bridge section. This would result in a wholly inappropriate structure of no aesthetic merit, effectively blocking this valley. It would be out of keeping with the historic landscape character of the valley and the detract from the objectives of the Country Park in landscape and heritage terms. We appreciate that a crossing may be needed to serve the western part of the development but a well designed elegant bridge would result in far less harm.</p> <p>Conclusion BGT therefore objects to the current proposals as they stand and requests that the valley crossing indicative proposals are substantially revised to ensure that the historic landscape character of the valley is protected. We also request that further information on the impact(s) on the path access and trees off Warren Road is provided and reassurance given that the path and tree line will be retained.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1719	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of a new Golf Clubhouse and covered golf cart parking located at the Bourbon	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for drawing our attention to the response from the architect to our comments responding to application 20/00695/APP. We note that the response was uploaded to your site 10 days after our comments were</p>

				<p>Playing Fields. Stowe School, Stowe Park, Stowe, Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH. GOLF, EDUCATION</p>	<p>uploaded. However, as the county gardens trusts are run by volunteers and I work only 3 days a week to cover the whole country, we have no time or capacity to make follow up checks on planning applications once we have submitted comments unless we are notified that further information has been forthcoming. This situation has been complicated further by the ongoing pandemic and therefore, can we please make a general request that the Gardens Trust is formally notified if further relevant information or comments have been submitted in response to our comments?</p> <p>With regard to this application, we have read the applicant's response dated 23rd March 2020 to our comments and we note the reference to the Gardens Trust (then the Garden History Society) response to the previous planning application 11/02681/APP which secured planning consent to relocate the golf course from the Western Gardens to the Bourbon and Lamport Fields area. Almost 10 years have passed since that application and, for the Gardens Trust and the Bucks Gardens Trust, our understanding of the significance of Bourbon and Lamport Fields has evolved.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant's approach has evolved with regard to these proposals, and alongside this, within the wider conservation discipline, the Gardens Trust and the Bucks Gardens Trust have an evolving conservation approach when considering applications.</p> <p>With this in mind and, as this is a new application, we considered the detail of this application and the impact the proposals have on the surrounding area with fresh eyes. We referred to the Historic Landscape Analysis & Conservation Plan as prepared by Dr Sarah Rutherford in September 2011 and noted that Dr Rutherford's Landscape Character Policy identified the need to minimise new buildings, to restrict to damaged parts of the C18/19 designed landscape and to minimise the visual impact via sensitive use of scale, materials and screening.</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge and welcome the revised proposals for a smaller and simplified clubhouse, we have reviewed the original Design and Access Statement, in particular the photo montages, and remain concerned that the proposed location of the clubhouse has the potential to damage significantly the character and fabric of the setting of the Bourbon Tower and its immediate surrounds.</p> <p>The applicant states that the main objection to siting the clubhouse 90m north & close to the western shelter belt (south of the existing pavilion) was rejected because of 'safe guarding' issues. However, the primary concern of the Gardens Trust is the protection and conservation of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Registered Park and Garden. Notwithstanding this we are not convinced by the argument for this site being chosen for safeguarding issues when the rest of the school site is as extensive and as wooded as the school grounds at Stowe.</p> <p>With this opportunity to reassess the proposals for a new clubhouse and associated works, we continue to question whether this proposal is the least damaging location for the proposed clubhouse and stand by our comments and objection.</p> <p>If despite our fundamental objection to the siting of this building the planning authority is minded to give consent to these revised proposals, we recommend three mitigation measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mitigate further the visual impact with additional appropriate planting to screen it as far as possible from the wider landscape. 2. Relocate the covered parking for the golf carts to the north side of the clubhouse so they are not visible from the Bourbon Fields therefore simplifying the view. 3. Ensure effective controls on the spread of this complex are applied. <p>Sport facilities inevitably spill further into the landscape, for example as additional equipment storage facilities become required. Any proposals approved by the planning authority must ensure that the provision of further ancillary structures are addressed as part of this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding Stowe School's responses to the comments we made in our letter of 9th July 2020.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) and Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) have already acknowledged that we welcome the reduction in scale of the Golf Club House. Our primary concern remains the protection and conservation of the Registered Park and Garden. Our response is based on research prepared by Dr Sarah Rutherford in September 2011 presented within her Historic Landscape Analysis & Conservation Plan. This identified the need to minimise new buildings, to restrict to them to damaged parts of the C18/19 designed landscape, and to minimise the visual impact via sensitive use of scale, materials and screening. It is the role of the planning authority to address the safeguarding concerns, not the GT/BGT.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>As the AVDC Urban, Landscape and Heritage Officers have accepted the revised proposals responding to their concerns regarding the siting of the proposals, we would just like to ensure that there is a management plan for the tree screen to ensure the long-term mitigation of the impact of these works on the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Finally, any future proposals to expand or increase the number of ancillary structures would be subject to further planning consents, but the GT/BGT remain concerned about the possibility of future requirements for additional sporting equipment storage relating to the golf course. We also feel this has to be the limit of works to this site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stoke Court	Buckinghamshire	E20/0274	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition at the rear and residential conversion of the existing Stoke Court mansion house, and re- development of site to provide 61 residential units and associated access, parking and landscaping. Stoke Court, Rogers Lane, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4LY. RESIDENTIAL Mr Graham Mansfield</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.07.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens) and Bucks Gardens Trust support this application provided that the submitted landscape masterplan restoring elements of the historic designed landscape is rigorously implemented.</p> <p>Sarah Rutherford</p>
Alderley Park	Cheshire	E20/0300	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for residential development (Use Class C3) with associated infrastructure, landscaping and access. Walled Garden and Kitchen Garden, Alderley Park, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4TF. WALLED GARDENS, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.07.2020</p> <p>This application has a material impact on the significance of Alderley Park which is identified in Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030 as a locally listed park and garden and Area of Special County Value within the Green Belt. Cheshire Gardens Trust’s report on Alderley Park was issued to Cheshire East Council in December 2015, and is available from Cheshire Historic Environment Record, Cheshire Record Office and Wilmslow Library. We are concerned that the applicant does not appear to have consulted the report in preparation of this planning application.</p> <p>We write to object to this application, which will have a negative impact on the significance of the historic landscape, landscape character and sense of place.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and its object is</p>

					<p>“To promote the appropriate action for any or all of the following: the restoration, enhancement, preservation, conservation, protection and understanding of designed landscapes that may exist or have existed in and around the pre-1974 historic county of Cheshire.” In furtherance of this objective, we liaise closely with the Gardens Trust regarding planning applications and consultations. For further information we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/ Alderley Park, which became the home of the influential Stanley family, has significance as a medieval deer park set within a designed landscape. Notwithstanding the loss of Alderley House and subsequent development of the site as a science park, the main features and essential character of the historic designed park were retained. The courtyards, gardens and pleasure grounds with their both designated and undesignated heritage assets have undergone change but they remain the heart of the historic site; their sequence and content are all of considerable historic interest, significance and importance in the story of Alderley Park.</p> <p>The walled garden</p> <p>Development of the gardens and pleasure grounds at Alderley Park took place c.1800 (recorded in the Estate Account Book August 1798 - April 1800) about the time that the Congleton Turnpike Road was diverted to the west to allow development of the ‘designed park’ around the Alderley House. The south, east and west boundaries of the walled garden appear to have followed the footprint of the Sandhole Field, with the western boundary wall lying parallel to the old road. The account book records that paving was laid in the walled garden in February 1800. Historic maps and photographs show the formal layout of the walled garden which provided produce for the family and their guests up until the 1930s, and continued in horticultural use under Fred Matthew of S E Matthews Nursery until 1962.</p> <p>Though the walls are no longer heated for glasshouses, and the pineapple pit, vinery, ancient Mulberry tree and dog’s cemetery recalled by Fred Matthews have gone, the garden is significant as a space that supplied the household with fresh produce throughout the year, a vital part of the country house and especially important to a family whose hospitality extended to Prime Minister Asquith and a young Winston Churchill. The kitchen garden walls and historic gateways remain and are part of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>fabric and history of this historic site. The garden, garden walls and route of the adjacent Congleton Turnpike Road, all have the potential to yield archaeological information. The Archaeological Report of 2014 submitted with this application does not mention the road and its relocation c. 1800, which was a significant change enabling the development of the designed park and new gardens around the house.</p> <p>We objected to the Outline Planning Permission 15/5401M and object now to the principle of developing this space for housing, a proposal which would be irreversible and would cause permanent harm to the significance of the walled garden. In a comparable case, Nantwich Walled Garden, where housing development was also proposed, an appeal was brought by the developer against Cheshire East Council regarding reserved matters. In paragraph 15 of her judgement, 16th August 2016, the inspector said: "The walls and the garden they enclose are intrinsically linked, both in visual terms and in terms of their historic function. The garden forms a setting for the listed walls and although presently overgrown, makes a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage asset. The proposed development, which would be L shaped, would have a total length of around 36m and would occupy over half of the length of the present garden. At such it would have a considerable impact on the spatial quality, historic function and appearance of the garden, particularly sited in a central position. Whilst the development has been designed to be lower and thereby less obtrusive than a two-storey development, the building and its impact on the space, would nevertheless be apparent from the adjacent public footpath. In addition, the introduction of a car park, which would also be of significant size, would have an urbanising impact that would detract from the tranquil character of the walled garden. Whilst it is proposed to landscape the remaining area in a Tudor style, it seems to me that this space would be incidental to the residential development and would not adequately mitigate against the loss of the present garden and its significance."</p> <p>Though the details of the case differ and the walls of the walled garden at Nantwich are of higher significance, the principal is the same - the garden forms a setting for the curtilage listed walls.</p> <p>In detail: notwithstanding the 5m stand-off included in the layout, we are concerned at the amount of construction within the walled garden so close to the curtilage listed walls.</p> <p>The north east gateway into the water garden is very cramped by the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>proposed close proximity of the house and garage on Plot 43. The arrangement is awkward and would produce an inappropriate approach to entering the water garden. We are concerned that the proposed plan has had more focus on pattern making than practicality. For example, some of the small, acute angled grass areas would be hard to maintain. Productive fruit trees could have been included. Species chosen for the hedges – Prunus lusitanica for the low 600m hedge and Taxus baccata for the 1.2 m high hedge will be a challenge to maintain at these heights when Prunus lusitanica will happily grow in excess of 3m.</p> <p>We further object to the walled garden application because it does not comply with Cheshire East policy, as follows:</p> <p>SE1 Design</p> <p>Development proposals should make a positive contribution to their surroundings in terms of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sense of place <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Ensuring design solutions achieve a sense of place by protecting and enhancing the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements; ii. Ensuring sensitivity of design in proximity to designated and local heritage assets and their settings iv. Ensuring that proposals are underpinned by character and design assessment commensurate with the scale and complexity of the development; v. Encouraging innovative and creative design solutions that are appropriate to the local context; <p>The proposed development would not contribute to Cheshire East’s unique character and sense of place. The proposed design is neither innovative nor creative, and its response to designated and local heritage assets is superficial. The proposals have not been underpinned by a full assessment of the designed landscape by an appropriately qualified landscape consultant, which would enable a proper understanding of the historic landscape and its significance as required by NPPF 128, and as requested in our earlier objection.</p> <p>Policy SE 4 The Landscape</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The high quality of the built and natural environment is recognised as a significant characteristic of the borough. All development should conserve the landscape character and quality and should where possible, enhance and effectively manage the historic, natural and man-made landscape features that contribute to local distinctiveness of both rural and urban
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>landscapes.</p> <p>2. Development will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Incorporate appropriate landscaping which reflects the character of the area through appropriate design and management; iii. Preserve and promote local distinctiveness and diversity; iv. Protect and / or conserve the historical and ecological qualities of an area; <p>3. In Local Landscape Designation Areas, Cheshire East will seek to conserve and enhance the quality of the landscape and to protect it from development which is likely to have an adverse effect on its character and appearance and setting.</p> <p>The proposed development, if permitted, would not “conserve the landscape character”.</p> <p>Policy SE 7 The Historic Environment</p> <p>1. Cheshire East has an extensive and varied built heritage and historic environment ... The character, quality and diversity of the historic environment will be conserved and enhanced. All new development should seek to avoid harm to heritage assets and make a positive contribution to the character of Cheshire East's historic and built environment, including the setting of assets and where appropriate, the wider historic environment.</p> <p>2. Proposals for development shall be assessed and the historic built environment actively managed in order to contribute to the significance of heritage assets and local distinctiveness.</p> <p>b. Non-Designated Assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Requiring that the impact of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be properly considered, as these are often equally valued by local communities... <p>“The character, quality and diversity of the historic environment” would not “be conserved and enhanced” if this development is permitted. We consider that the harm of the proposed development in the walled garden, not just consideration of the walls, outweighs the benefit of development. Alternative uses for the walled garden have never been fully considered and, five years on from the original application, should be reviewed. Alternative uses would safeguard irreplaceable heritage and potentially make a greater contribution to the quality of the development as a whole and what it has to offer. This would require vision, imagination and a willingness to forego perceived short-term economic benefits.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The Kitchen Garden</p> <p>This area was named “The Kitchen Garden” in the outline application but the name has no historic basis and leads to misunderstanding. Until it was developed as a sports field, the area was part of the southern parkland, a space or buffer between the gardens and the wider estate. While the infilling of this space is regrettable in that the historic spatial arrangement will not be maintained, we do not object to the development of housing as part of the wider project to support the creation of a world class Life Science facility at Alderley Park.</p> <p>We have two areas of concern in relation to the proposed layout and planting. We are concerned that Plot 28 and its associated 1.8m boundary wall would detract from the entrance to the arboretum and obstruct views to it from the pedestrian path beside “Arboretum Walk”. The proposed forest scale trees adjacent to “Arboretum Walk” include Liriodendron tulipifera, Quercus rubra and Castanea sativa which have the potential to be excessively large for the space available. While we appreciate the aspiration to include such trees in the proposals, but there must be consideration of the space available to these species and their future impact on adjacent properties.</p> <p>Management and Maintenance</p> <p>Condition 14 of the outline planning permission required that “a detailed 10 year Landscape & Habitat Management Plan for all areas of the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of any approved landscape works.”</p> <p>Given the nature of the proposed landscaping it is imperative that such a plan is prepared as an integral part of the design process, not as an afterthought, in order to ensure that the necessary management and maintenance costs of the scheme can be met.</p> <p>We are concerned that such a Landscape Management plan for the Water Garden was apparently not included in the application for the apartments sited within the garden. It is essential that management of the Water Garden is properly informed and funded. The same applies to the Arboretum. These are significant but vulnerable historic assets, unique selling points for the site and ones from which the housing developments derive great benefit. We would be grateful to know how these proposed public areas of the historic landscape would be funded and managed.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust strongly believes that the form and layout of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>current proposals contain serious deficiencies. We therefore object to the granting of detailed planning permission for the housing in the walled garden and request consideration of points of concern raised regarding the "Kitchen Garden".</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p> <p>cc. Chris Mayes, Heritage at Risk Officer Historic England Alison Allighan, Conservation Casework Manager, The Gardens Trust Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Cheadle Royal Hospital	Cheshire	E20/0388	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and the development of a new hospice facility including access and landscaping; and Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for a residential development, landscaping and other associated infrastructure. St Anns Hospice, 20 St Anns Road North, Heald Green, Cheadle, Stockport, SK8 3SZ. MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2020</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 Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response concerning the detailed application for a new hospice facility which has a material impact on the significance of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Cheadle Royal Hospital. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>We write to object to the application, which if permitted would result in a) avoidable adverse impact on the west avenue which is part of the registered Cheadle Royal Hospital site (designated 1995) and b) an irreversible adverse impact on the setting of the registered site, through overdevelopment of the western approach. Whilst the applicant considers that the harm to heritage assets is 'less than substantial' this does not take into account the cumulative impact, in combination with previous urban development, on this nationally significant historic landscape, and its wider conservation area.</p> <p>In assessing the application, we have referred to Historic England's Parks and Gardens Register Entry, to historic maps, aerial photos and to application documents including the Heritage Significance and Impact Assessment. It is noted that the application for full planning permission includes, and depends on, the demolition of the existing St Ann's Hospice</p>

					<p>which is shown as a Key Historic Building on the conservation area townscape appraisal plan, linked to the registered site by an area shown as a Key Open Space. Demolition of the existing hospice is one of three options considered, the other two retaining the original building - we are unable to comment on this aspect but any option which reduced the overall footprint of new development would be preferable. There is certainly no objection to the principle of upgrading the hospice facilities. For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org.</p> <p>Impact on the significance of the historic landscape</p> <p>The significance of Cheadle Royal Hospital is based on its survival as an early example of an approach where “the design of the hospital and the surrounding grounds reflects the development of progressive attitudes to the care of people with mental illness; the provision of outdoor space was part of a more humane therapeutic approach” (Heritage Significance and Impact Assessment, March 2020).</p> <p>The Register entry states: “Cheadle Hospital is described in the 1850s (Conolly 1856) as being one of several new asylums where: 'One of the chief of the indirect remedial means of treating mental disease is a cheerful, well-arranged building, in a well-selected situation, with spacious grounds for husbandry, and gardening, and exercise'. As built the hospital had thirty acres of meadow and eleven of arable land, two-and-a-half acres of kitchen garden, and five acres of flower gardens with avenues, shrubberies and gravelled walks. As part of their cure patients were involved with planting and improvements to the grounds, as well as using them for exercise and outdoor amusements including bowls and cricket”.</p> <p>The conservation area includes the registered site and listed hospital as well as St Ann’s Hospice. Section 3.10 of the CA appraisal, in defining the special interest of the CA, refers to the Register of Parks and Gardens and states that “The function and spatial relationship of the grounds to the historic buildings in this conservation area are of special interest”. In section 3.5 the appraisal describes the hospital’s landscape setting, views and vistas stating that: “Views towards the Main Wing from all directions, including the avenue leading from St Ann’s Road, are imposing... The grounds have a quality of tranquillity and unrestricted access and openness...”. The contribution of trees, hedges and green spaces is discussed in section 3.8, including: “All main routes within the hospital</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>grounds are laid out as tree-lined avenues, enhancing vistas of the hospital and grounds and providing a picturesque approach from both east and west”.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (March 2020) describes the site between St Ann’s Hospice and the west avenue as having medium significance for historic interest but it is clear from the evidence provided that development would remove the only surviving remnant of the original farmland that was converted to parkland and pasture as part of the hospital’s farm. The former hedgerow trees, some pre-dating the hospital, and growing in a naturalised area which is very likely to retain original soils and seedbank, would be put at risk. The masterplan shows one high quality category A tree lost to road development (surely unnecessary as the derelict nurses’ home it leads to could be accessed from Oakwater Avenue) and others with much disturbance to their root protection areas. These trees, all with TPOs, currently contribute to the setting of the registered area and conservation area as well as having other values in their own right. Trees along the avenue appear at less risk. They are likely to be younger - their distribution does not reflect that shown on the 1937 OS map - but insufficient information is provided.</p> <p>The Heritage assessment considers that St Ann’s Hospice now makes a low contribution to the significance of the registered landscape but the former farmland/parkland to its south is considered to contribute to the overall setting “for historical, spatial and visual interests”, its “open character and mature trees giving a parkland character setting to the formal designed grounds of the hospital”. The derelict former nurses’ home was built in a ‘country house’ style within this same setting, which would be degraded by the proposed car parking.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>The proposed development would conflict with the objectives of both the Register of Parks and Gardens and conservation area designations in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of open aspect - the CA appraisal is concerned that “Further development in the grounds of Cheadle Royal Hospital may result in the erosion and loss of its special quality, which is the relationship of the hospital to the views and open aspect of the generous landscaped grounds” • Irreversible change in character locally due to loss, risk or degradation of existing features including trees and greenspace of historic as well as
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>potential future value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further intrusion of new built development and car parking in views along the west avenue towards the hospital, particularly in winter, direct impact at the entrance from St Ann’s Road, and possible constraints to future use. <p>The details of the design, as described and illustrated, are also unsatisfactory in relation to the registered area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The western end of the avenue is shown as providing vehicular access to part of the hospice - the widening, signage, kerbing, gate and surfacing involved would have a direct adverse impact on historic character which are unlikely to be acceptable. Further details are needed; • Insufficient attention has been paid to the potential role of the west avenue in its wider context but it is also unclear what its use (if any) could be in relation to access to the registered site itself particularly if cut off by security fencing. It would be unacceptable for any part of the current proposals to constrain future uses; • The west avenue is not treated as a significant feature in its own right as there are only proposals for its northern boundary and from the perspective of the hospice. The proposed hedge could further reduce the width of the avenue which is already narrow. Cross sections are needed to show how the proportions and setting of the avenue would be retained, enhanced and managed, and how the treatment would coordinate with the remainder of the avenue which should be considered as a whole. Proposed hedging or fencing should preferably be located outside root protection areas; • No information is provided on the avenue’s current surfacing, fencing or other built features. The arboriculture report refers to the ‘Lime Avenue’ but has very little information on the trees themselves - species, age, condition details etc are only provided for trees near to St Ann’s Road. No proposals for enhancement are included in the scheme, although ‘enhancement’ is referred to. <p>Policy</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Feb 2019) states in paragraph 184 that ‘heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations’. The NPPF further advises in paragraph 189 that the significance of heritage assets includes “...any contribution made by</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>their setting”.</p> <p>In paragraph 193 the NPPF states that “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”. It is considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on a key axial approach to Cheadle Royal Hospital.</p> <p>Stockport MBC Core Strategy DPD (March 2011) states that: “Development will be expected to make a positive contribution to the protection and/or enhancement of the borough’s heritage assets. Buildings, sites, monuments, places and areas positively identified as having a degree of historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological significance (including canals and other transport infrastructure of historic value) will be safeguarded for the future”. It is not considered that the proposals would safeguard or enhance the remaining heritage of Cheadle Royal Hospital.</p> <p>The proposal conflicts with Stockport Local Plan Policy HC4.1 Development and parks and gardens of historic interest which states that: “Development which would adversely affect the special character and appearance of parks and gardens of historic or landscape interest, or detract from their settings, will not be permitted”.</p> <p>Position</p> <p>The purpose of the existing historic park and garden and conservation area designations is to protect the remaining historic landscape significance of Cheadle Royal Hospital and St Ann’s Hospice. Whatever its merits in other respects, the proposed development is clearly contrary to this purpose.</p> <p>The west avenue within the registered site would become unacceptably squeezed between the new development and existing residential development on Gleneagles Road. Its historic character would be compromised by changes to create a new access to the rear of the proposed hospice, and the future role and use of the remainder is very uncertain. Within the area between St Ann’s Hospice and the west avenue the proposed modern urban development would result in an irreversible change in character, adding to existing business park and residential development to remove the last area of former farmland/parkland associated with Cheadle Royal Hospital. The sense of space which was so important to the original purpose of the hospital, and which is still retained</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>to some extent on the approach from the west, would be reduced and the value of the heritage asset as a whole would be diminished. There appear to be other options for development of St Ann's Hospice which would be less harmful, retaining the 'parkland' as green space for its historic, environmental and potential health and well-being values.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Grosvenor Park	Cheshire	E20/0414	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of one detached dwelling. Redcliffe, 9 Lower Park Road, Chester Cheshire CH4 7BB. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2020</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust was only made aware of this application yesterday by a local contact. Given the visual relationship of the proposed development to Grosvenor Park, Grade II*, we consider that the Gardens Trust in its role as statutory consultee should have been notified. We therefore request that our comments, although submitted late, should be taken into account in determining this application.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust and its object is "To promote the appropriate action for any or all of the following: the restoration, enhancement, preservation, conservation, protection and understanding of designed landscapes that may exist or have existed in and around the pre-1974 historic county of Cheshire." In furtherance of this objective, we liaise closely with the Gardens Trust regarding planning applications and consultations. For further information we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/</p> <p>We write to object to this application which if permitted would have a detrimental impact on the significance of listed buildings and their settings and landscape character of the Queen's Park Conservation Area as; on the Chester City Centre Conservation Area and on Grosvenor Park, registered Grade II* in the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England.</p> <p>The significance of No 7 and No 9 Lower Park Road lie in their ownership and development by the Frost brothers, prominent businessmen in 19th century Chester; the layout of the two gardens as an integrated design by Edward Kemp, Superintendent of Birkenhead Park, and illustrated in his influential book "How to lay out a small garden"; for the originality of the</p>

					<p>design for two modest plots enabling the 'borrowed landscape' of one to contribute to the setting of the other and encompassing a sandstone cliff face of the River Dee; for the "The quality of exterior and interior and their relation to the contemporary garden make this item probably the most complete example of a C19 suburban house in Chester." (Listed building entry); for the survival of original plant material including trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders; for their contribution to the character and quality of the Queen's Park Conservation Area, to views from the Groves and boathouses on the north bank of the River Dee, and to the principal view from Grosvenor Park taken from the belvedere, all of which lie within Chester City Centre Conservation Area; for being an important part of the collection of Kemp's work in Chester which includes Grosvenor Park and the Lead Works.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the changes that have taken place to both No 7 and No 9 Lower Park Road, and to development within the Queen's Park Conservation Area as a whole, these properties retain much of original character and integrity.</p> <p>Our objections are that if permitted the proposal would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have prominence in views from Chester City Conservation Area and Grosvenor Park, being setback from the road but forward of the rear property line and towards the river, and in a style that demands attention and is not subservient or respectful of its locale; • Have a negative impact on views from the belvedere in Grosvenor Park, the principal viewpoint which terminates a main axis and is an important part of Kemp's design; • Not be respectful of the listed buildings or their setting; • Result in loss of space between properties, space which is important to their understanding of Kemp's design and historic character and contains mature planting ; • Lie in immediate proximity to garden features which should be regarded as curtilage listed; • Dominate and obscure views to the mature planting and probably diminish the long term health of adjacent trees, part of the original planting, historic fabric, and covered by Tree Preservation Orders; • Dominate and be situated close to the sandstone cliff edge, a significant feature of the Dee landscape <p>We object to the application because we consider that it does not comply with Cheshire West and Chester policy, as follows:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>ENV 5 Historic Environment CH 5 Conservation Areas CH 6 - Chester key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline DM 3 - Design, character and visual amenity DM 46 - Development in conservation areas DM 47 - Listed buildings DM 48 - Non-designated heritage assets DM 49 - Registered Parks and Gardens and Battlefields Conclusion Cheshire Gardens Trust firmly believes that this development is both damaging and wholly unsuitable in this context. We are not against residential self build, contemporarily designed homes in principle, but in this location as infill between listed buildings within a historic designed landscape and Conservation Area this is totally inappropriate. We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted. Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett cc. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2020 Our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust responded to the above application on 8th July. We were not notified of this by yourselves, hence the very belated response. Due to the lateness of this response we would simply like to fully endorse the comments made by our colleagues and support their object to the application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</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. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2020 The Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust note that Pip Morrison has now submitted a document with the information we asked for. We are happy to withdraw our holding objection to the above application. Best wishes Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Barlborough Hall	Derbyshire	E20/0384	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Detached two storey dwelling.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory</p>

				Land Adjacent 1 Park Street, Barlborough. RESIDENTIAL	<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.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation accompanying this application and are surprised at its inadequacy given that the application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Barlborough Hall. The Design and Access statement makes absolutely no mention of this or indeed its proximity to the Grade II listed lodge, or other listed heritage assets within the setting. The application site lies directly on the other side of a drive to other residential properties behind the Lodge and would sit prominently at a key entrance point to the RPG opposite the Grade II listed lodge. Having looked on Google Maps Street View, the application site reads as open land adjacent to the lodge and as part of the approach to the main park. We would have expected to find a Statement of Significance, a Visual Impact Assessment and certainly some mention as to how the proposed building would affect the setting and significance of the RPG and other listed structures. The applicant's agent does not seem to have understood the implications of submitting an application within an RPG and therefore the application is contrary to NPPG 189 & 190 which requires an applicant to describe the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected and the potential impact of the proposal.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust OBJECTS to this application, which in our opinion will negatively impact the setting and significance of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Knowle	Devon	E19/1461	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Flood alleviation scheme comprising a drainage swale and grassed amphitheatre designed to attenuate surface water runoff and provide a venue for public events at The Knowle, Station Road, Sidmouth, EX10 8HH. FLOOD RELIEF/DRAINAGE, EVENTS	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2020</p> <p>The Knowle Flood alleviation scheme comprising a drainage swale and grassed amphitheatre designed to attenuate surface water runoff and provide a venue for public events</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust were consulted on the planning application for the above as The Knowle is an historic designed landscape included on the Devon Gazetteer of Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is keen to encourage good modern landscape design and supported the planning application. We were pleased to see that the proposal included the removal of the incongruous hard standing performance area and its replacement by the amphitheatre will be a considerable improvement. We welcomed the proposal to plant seven</p>

					<p>semi-mature trees as part of the works and presumed that these would be parkland trees.</p> <p>We suggested that the scheme should be a catalyst to encourage EDDC to take an holistic approach to the future management of The Knowle parkland, including the conservation of the existing trees and a programme for succession replanting of parkland trees. A substantial area of the parkland remains, containing some magnificent trees: Cedar, Wellingtonia and Monterey pine but many are getting well past their natural life span. A copy of the proposed planting plan set out in B2300413-SID-PH2-3500-LT-005 and B2300413- SID-PH2-3500-LT-006 Arboretum. We are concerned that almost all the tree choices proposed are either short-lived or small scale or both. The new planting should be for several generations to come and should be parkland trees such as oak, walnut, chestnut, lime and pines on any drier raised area because the iconic Sidmouth ones are dying out. We welcome the proposal to plant Quercus petrea but suggest that you would consider replacing the other trees with other native species. We would hope that the existing liquidambar could be moved rather than replaced.</p> <p>We have met Ed Dolphin of Sidmouth Arboretum on site. We accept the inclusion of Populus nigra as it is particularly pleasing to some members of the Sidmouth Arboretum who are involved in re-establishing this tree in the valley. We note that he has suggested Taxodium distichum and Thuja plicata as suitable alternatives for the three Alnus glutinosa proposed at the northern end of the scheme. He also suggests Castanea sativa, Quercus robur, and Pinus radiata as alternatives at the southern end of the scheme. However, we understand that the Woodland Trust advise that Castanea sativa is susceptible to fungal diseases.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss the choice of species with you and look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Yours sincerely John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Glen Andred Garden	East Sussex	E20/0271	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION REMOVAL OF EXISTING FRONT EXTENSION AND LARGE GARDEN SHED. NEW SINGLESTOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT INCLUDING GLAZED LINK.	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2020</p> <p>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.</p>

				<p>REBUILDING OF GARDEN WALL ON FORMER ALIGNMENT. LINK DETACHED (GLAZED) SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR. MINOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS. CONYER LODGE, CORSELEY ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9PN. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>The site lies within Glen Andred, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II* designation. The Glen Andred site was extensively researched by Barbara Simms on behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust and Wealden District Council in 2004 and a copy of the report was lodged with the Council at that time. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application and finds these reflect the findings of the report referred to above. The proposals lie within the former kitchen garden and are unlikely to adversely affect the significance of the formal gardens, pleasure grounds or the unique rock garden and dell. However, SGT finds the style of the proposed new extension to be out of keeping with the setting of 19th century kitchen garden in which it would lie. For this reason, SGT objects to the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Buxted Park	East Sussex	E20/0354	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR MEANS OF ACCESS) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR UP TO 39 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS. LAND WEST OF FIVE ASH DOWN ROAD, COOPERS GREEN. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2020</p> <p>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. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application.</p> <p>The site is directly opposite the western entrance of Buxted Park, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II* designation. The mansion, church and the main entrance avenue to the Park are located about 1Km from the development site and would be well screened by extensive woodland. Hence the proposals would not cause any harm on the significance of these parts of the Park.</p> <p>However, the proposals provide for existing scrub planting to be removed and the new houses would be clearly visible from the road, resulting in visual harm to the setting of the Lodge and the Park beyond. For this reason, SGT objects to the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trus</p>

Firle Place	East Sussex	E20/0436	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to wedding (Use Class D1) and filming (Use Class B1) venue together with minor alterations. Riding School, The Street, Firle BN8 6LP. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.202</p> <p>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. Thank you for consulting SGT; the GT has also brought this application to our attention.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully studied the documents submitted with the application. The site lies within the boundary of Firle Place, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>SGT has no objection to the alterations to the riding school /stables or their greater use for events, but is not satisfied with the justification for further increased parking activity in the visually sensitive parkland location immediately in front of the house and its formal gardens. For this reason, SGT objects to the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Thorndon Hall	Essex	E20/0252	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolish attached garage and construct two detached bungalows and create new access. 42 Peartrees, Ingrave, Brentwood, Essex CM13 3RP. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation in relation to the proposal's impact upon the Grade II* Thorndon Hall registered park and garden (RPG). The intensification of built form right on the boundary of the RPG is to be regretted, but with the existing tree cover, the proposal is not considered to affect the setting or significance of the Thorndon Hall RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Manor House, Stansted	Essex	E20/0347	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of outbuilding to 1 no. dwelling. The Manor House, Church Road, Stansted. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2020</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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. Stansted Manor lies within the parkland area associated with Stansted Hall,</p>

					<p>a landscape for which Repton prepared a Red Book, though it was never fully implemented. The park is represented on the county Chapman and André map of 1777, and is readily recognisable on the map today, being enclosed by existing roads. Stansted Manor is included in the Essex Gardens Trust's Inventory of Historic Designed Landscapes in Uttlesford District. This stable building does not lend itself to conversion to a well designed house. Residential development will put further pressure on the remaining character of this parkland landscape, in what is Green Belt. The GT/EGT do not support this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Killigrews, Margaretting	Essex	E20/0443	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of garage and construction of two-storey building for garaging, storage and staff accommodation. Killigrews, Main Road, Margaretting, Ingatestone, Essex CM4 0EZ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2020 Killigrews is a grade II* 18th century house, a remodelling of an earlier one which stands on a moat enclosed by a Tudor brick wall with small turrets at the angles. Around the house on the moat, there is a long-established garden. Outside the moat, there is a walled garden. Killigrews is included in the Essex Gardens Trust's inventory of important gardens and landscapes in Chelmsford City district. This application is for the removal of an outbuilding adjacent the walled garden and its replacement with a similar but taller building providing garaging and service accommodation. The heritage statement's conclusion that the outbuilding is not curtilage listed probably needs review, but nevertheless, the proposed new building should be neutral in its effect on the gardens and site so long sympathetic materials are used, notably roof tiles and bricks.</p> <p>David Andrews Essex Gardens Trust</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0464	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION extension and alterations to existing building and for change of use from parkland to garden. Dairy House, Shortgrove, Newport. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.07.2020 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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The grade II registered landscape at Shortgrove is one of the best Capability Brown landscapes in Essex. It retains parkland with veteran trees, lakes, streams, the Brettingham bridge, a magnificent Georgian grade II* stable, a grade II dovecot, two walled gardens and other walls, glasshouses, an ice house, and other features.</p>

					<p>With the loss of the main house at Shortgrove in 1966, its site and former outbuildings are now in divided ownership, which has seen the development of a number of houses and related infrastructure east of the main north-south drive through the park. The parkland west of this drive is unaffected by development except for the Dairy House and a pair of cottages. The Dairy House is a charming Arts and Crafts building of the early 20th century erected during the Meyer family tenure of the estate. It is probably difficult to argue it is curtilage listed, but there is no doubt it is an undesignated heritage asset. It is part of the historic character of the registered landscape. The proposed extensions would more than double its footprint, and totally alter its appearance, overwhelming the existing building. The change of use of adjacent land to garden would add to the intrusion into the parkland, as it would see driveways, hard-standing for car parking, new boundaries and the ancillary pressures which come with amenity use. It would only add to the incremental suburbanisation of the parkland.</p> <p>In our opinion, within the context of the NPPF, the damage to the heritage assets would be substantial and not balanced by any public benefit. The GT/EGT therefore OBJECTS to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sudeley Castle	Gloucestershire	E20/0334	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 4 detached dwellings with associated landscaping and parking. Land To The Rear Of Sudeley Castle Holiday Cottages, Castle Street. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.07.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impinge on the integrity of Listed or Registered parks, gardens, and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>The primary matter for GGLT's role is to comment on the relationship of this development proposal with the adjacent Grade 11* Registered parkland and gardens. Depending on the final scale, the setting of this development adjacent to the Park is such, that with care given to the proper and necessary management and thickening (see Tree Report) of the tree belt along its eastern and southern boundaries, there should be marginal impact on the visual quality of the Park.</p> <p>However, widening the scope of the Trust's remit by looking at this proposal within the context of the existing settlement edge at this point, and its character in terms of its scale, form and materials; the Trust would express strong reservations. The principle of some development would be</p>

					<p>acceptable; as could its being framed in a contemporary manner, rather than being a vernacular pastiche. However, there would certainly be a preference for a scheme that used a linked grouping of smaller scaled housing; as it is considered that this type of development could fit rather more successfully into the "grain" of the adjacent properties.</p> <p>On a practical matter, one cannot help being nervous about the relationship of development to the pond. Apart from its "gentrification", it might be necessary to incorporate rather more robust provision for its outflow to the Beesmore Brook to cope with exceptional rainfall conditions.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Alderley Grange	Gloucestershire	E20/0348	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed swimming pool. Alderley Grange, Alderley, Wotton-Under-Edge, Gloucestershire. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.07.2020.</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for planning applications that might impact on Listed or Registered gardens, parks and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>This proposal lies just outside the Grade 11 listing for Alderley House and its garden. In principle, the construction of a swimming pool in this location should cause little adverse visual impact on the heritage value and aesthetic integrity of the Grange and its garden.</p> <p>However, one would expect a scheme in this location to be accompanied by information to fully set out the detail of the proposal. Looking at the scheme in more detail, the enclosing "rubblestone wall", part of which is the common boundary to the Statutory Listing, gives little detail of its height and specification.</p> <p>Equally, the planting and hard landscaping to the pool court is sparsely detailed; and one assumes that the adjacent buildings fronting on to the court to the South, will, subject to consent, become the plant and changing rooms. Again this absence of information could materially influence the quality of this scheme</p> <p>Finally, I note that the response from both Heritage England and the District's Specialist Conservation Officer are not available on your website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Daylesford House	Gloucestershire	E20/0517	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Subterranean extension to the</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.07.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for planning applications that may impact on Listed buildings, parks, and gardens, has notified The</p>

				<p>lower ground floor level to provide additional leisure facilities at Daylesford House Daylesford Adlestrop Moreton-In-Marsh Gloucestershire. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Having considered this very detailed Application, and applauded its engineering complexity; the impact of these extensive works on completion would result in a negligible impact on both the Listed Building and its setting. Therefore, GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment on this proposal. Yours sincerely, David Ball,(on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Canons Park	Greater London	E20/0286	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of additional floor to create 8 flats (8 x 1 bed); Parking and cycle storage; refuse Storage. 1-20 Cannons Park close, donnefield Avenue, Edgware HA8 6RJ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.07.2020 I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Parks & 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 affecting sites included in the Historic England 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 www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). 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 had 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 & 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. This application seeks permission for the creation of an additional floor to</p>

					<p>create 8 flats (8 x 1 bed); parking & cycle storage; refuse storage</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 present low-rise maisonnettes are an attractive low-rise group which although still somewhat incongruous, have been in situ for many years and are well-balanced and well-detailed.</p> <p>However, the proposed additional floor would result in a significant increase in height and bulk from the present building and it would be highly visible across the historic landscape. Even more so at night the light from the ‘penthouse’ high floors will dominate the park landscape and potentially impact on wildlife, especially when added to the large increase in vehicle movements during the day. The detrimental impact of the development on the present character of the site and attractiveness of the building will be significant and harmful. In addition to this, the knock-on impact of an additional 8 units on this site and their increased need for parking, waste disposal, storage and private amenity space show that this is an overdevelopment of this unique site.</p> <p>The LPGT objects to this planning application on the following grounds: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The height, bulk and outline of the proposed buildings will have a harmful impact on the historic character of the park and would become too dominant from many key locations within the park. • The proposed design of the additional units undermines the coherent design and detailing of the original building. • The imposition of an additional 8 units will cause unacceptable additional pressure on the amenity of the existing original units and parking and waste storage and disposal <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer For and on behalf of the Planning & 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>
Hyde Park	Greater London	E20/0330	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Use of an area of Hyde Park for the Christmas event 'Winter	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT)</p>

			<p>Wonderland' including an outdoor ice rink, fairground rides and market stalls for a temporary period between Thursday 19th November 2020 to Sunday 3rd January 2021. (Set up and site clearance between 1st November 2020 to 15th January 2021). Hyde Park, Serpentine Road, London, W2 2UH. VISITOR ATTRACTION</p> <p>OUTCOME 28.07.2020 Permission granted</p>	<p>formerly known as the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT 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 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 https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Hyde Park is listed on the Historic England National Register as Grade I (Grid ref:TQ270802 (527058,180308). It covers approx. 140 hectares. It lies within the Hyde Park Conservation Area and is also designated Metropolitan Open Land and as a nature conservation area of metropolitan importance. More Information on the history of the site can be found here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=WST046&sitename=Hyde%20Park%2C%20including%20Hyde%20Park%20Corner%20%2A</p> <p>Hyde Park was enclosed by Henry VIII as a royal deer park in the C16th and continued to be used as such in the C17th. It was first opened to the public in 1637. It was landscaped in c.1730 when two lakes were formed, the Serpentine and Long Water. Originally c.248 hectares, the site dwindled to c.138 hectares partly through the development of Kensington Gardens to the west. From 1820s subsequent landscape improvements were undertaken by Decimus Burton.</p> <p>This planning application is for a substantial area of Hyde Park for the Christmas event 'Winter Wonderland' including an outdoor ice rink, fairground rides and market stalls for a temporary period between Thursday 19th November 2020 to Sunday 3rd January 2021. (Set up and site clearance between 1st November 2020 to 15th January 2021). It is classed as a temporary visitor attraction although it has been recurring for the past few years.</p> <p>As an organisation, we are concerned by increasing commercialisation of important public spaces and the impact of such intensive and recurring use on the fabric of parks, both built and natural. Compaction of the earth and</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>the damage that causes to tree roots and soil health is of particular concern. The present Covid-19 pandemic has emphasised the essential nature of public open spaces and normally we would object to such a large area of park being routinely removed from public access. However, we are well aware of the importance of the financial income generated by Winter Wonderland to the Royal Parks and we are not unsympathetic to their plight. This event is also held during the winter months when park use is reduced anyway. For these reasons we are not objecting to this event on this occasion.</p> <p>The LGT observes with regards this planning application: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The event is held in the winter months when the park is less used for informal public recreation and leisure. A similar event in the Summer, hiving off a large area of park for commercial use would give us graver concerns. • The event must always attempt to be plastic litter free. We are aware of the additional challenges the pandemic poses but reduction of waste should still be a prime concern. • Reinstatement of the ground conditions must be secured and fully enacted. Additional surveillance and monitoring of tree health should be included to record the impact of these events over time. <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer For and on behalf of the Planning & 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>
Royal Greenwich Local Heritage Listing Policy	Greater London	E20/0355	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Consultation: Royal Greenwich Local Heritage Listing Policy	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.07.2020</p> <p>The London Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on their behalf in respect of planning consultations. London Parks & Gardens Trust aims to increase knowledge and appreciation of parks, squares, community gardens, cemeteries, churchyards – all those places that form London's open space network. There are 74 Greenwich entries on the London Gardens Online inventory. This represents a significant wealth of parks and gardens of heritage,</p>

					<p>cultural and landscape value in the borough. The LPGT inventory has full descriptions of the value of each site of merit in the Borough. All these designed landscapes are local heritage assets. (Four of these are on the national list of protected parks and gardens.)</p> <p>https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sitelist/?sitename=&borough=Greenwich&type=%25&keyword=&Submit=Search</p> <p>Your policy aims to identify buildings within landscapes but omits recognising the heritage value of designed landscapes in their own right. We strongly object to the proposed policy and request valued open spaces of cultural landscape or heritage value be eligible for inclusion on the local list.</p> <p>We request that the Local Heritage List be expanded to recognise the value of the omitted sites which meet the criteria set out by Historic England in 2016. https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/what-is-designation/local/local-designations/</p> <p>This would redress the imbalance of the current list by including open spaces of cultural, landscape or heritage value. Some of these may already be recognised for other values such as public parks or biodiversity but this does not ensure their heritage value is taken into account through the planning system.</p> <p>London Parks & Gardens Trust welcomes the involvement of local communities in the review of the local list. It is important that the list reflects local cultural values.</p> <p>Helen Monger Director On behalf of the London Parks & Gardens Trust Planning and Conservation Group</p>
Kensington Gardens	Greater London	E20/0393	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION November 2017 (RN 17/02957/FULL) which was a Variation of Conditions 1 and 6 of planning permission dated 2 March 2017 (RN 15/10671/FULL) for the demolition and redevelopment of 117 to 125 Bayswater Road, together with 2 to 6 Queensway and 7 Fosbury Mews for a new building</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.07.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT) formerly known as the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT 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 affecting sites included in the Historic England 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</p>

			<p>comprising 3 basements, ground and 9 upper storeys to include 55 residential units and ancillary residential facilities (class C3), together with retail (class A1) unit, a retail (class A1) and/or restaurant (class A3) unit, a dentist (class D1) and a spa use (class D2), highway works and the use of car parking within the basement of Consort House. to vary the approved drawings to amend the ground floor frontage to allow the existing bureau de change to remain in situ and be part of the scheme temporarily and to extend the spa over all three basement levels rather than two. NAMELY, to vary the approved drawing numbers for Removal of the Building Maintenance Unit (BMU) and relocation of plant at Level 9 to ground and lower ground floors, reconfiguration of Levels 8 and 9; passenger lift access to all floors, lift overruns at roof level; north façade rationalisation; alterations to the external materiality of the building and incorporating a higher percentage of stone in the proposals. Development Site At 117 - 125 Bayswater Road, 2 To 6 Queensway, Consort House And 7, Fosbury Mews, London.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>green open spaces, especially when included in the LPGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>This application, ref20/03862/FULL Variation of condition 1 (Approved drawings) of planning permission dated 27 November 2017 (RN 17/02957/FULL) which was a Variation of Conditions 1 and 6 of planning permission dated 2 March 2017 (RN 15/10671/FULL) for the demolition and redevelopment of 117 to 125 Bayswater Road, together with 2 to 6 Queensway and 7 Fosbury Mews for a new building.</p> <p>The variations are described as, 'to vary the approved drawings to amend the ground floor frontage to allow the existing bureau de change to remain in situ and be part of the scheme temporarily and to extend the spa over all three basement levels rather than two. NAMELY, to vary the approved drawing numbers for Removal of the Building Maintenance Unit (BMU) and re-location of plant at Level 9 to ground and lower ground floors, reconfiguration of Levels 8 and 9; passenger lift access to all floors, lift overruns at roof level; north façade rationalisation; alterations to the external materiality of the building and incorporating a higher percentage of stone in the proposals.'</p> <p>The changes to the front façade bring the set-back higher levels forward and therefore closer to the designated park opposite, Kensington Gardens, and the higher percentage of stone in the proposals actually results from a further simplification and loss of articulation of the proposed building's unique design features.</p> <p>Kensington Gardens is designated Grade I on The National Heritage List for England, Parks & Gardens and it is a royal park on the former gardens and park of Kensington Palace, established when William III purchased Nottingham House in 1689, incorporating land from Hyde Park. The park is largely in Westminster, although the westernmost strip in Kensington & Chelsea contains Kensington Palace and its gardens. There are remnants of the early C18th landscaping of Bridgeman and Switzer and the subsequent layout by William Kent, such as the Broad Walk, Round Pond, Long Water and Serpentine. Some of the built structures remain including the Palace and Orangery. In the later C18th and early C19th the formal layout was progressively softened, leaving largely open areas crossed by paths between entrances and features within the park, and with numerous mature trees. The Italian Garden dates from 1860s; the Albert Memorial</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>built 1863-72. The Princess Diana Memorial Playground opened in 2000. This building will dominate the street as viewed from the park and this application erodes still further design elements which were no doubt called upon to justify the development in the first instance. The resulting building is more dominant and less interesting as a result. We lay out our particular objections below.</p> <p>The LGT objects with regards this planning application:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing forward the upper level setback floors erodes the attempt to avoid the building becoming overbearing and dominant in the streetscape and, by token of its close proximity, to dominating the Grade I park opposite. • AVRs also demonstrate the loss of design flair as bringing forward the floors results in the loss of shadow lines emphasising the USP of the building which is the curving line of the brise soleils. See in particular AVRs 8, 11 & 12 • Generally, the loss of varied materiality and recess has led to a blandness through loss of colour, finish and shadow emphasising the articulation of the facades. <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer For and on behalf of the Planning & 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>
Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park	Greater London	E20/0519	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION In Outline, with all matters reserved, for a comprehensive phased mixed-use development comprising demolition of existing buildings and structures, for the following uses: Residential (Class C3); Business uses including office and flexible workspace (Class B1); Retail, financial and professional services, food and drink uses (Class A1, A2, A3 & A4);</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.07.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LPGT) formerly known as the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LPGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust, which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England 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 www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in</p>

			<p>Community, education and cultural uses (Class D1); A sixth form centre (Class D1); Assembly and leisure uses (Class D2); Public open space including Bow Common and public realm; Storage, car and cycle parking; Formation of new pedestrian and vehicular access and means of access and circulation within the site together with new private and public open space and site preparation works; and Sustainable energy measures. In Full, for a comprehensive phased development comprising demolition of existing buildings and structures, and residential (Use Class C3) flexible residential facilities and commercial uses (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, C3, D1 and D2) together with public open space; public realm works and landscaping; car and cycle parking; servicing arrangements; sustainable energy measures; formation of new pedestrian and vehicular access and means of access and circulation within the site; and site preparation works. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Bow Common Gas Works, Bow Common Lane, London. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). The application referenced above is for a large, high-rise development adjacent to Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park, the inventory record for which can be found here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=THM056&sitename=Tower+Hamlets+Cemetery+Park</p> <p>Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park (THCP) is the farthest east of the seven early commercial cemeteries and was created to serve the parishes of Stepney and Bromley-by-Bow. Consecrated in 1841, the cemetery had a lodge and two chapels, and was laid out as a grid and planted with ornamental trees and shrubs. By 1889 over 247,000 burials had taken place but the cemetery became neglected and much overgrown, later suffering bomb damage in WWII. In 1990 it was designated a cemetery park.</p> <p>The cemetery is designated a conservation area and contains various statutorily listed graves. It is a local nature reserve and a nature conservation area with metropolitan importance as well as designated metropolitan open land.</p> <p>The application PA/19/02379 is for comprehensive demolition of the existing buildings and structures on site and the construction of 10 distinct blocks of varying size ranging from 4 to 22 floors, the majority of buildings being between 8 and 13 storeys. The proposed building heights and typologies are alien to the area and offer no stitching of the new development into the fabric of the surrounding area physically or visually. The masterplan does not acknowledge the linear park which has obviously been a local priority in the past, as evidenced by it being clearly defined on either side of the gas works site.</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site would seem to have offered the ideal circumstances to complete this important linear feature but instead the proposals offer an inhospitable, treeless, concrete path which will be in perpetual shadow. The path will be dominated by a bulky, slab block adjacent of between 8, 11 and 13 storeys high and punctuated by point blocks - one a staggering 22 storeys high. The proposed 'Railway Walk' will offer no visual buffer for the historic park on the other side of the railway line or physical buffer to protect the nature reserve element. It also offers no relationship to the one small historic feature retained from the original gas works site, but instead cuts it adrift as a small relic.</p> <p>The development is a harmful imposition on the surrounding area, the historic character of THCP and on the health of the nature reserve,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>predominantly through excessive shade and light pollution but also through the visual impact of incongruous and overbearing design. It is essential the site provide a substantial tree canopy adequate to create a corridor for wildlife along the railway line. The landscape strategy for any redevelopment of the gas works site should be required to create and augment cross-links to existing green spaces and corridors in the wider area and ensure they promote bio-diversity and offer pedestrian and cycle routes humans can enjoy. At the very least the development site should be set-back from the railway line to provide the natural corridor and buffer for the park beyond, but ideally the height and typologies of the buildings across the whole site should be amended to be more harmonious with the existing local residential character.</p> <p>The LPGT objects with regards this planning application: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed redevelopment is incongruous, dominant and overbearing in height and design. • The close proximity of the tower blocks will cause visual harm to the historic character of Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park (THCP) • The development will likely impose ongoing noise pollution on THCP beyond the construction phase. • The site interrupts the linear park next to the railway line which is evident either side of the development. Anything less than fully completing the linear park will undermine the natural corridor required for wildlife and fail to protect the nature reserve beyond from the dense high-rise development. • The masterplan for the site should link wider green areas, parks and nature reserves to provide natural corridors for wildlife, encourage biodiversity and routes for pedestrians & cyclists. <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer For and on behalf of the Planning & 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>
Berrington Hall	Hereford and Worcester	E20/0472	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed construction of a building to house a new biomass	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2020</p> <p>The Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust has reflected upon the present proposal with care and in the context of the wider ranging improvements</p>

				<p>boiler and store, waste bin store, secure storage for machinery and new heat main pipe and services plus demolition of bin store wall. Berrington Hall, Berrington, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 ODW. BIOMASS</p>	<p>already undertaken at Berrington Hall, and those that are in the pipeline, the majority of which we applaud unreservedly. The removal of farming activities in the northern part of the walled garden is most welcome as is the tidying up of the outer face of the north-side of the service court. It is often forgotten that Henry Holland designed the Hall as a free standing structure – a villa - pleasing to view from all sides, including the north-west, which sadly still retains modern garaging.</p> <p>The removal of the extensive stables and other farming activities from the northern approach to Berrington has been a considerable improvement. Moreover, with the reclaiming and replanting of parkland to the west and the distant views of the Welsh hills this has probably become the best approach to the house. It is, in many respects, much more informative of the design principles, contrived by Brown and Holland, relating to the placing of the mansion and park, than the approach from the south east. Placing the biomass store beside the northern drive seems counterproductive: as it is planned this is a long utilitarian building, not much better than the farming buildings recently removed. A better designed building might be the answer but a more permanent solution might be found on the north-east side of the walled garden, adjoining the public car park where there is also some vestige of tree cover. Obviously this is further away from the mansion and therefore more inconvenient. Perhaps a better designed building, one more square than linear, is the answer with some shrubby planting around it.</p> <p>Clearly, a biomass store signals a thoughtful approach to the management of the property, in the light of modern concerns about sustainability, but in the rush to fulfil ecologically fashionable objectives aesthetic considerations should not be forgotten. Both the house and its landscape carry the highest designations as a listed building set in registered parkland.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, David Whitehead on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust</p>
7 Reddings, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0368	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Crown thinning of 3 x Oak tree by 20% under TPO 836 2018 (T1, T2 and T3). 7 Reddings, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LA. TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. As no reason for crown thinning of these mature oak trees, part of the historic Sherrards Wood, is given, we cannot comment. We trust the council will be taking the condition of the trees and any required work based on that, into consideration.</p>

				OUTCOME 29.07.2020 No objection	<p>Kate Harwood Herts Gardens Trust</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Our comments on this work, submitted under 6/2020/1438/EMT, pertain Kate Harwood</p>
Balls Park	Hertfords hire	E20/0372	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed single storey rear extension. 30 Willis Grove, Balls Park, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG13 8FH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Willis Grove lies adjacent to the Grade II walls of the Walled Gardens, in the setting of the Grade I Mansion and within Grade II Registered Park. We are therefore disappointed that a Heritage Impact Statement or similar has not been submitted, detailing possible harm and mitigation measures proposed. We consider that this development will cause some harm to the setting of the listed Garden Walls, but less to the parkland and mansion. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Ponsbourne Grange, Newgate Street	Hertfords hire	E20/0386	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Submission of details pursuant to condition: 11 (Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS)), on planning permission (6/2019/0598/MAJ). Ponsbourne Grange, Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8QS. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The documents regarding the SUDS scheme to which this application refers are not available on the WHBC planning website. We are therefore unable to comment on this application. Kate Harwood Herts Gardens Trust</p>
Putteridge Bury	Hertfords hire	E20/0419	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey detached annexe for dependant family member. East Lodge, Lilley Bottom, Lilley, Luton, Hertfordshire, LU2 8NH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member and authorized to respond to planning consultations on their behalf. East Lodge lies within the Registered Park & Garden of Putteridge Bury and we would expect to see a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) of the proposed building on this RPG. Historically this lodge was deliberately sited on a slight bend and within woodland, which covered the site of the proposed annexe as well. Much of the woodland has now gone leaving the lodge as the sole marker of the entrance to the important Putteridge Bury landscape. We consider that the</p>

					<p>proposed building would cause some harm to the reading of this landscape by cluttering the entrance at East Lodge, and adversely affecting the views across the parkland. This could be mitigated by tree planting to screen the development and approximate to the historic design intent. We have not seen a detailed landscape proposal for this application.</p> <p>If the LPA is minded to approve this application we would trust that an HIA is produced and found adequate and that a detailed landscape scheme to include adequate screening of any new building and parking is required as part of the permission. The NPPF requires that any development conserves or enhances heritage assets, especially designated ones. As this proposal is presented, harm will be caused to the landscape and mitigation should be put in place</p> <p>Kind regards Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
5 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0420	-	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell row of cypress conifers to rear. Fell 1x holly tree. Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JW. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</p> <p>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 objections.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
71 The Ryde, Hatfield	Hertfords hire	E20/0422	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to windows to front elevations and Installation of new roof lights. 71 The Ryde, Hatfield AL9 5DN. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are familiar with the Cockaigne Housing Group development at The Ryde, and the unique streetscape and communal gardens, which is on the HGT List of Locally Important Historic Gardens in Welwyn Hatfield. We support plans to restore this house in a sensitive manner.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
9 Drycroft, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0426	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Group of Field Maples to reduce to around 7m height (previous pruning points). 9 Drycroft, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4DH. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a comment. We have no objection to reducing the field maples to the previous pruning point proposed in this application.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
76 Brockwood Lane, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0434	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Hawthorn (crataegus monogyna); Fell 1 x Hazel (corylus avellana); Fell 1 x Hornbeam. 76	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2020</p> <p>We have no objection to the proposed tree works.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

				Brockwood Lane, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7BQ. TREES	
6 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0448	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree (T1). 6 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2020 We regret the loss of this mature oak, which is part of the historic landscape of Sherrards Wood which predates the housing developments now contained within it. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hertsmere Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)	Hertfords hire	E20/0461	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Feedback invited https://www.hertsmere.gov.uk/Planning--Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Planning-Consultations/Statement-of-Community-Involvement.aspx	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2020 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on the proposed revisions to the SCI. We have 2 comments on the draft. 1. Evidence Base Section 4.17. HGT is happy to provide assistance in identifying historic gardens of local importance for a Hertsmere Local List of Historic Gardens, if required. We have prepared such lists to assist Dacorum, St Albans, Broxbourne and Welwyn Hatfield LPAs. 2. Appendix 1. Consultee List We note that the Gardens Trust is missing from the list of statutory consultees. Documentation has recently been sent to all LPAs about this but we note that we were not consulted on the proposals for the new buildings (Arts Block) at Aldenham House RPG (Haberdasher Aske's Boys School). We would ask that The Gardens Trust be added to this list. The Gardens Trust was formed in July 2015 following the merger of The Garden History Society and The Association of Gardens Trusts. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee for all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Under the terms of the 1995 Direction set out in DoE Circular 9/95, local planning authorities are required to consult The Gardens Trust on planning applications which affect all grades of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens (Grade I, II* and II). I attach further details. Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E20/0477	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration and change of use of water tower to ancillary	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application. We have the following comments, not all of which could be entered on your

				<p>residential use for Goldings Estate. External western red cedar cladding and windows on all four elevations, restoring of the steel drum to be painted light grey. Water Tower, Devey Way, Goldings, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2WU. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>online comment form. We trust these expanded comments will be taken into consideration when assessing the application/ Historical Background The area in which the 20th century water tower stands is part of the lawns and trees laid out with careful regard to species and spacing, interlaced with paths, forming an informal wilderness-type landscape with views to the mansion and across the northern part of the parkland. The water tower, erected between 1897 and 1923 (OS Map Sheet XXIX.6) perhaps to serve the new use of the site as a Dr Barnardo's school in the early 1920s, is utilitarian and not ornamental as a garden feature as so many were. The open frame of the four supporting legs and struts has meant that views are still extant, although compromised by inappropriate Lawson Cypress and ornamental cherry plantings. Two WWII semi-underground bunkers lie adjacent to the tower, and now form part of the heritage of the site. The Gardens Trust objects to the current proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is Green Belt land and development here is contrary to both the NPPF Section 13 and EHDC's own Policy GBR 1, specifically Point 3 to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 2. This is a Registered Park and Garden, Grade II and EHDC policy HA1 aims to enhance and preserve the historic environment. Policy HA8 aims to protect historic parks. This reflects the NPPF Section 16 which aims to conserve and enhance the historic landscape. This proposal would harm the historic Significance of the landscape by <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Blocking views across the landscape and to the mansion due to cladding of the tower. b. Introduce a new built element to the parkland out of keeping with the historic intent. This would cause cumulative harm due to the overdevelopment already permitted at North Field houses. c. Although the proposed felling of the Lawson Cypress is to be welcomed, further planting as proposed would cause harm due to not being guided by the existing historic landscape design. Even if the planting were to be of historic integrity it would take many years to mature and thus adequately screen the cladding. 3. A previous application for conversion was refused by the Planning Inspector on Appeal (APP/J1915/19/3237241). In the decision notice by the inspector Point 9 states the loss of views, 11 considers it inappropriate in
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Green Belt and 13 dismisses the idea of it being a folly. All these points pertain to the current application</p> <p>4. It lies within the curtilage of the listed mansion which has clear views towards the water tower as it is situated with in the ornamental woodland/wilderness. The setting of the mansion would be harmed by blocking the views around it. Historic England GPA3.2 the Setting of Heritage Assets details the harm which can be caused although the applicants do not mention this document.</p> <p>5. The land on which the tower is situated is part of the communal land set up after planning permission for the original conversion was given under an S106 which specifies that this land is for resident-access only managed by Goldings Amenities Ltd. The S106 further states that the communal areas of landscape be managed according to the Goldings Estate Landscape Management Plan (Brown, 2018 revision). We consider that the area outlined in red on the plans as the application site should therefore remain as part of the communal land and not be reserved from private use around the tower.</p> <p>6. Any harmful development which affects a heritage asset should be weighed against public benefit (NPPF 193). There is no public benefit from converting the water tower to private accommodation.</p> <p>7. The application mentions Folly Towers of which there are many around the country. Follies are carefully considered and sited to enhance a landscape. Some are water towers but built as substantial ornamental structures. The folly criteria do not apply to a conversion of a utilitarian structure deliberately sited in woodland with no designed views.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust considers the proposed plans to be of harm to a Registered landscape contrary to legislation, with no public benefit to outweigh this harm. We therefore object to application 3/20/1314/FUL</p> <p>Kate Harwood The Gardens Trust: Conservation Committee Hertfordshire Gardens Trust: Conservation & Planning Officer</p>
Campus East Car Park, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0482	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of the existing masonry walls, entrance doors to the individual garages including the brickwork gable ends to create surface parking spaces.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this applications and our knowledge of the are we have no comment to make on the demolition of the garages as described.</p> <p>However, the envisaged redevelopment both of Campus West and Campus</p>

				Campus East Car Park, College Way, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UN. PARKING	East will have an impact on the design concept and present 'City Beautiful' aspects of the heritage of WGC, on which we would be pleased to comment in due course." Kate Harwood Hertfordshie Gardens Trust
144 Boundary Lane, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0486	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce Group of Field Maple Trees by aproximately 7m height. 144 Boundary Lane, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4DF. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have commented on 9 July for a similar proposal to reduce a group of 7 Field Maples by the residents of 9 Drycroft (6/20202/1508/EMT). We assume that these are the same trees as they appear to be on the boundary between the 2 properties. We have no objection to the proposed works. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Tring Athletics Football Club (Pendley Manor)	Hertfords hire	E20/0496	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 4no, 18m high floodlighting columns with 20no luminaires. Tring Athletics Football Club, Cow Lane, Tring, Hertfordshire HP23 5NS. EXTERNAL LIGHTING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.07.2020 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust. Tring AFC is located within the wider historic parkland of Pendley Manor, but separated from the core historic pleasure grounds by the belt of woodland lying to the east of the football ground. We consider that the proposed floodlighting would cause no additional harm to the significance of the Locally Listed park and garden, including the northern woodland belt and therefore have no objections to the proposal as detailed in this application. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
600 Howlands, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0498	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 1 x Deodar Cedar by 4m height & 1.5m width. 600 Howlands, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4ET. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are concerned about the considerable amount (4m x 1.5m) proposed to be pruned from this Deodar Cedar, as we are aware that cedars do not tolerate drastic pruning, and general advice is to prune only the tips of the branches. We would advise that advice be sought from the council's aboricultural officer, as it does not appear to have been sought by the applicant pre-application. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/0504	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new wildlife pond, associated features and relocation of spoil to form mounds. Napsbury Park Off Beningfield Drive, London Colney, Hertfordshire. WATER FEATURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2020 HGT have visited the site and supplied a written report which has been included by the applicants in this application. The plans proposed are largely those we considered would not cause undue harm to the Napsbury RPG whilst enhancing the biodiversity. We did suggest planting of grey alders for siskins etc but note that these do not appear on the plan. If further trees are to be planted we would be able to assist with siting to enhance the significance of the RPG. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Sandridge Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E20/0520	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN new Neighbourhood Plan consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2020 This NP acknowledges heritage assets but does not include historic designed parks and gardens. There are no nationally registered parks and gardens within the parish but part of Oaklands lies within the area. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust has included that in their list of Locally Important Heritage Landscapes which was prepared with the support of English Heritage (now Historic England). Our Register entry is attached. We suggest this is added to the heritage assets under 4.18. Policy D1 suggests that curtilage land could be used for infilling of small housing developments. This land should not be considered for development if it forms part of the setting (e.g. a garden) of a heritage asset (e.g. listed building). This would cause harm to the Significance of a heritage asset contrary to NPPF. We have no further comments. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/0522	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to roof of single storey rear projection and insertion of rooflights, alterations to openings. 21 North Cottages, Napsbury, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL2 1Ap. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. North cottages formed part of the northern approach to Napsbury Hospital, and were attendants' cottages. They lie wholly within the Grade II RPG of Napsbury. We do not consider that the proposed alterations would harm the historic landscape or the important views, although the changes to the first floor windows may adversely affect the set of cottages as a design entity Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0551	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree (TPO 738 2018) to rear to be replaced with 1 x Oak elsewhere in the garden. 19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JQ. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that the application form states damage to property from this tree but no technical/arboricultural evidence appears online. We would support a replacement tree being planted if permission is given for the felling of oak TPO 738 2018</p> <p>Kate Hartwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
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	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2020</p> <p>Pad, Holderness Road, Kingston Upon Hull HU8 8JU.</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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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</p>

					<p>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 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>
Burton Constable	Humberside	E20/0431	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to allow the 'Great Hall' to be used as a venue for civil weddings. Burton Constable Hall, New Ellerby Road, Burton	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.07.2020</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 included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Burton Constable at grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a</p>

				<p>Constable, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU11 4LN. EVENT/FUNCTION</p>	<p>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>As you know Burton Constable is particularly important; encompassing a medieval settlement and field system (Scheduled Ancient Monument), a wonderful grade I house with several other listed buildings, and park and gardens laid out in c.1769-82 to designs by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown for the noted plant collector William Constable (1721-91). The proposal affects the Great Hall which is a part of the building dating to Sir John Constables' rebuilding in the 1560s.</p> <p>We understand that there will be no impact on the registered park and garden or the exterior of the building and presume that the existing car parking arrangements will suffice. The Heritage Statement notes that there will be no impact on the interior of the building. However, we ask that careful steps are taken to ensure the architectural fabric does not get accidentally damaged and is monitored for wear. We support the comments of your Authority's Conservation Officer – no stiletto-heeled shoes, artificial confetti and red wine; all of which could damage the fabric.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Historic England(e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Lytham Hall	Lancashire	E20/0301	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION ERECTION OF 2.5 STOREY DETACHED DWELLING WITH ATTACHED SINGLE STOREY SWIMMING POOL ANNEX AND DETACHED GARAGE / OUTBUILDING IN WALLED GARDEN WITH NEW ACCESS DRIVEWAYS FROM WATCHWOOD DRIVE AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING. HOME FARM, WATCHWOOD DRIVE, LYTHAM, LYTHAM ST ANNES, FY8 4NP. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it to protect and conserve registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The current application lies entirely within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Lytham Park which provides the setting for Grade I listed Lytham Hall. We are pleased that Home Farm itself has been assigned a Historic Asset Record (HAR) which has wide coverage: "This includes the Farm House and some of its rear appendages, cobble walls within the stabling, the perimeter wall of the kitchen garden and its crested entrance gate piers. All these structures merit Non Designated</p>

					<p>Heritage Asset status”.</p> <p>Over the last 60 years the former walled garden has been operating as a farm with almost the entire area covered with concrete yards and buildings. Only half of the former walls remain, mostly in an advanced state of disrepair. We have reviewed the documentation supporting this application and welcome the thorough archaeological report and the comprehensive details of the intended reconstruction of the walls. We note the removal of recent agricultural buildings and the sensitive renovation of the Home Farmhouse, as well as intended improvements to the neglected wider estate. The resolution of drainage problems which had impacted adversely on the Lytham Hall parkland is welcomed. Although outside the current application boundary, we hope for the removal of further intrusive industrial scale buildings and agricultural detritus.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement recognises the decades of neglect which the estate has suffered and sets out high aspirations to improve and secure its long term future.</p> <p>We support the restoration works and recognise that without a significant source of funds such investment would not be possible. We therefore accept the ‘re-purposing’ of the Victorian walled garden and have no objection to the creation of a new house within the site. We welcome the proposals for creation of the new formal garden and note the innovative details and features which are proposed, and not least the intention to allow some public opening opportunities.</p> <p>We have no comments on the new road access being created at Ballam Road.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me: conservation@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Whatton House, Kingston Park Pleasure Gardens	Leicesters hire	E20/0331	II, II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of B8 warehouse together with ancillary buildings and associated access, parking, service and yard areas and landscaping. Plot 12. East Midlands Gateway Development,	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.07.2020</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 both the Leicestershire Gardens Trust (LGT) and Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) as the proposal has the potential to affect two registered parks and</p>

			<p>Ashby Road, Castle Donington. LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ADAM.MELLOR@NWLeicestershire.gov.uk</p>	<p>gardens, one in each county. This is therefore a joint response from the GT, LGT and the NGT.</p> <p>As far as Whatton House is concerned, my colleagues in the LGT are of the opinion that the geography of the land between the house and the site means that despite the new development being only 2.5-3km away, it will not intrude on Whatton House and the existing belts of trees on the north side of the House will give it additional protection from the effects of the development.</p> <p>This is not the case with Kingston Hall in Nottinghamshire. The NGT has been able to make a site visit to Kingston Hall parkland as well as reviewing the documentation accompanying the planning submission. As far as Kingston on Soar is concerned, there is inter-visibility between the proposal site and the grade II listed Hall (as identified in the additional ZTV information of 9th June) and as such the setting of the Hall is a consideration from the NPPF perspective. It is strange that the Heritage Impact Assessment identifies Kingston Hall, parkland and associated heritage assets but does not provide any consideration of the potential impacts on the setting of these designated heritage assets. We welcome the attention drawn to this by the NWLC conservation officer and would suggest that the Rushcliffe Borough Council conservation officers' views are also sought.</p> <p>Based on considerations of the existing development of the East Midlands Gateway DCO site, there is clear inter-visibility between that part of the site and the area of high ground which is occupied by Kingston Hall and parkland. The very large scale of the buildings are clearly visible on the horizon and, despite the careful approach to gradation of cladding on the elevations, the proposed building will be highly noticeable. The distance between Kingston Hall and the site is about 4km and the proposed development will most likely appear as a substantial square edged structure on the horizon between the farm land and skyline. It is difficult to assess the precise appearance as the Landscape Visual Impact information supplied does not include any visualisations from the Kingston location, however, based on the existing EMG structure, it would be fair to suggest that the proposed building will be easily visible within views from the south side of the Hall.</p> <p>The south side of the hall is the primary garden elevation and the parkland was laid out by the architect Edward Blore with the Kingston brook (damned to create decorative 9 acre lake, 'The Pool') in the middle</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>distance. Around the Hall the formal terraced gardens are elevated and provide for long 'commanding views to the south, west and east' (HE register entry) over the Belper estates. The Historic England registration entry states the reasons for designation as the substantially intact pleasure gardens and parkland to the south of the Hall and the unusual example of holistic design of a Hall and parkland by Edward Blore (an architect of national renown). It is unclear whether this heritage interest was given appropriate weight at the time of the DCO allocation in 2016 but it is very clear that the resultant EMG development has very much produced an impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets of the Hall, parkland and associated building components. The EMG development is clearly visible from the main entrance to the Hall on the Gotham road and occupies considerable prominence in views from the Gotham Road as you approach Kingston-on-Soar village traveling alongside the C19th estate boundary stone wall, and importantly this highlights the potential for similar impacts arising of the present proposals for plot 12.</p> <p>The proposed landscape planting mitigation strategy for plot 12 must be explained by the applicant more thoroughly from the perspective of Kingston Hall and registered parkland. As presented, the proposals do not demonstrate that the bund creation and tree planting will protect the important views that form an integral component of the setting of Kingston Hall and parkland. From the information provided it seems very likely that these will be impacted on negatively and in such a way as to cause permanent harm. I think the measure of the level of this harm requires further detailed examination through the preparation of viewpoints, setting receptors at the Hall, parkland and gardens to the south and west and from the Gotham Road boundary and entrance.</p> <p>We feel that this application will add to the harm already caused to the setting and significance of Kingston Hall. Your officers will be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. This states on page 4 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.'</p> <p>Our objection is based on the failure of the applicant to demonstrate that there will be no harm, or that the mitigation measures (planting etc) will</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>eliminate the harm. Appropriate mitigation may be possible, as long as the issue is given sufficient weight, but at present, there is no indication that the impact on the setting of Kingston Hall and RPG has been acknowledged as an issue.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2020 ...We stand by our objection as per our letter of 3rd July. I have consulted again with our colleagues in the Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT). The NGT has no record of being consulted with regards to the planning application reference 17/01165/FULM for the increase in height of the plot 2 warehouse. The response to our concerns confirms that views from Kingston Hall registered parkland towards the proposals will exist. We do not agree with the assumption that the visibility of the development should be considered against the existing development and recent permissions, rather we would contend that these did not fully consider this issue (of impacts on the setting of Kingston Hall registered parkland) because we were not given the opportunity to comment. We continue to assert that the current proposals we are now being provided the opportunity to comment on, will continue and increase the damage to the setting of the parkland. We question the assertion that the impacts on the horizon are unimportant, and point to the cumulative impacts of the DCO site developments which are increasingly harmful to the setting of the registered parkland and Kingston Hall and therefore contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2020 We accept that with the additional tree planting mitigation as proposed by the planners, over time, the level of harm will likely fall into the 'less than substantial' category.</p> <p>Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Shotesham Hall	Norfolk	E20/0228	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Change of use and associated internal and external alterations to existing stable block to form new events venue. The Hall, Mill Lane, Shotesham, Norfolk. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, EVENT/FUNCTION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2020 NGT did comment on the original plan for modifications to a stable block and an extension to an existing parking area. We stated that it was difficult to object to the proposals, but expressed our concern about the number of trees that were being removed for the car park extension - this comment is still applicable to the amended planning application. Peter Woodrow
Precinct Wall, Norwich	Norfolk	E20/0473	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Partial demolition and rebuilding works to the Listed Precinct Wall to reopen a historic filled-in opening, together with the provision of new surrounds to the opening and an entrance door and any associated repair works. Precinct Wall, Palace Street, Norwich. REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2020 NGT have no objection to the opening of a filled in doorway in the precinct wall. There is likely to be a further planning application for the building of a new refectory and teaching block for Norwich School and the planned opening of the doorway is needed to access the proposed new buildings. Norwich City Council refused planning permission in 2019, but I understand from local press reports that a revised application is being submitted. In the original plan a number of trees would need to be felled - this is still likely to be the case so more detailed comments are likely to follow when the revised application is available for comment. Peter Woodrow
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E20/0079	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of 790m of hedgerow. Low Lindrick Farm, Studley Royal, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 3BD. AGRICULTURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2020 Thank you for your recent e-mail following the Gardens Trust (GT) and Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) consultation response of 14th May. We have noted the further supporting information from the applicant, maps from Leeds Archives and various responses from external bodies. The proposed works lie just outside the Buffer Zone of the World Heritage Site. The hedge removal (400m) and the proposed new hedge (478m) between Galphay Lane and High Birkby (Studley Moor) is close to the long northern arm of the registered park and garden. The hedge proposed to be removed runs north-south whereas the new hedge is west-east. We note that the 1831 map from Leeds Archives (WYL150/Z/15) shows the line where the new hedge is proposed and the southern leg of the hedge proposed for removal. There is no hedge marked on the northern leg on the 1831 map. All the hedges are marked on the c.1870-1899 map from Leeds Archives (WYL150/Z/1). We welcome the proposed replanting of the west-east hedge but regret the loss of the north-south hedge particularly the southern leg.

					<p>The hedge proposed to be removed north of Studley Roger and south of Sunley Raynes (390m) runs west- east and the proposal is for a new hedge further north nearer Sunley Raynes (400m). The hedge proposed for removal is marked on both the 1831 and the c.1870-1899 maps so the hedge line must be at least two hundred years old. We understand the comments from Mr Ramsden and also note the ecologist's comments about lengths of the hedge being species rich and although a new hedge will be planted it will take many years to attain similar ecological richness. Should permission be given for the hedge be removed, then we support the leaving of the veteran trees in the hedge line as field trees which will be an ecological benefit as well as indicating the historic line. Should these trees be lost in the coming years could replacements be planted on the historic hedge line?</p> <p>We welcome the applicant's intention (stated in the application form) to improve the look of the landscape and trust that a balanced decision can be made. We have no further comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Marske Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0179	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission and listed building consent for conversion of Marske Hall from 10 open market apartments to an aparthotel and conversion of basement to associated facilities which include gym, sauna, laundry, retail space, cellar bar and tasting rooms; conversion and extension of the kennels to an events space; conversion of the Sawmill to an events space; construction of outbuilding to house electricity sub-station and provision of car parking areas. Marske Hall and the Sawmill, Marske. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) regarding the further advice and discussions that you have been having with officers in your Authority, Richmondshire DC and NYCC Highways and with Marske and New Forest Parish Council.</p> <p>I have not been able to visit the site for many years so our comments are dependent on the documents that we've seen.</p> <p>As you know from our previous letters (17th January, 26th May) our main concern remains the vehicle parking for the proposed development. We support the advice of Gaby Rose, Building Conservation and the Senior Listed Buildings Officer, and Nicola Child, Trees and Woodland Officer.</p> <p>We agree that there should be as little change as possible to the historic layout/design and setting for all the listed buildings, which should also ensure that the visual impact of vehicles will be lessened. We appreciate that the car parking is a difficult issue to resolve particularly with the topography of the site, and ideally, we would prefer parking which is away from and does not harm the heritage assets.</p> <p>Ms Rose's suggested revised layout for parking appears a better solution,</p>

					<p>having less impact on the listed buildings and a more cohesive approach. We agree that the shared space between the sawmill and stable should not be lost as it would harm the setting of both buildings and eliminate a part of the historic design. We have no objection to sympathetically designed parking in the stable courtyard as long as it respects the listed building, any historic yard surfaces and the overall space.</p> <p>The lawn at the west/rear of the hall enables inter visibility between the hall and the kennels and the revised and reduced number of spaces will be a benefit.</p> <p>The 8 spaces to the north of the hall may be in views from the eastern aspect/entrance to the hall and also across the road from the gardens and walled garden opposite the hall to its north and northeast – these are significant elements in the historic designed landscape. This will need to be checked on site. Looking at the 1st Ed OS map and the 25":1mile OS map revised 1911 this area may be visually shielded from the designed landscape to the north by ornamental trees and shrubs.</p> <p>The area of the field near the eastern entrance to Marske Hall – in the dog leg – as suggested by Ms Child may be a possibility for some parking, but the land is very steep and already supporting some trees – although these are not marked on the OS maps above and may be self-sown. However careful landscaping and planting could hide vehicles and the necessary short access road, from the views.</p> <p>We do remain doubtful that the 75 parking places will be sufficient for all the proposals at Marske Hall, but perhaps if there was a revision of the plans to reduce the events spaces and make more accommodation space, that would reduce the demand for parking.</p> <p>If we can give any further advice in the future then do please consult us.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Julie Martin, Chairman YDNPA Planning Committee, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Scarthingwell Park	North Yorkshire	E20/0281	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed demolition of existing two storey care home (Class C2), and erection of replacement two storey care home (Class C2) comprising 70 single en-suite</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.07.2020</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. Scarthingwell Park is not included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, however Scarthingwell Park is a locally important historic park and garden through the Landscape Assessment of</p>

				<p>bedrooms together with associated car parking (50 spaces), access arrangements and landscaping. Highfield Nursing Home, Scarthingwell Park, Barkston Ash. DEMOLITION, MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>Selby District Council (January 1999) and the Selby District Local Plan 2005. For planning purposes, the parkland is considered to have status equivalent to that of a non-designated heritage asset. 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 historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Scarthingwell Park is near the Towton battlefield and there may be mass graves of those killed at the battle in this area. (A grave was discovered at Towton Hall in the 1990s during the construction of a garage.)</p> <p>From the 18th century Scarthingwell Park was an ornamental designed landscape centered on the hall. The hall appears to have been present by at least 1720 when it was marked on Lumby's touring map and a medieval manor house is known through documentary records. The model farm, whose buildings are still extant to the north of the site was constructed around this time and recorded on Jeffreys map of 1771. The first record of the designing of the landscape at Scarthingwell comes from 1790 when John Davenport, a nurseryman from Shropshire was employed by Lord Hawke to form a lake and build a bridge across it.</p> <p>www.parksandgardens.org/people/john-davenport</p> <p>John Davenport was a nurseryman from Burlton Grove, Wem, Shropshire, active in the 1780s and 1790s, with a speciality in hothouses. Davenport claimed to have been in business since 1768 'imployd in conciderable Buildings of Houses for gentlemen as well as their Grounds &c.'. He designed an elaborate picturesque landscape for Warren Hastings, Governor General of India at Daylesford House, Gloucestershire, but was dismissed in 1791. Davenport's client, Admiral Hawke was a prominent 18th century naval commander and it may be that he engaged Davenport in the 1790's to reshape the land at Scarthingwell which falls from west to east, in order to develop service buildings, build the walled gardens with their glasshouses to the north of the hall, as well as forming the picturesquely-shaped lake (Fish Pond) with a bridge, boathouse and islands. As a nurseryman Davenport may also have been involved in the laying out of the parkland (then c.160acres) and more formal gardens to the west with terracing that is still evident – although the latter may be earlier. Although we have not seen the family archive and any documentary evidence for the work, all the areas typical of a gentry small ornamental estate are evident in the OS maps of the 19C.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>The hall was sold by Hawke to the Maxwell-Stuart family some time before 1848. They built the Roman Catholic church (listed grade II) next to the house designed by Atkinson of York in 1854. Scarthingwell Hall was demolished in the 1960s and the current buildings erected but much of the historic designed landscape remains despite being somewhat eroded. The public when walking from Barkston Ash on the public footpath can enjoy the historic designed views of parkland and fine veteran trees to the left (which would have been views from the carriage drive), before glimpsing the fish pond to the right historically overlooked by the hall, with remnants of the walled gardens beyond the church to the left. Unfortunately, the relatively recent residential development to the south of the site creates an interruption to the parkland but nevertheless much can be enjoyed. The area lies in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The GT and YGT have no objection to the principle of replacing the care home, however we do have some concerns and strongly support the advice of your Authority's Conservation Officer and Principal Landscape Architect.</p> <p>We are concerned about the proposed parking areas and lighting on the significance of the designated and non-designated heritage assets as we have not noted any assessment. Both need more careful consideration to balance the needs of the care home with visual intrusion harming the church and parkland.</p> <p>There should be more careful consideration of the hard landscaping, surfacing and boundary treatments for this historic site. Traditional materials and design should be used particularly in the area between the proposed development and the church and we suggest historic parkland fencing for the boundary.</p> <p>We have looked at the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment but find it impossible to read on-line. We have not noted detailed proposals for tree protection during the work or for tree planting subsequently. We suggest that this is addressed. Tree planting is an opportunity to improve the setting of the development area so that it fits more seamlessly into the wider historical parkland setting and the reciprocal views. A landscape architect with expertise in historic designed landscapes should advise. We suggest that there is an archaeological watching brief for this development which should include service trenches and all excavation works. This may give more information about the historical development of the area.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>As this area has a long history, we also suggest that there is some interpretation for the public. Interpretation boards could be included in the vicinity of the public footpath/church.</p> <p>We consider that the development proposal is an opportunity to improve the overall setting of the church and historic designed landscape and trust that this will be achieved.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Whitby Abbey House	North Yorkshire	E20/0311	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use, alteration and extension of agricultural buildings to form distillery (B2) and visitors centre (D1), formation of new access track, gates and hardstanding areas for pedestrian and vehicular access. Land South Of Whitby Abbe, Abbey Lane, Whitby, North Yorkshire YO22 4JT. DISTILLERY, VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2020</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 included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens; in this case Whitby Abbey House 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>The application site includes the remnants of the former farmstead of Abbey Lands Farm much of which (including the farmhouse), was lost in the 1990's after the land ceased to be a farming operation. Historically part of the farming of the Cholmley family, the barns and small outhouse/privy were built between c.1800 and the early 20th C. The barns are listed and the site is within the Whitby Conservation Area, part of the grade I Whitby Abbey House complex and close to the scheduled Whitby Abbey. The north barn lies within the Registered Historic Park and Garden and the south barn immediately outside the boundary.</p> <p>The agricultural buildings have been in a dilapidated condition for some time and we welcome a new sustainable and sensitive use for them and in general find the designs involving a mixture of both modern and traditional materials sympathetic. We support the proposals for the landscaping which combine some practical planting solutions with plant material for the gin operation, and planting for the visual and ecological aspects, for the physical security of the site, and giving community benefits particularly with the proposed orchard. We note that vehicular access is to be by a spur road from the Abbey car park with very limited onsite vehicular space, all</p>

					<p>non-disabled visitors expected to use the Abbey car park and deliveries largely outside the times when the public will be accessing the car park. We hope that this is a good solution and that there will not be a requirement for improved access eg for emergency vehicles, in the future, which could impact on the heritage assets.</p> <p>We have the following concerns and advice.</p> <p>Although parts of the area of the application has been built on before, due to the long history of Whitby Headland, there is likely to be archaeology which will require further investigation and care. We are pleased to see the comments from the Principal Archaeologist at North Yorkshire County Council and the advice from Historic England.</p> <p>We have some concerns about the planning proposal and its possible impact from a variety of viewpoints but have not seen any visualisations to ally our concerns.</p> <p>We note that the Heritage, Access and Design Statement p12, writes that the buildings ‘...have a strong visual presence. Approached from the Scarborough council car park and the Abbey Grounds south entrance they are highly visible, often silhouetted against the backdrop of the townscape on the north side of the Esk and the rising agricultural and moorland landscape beyond.’</p> <p>And p13. ‘When viewed from across the river Esk and from the ‘new’ bridge the barns are perceived as either visual interruptions on the skyline or seen partially against the backdrop of the Abbey ruins to the north of them. Only from views from the south of the barns is there a direct visual relationship to the Abbey beyond, predominantly from the footpath known as Caedmon’s Trod which links the town and the council car park and the path running beside the west boundary linking to the Abbey House complex. From these view- points the barns are seen as being run down and rather derelict in appearance.’</p> <p>We have checked the view from A171 Scarborough road bridge over the River Esk and the development site is clearly visible.</p> <p>In views diagonally south-eastwards from the registered Abbey House Gardens, the north elevation of the existing barn rebuilt and repurposed into a function room, is likely to be most visible along with parts of the west elevation; the rebuilt barns, one new ‘barn’ and new link sections are also likely to be visible. Visibility will be greatest from the elevated east side of the gardens.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>As Whitby Headland is exposed and often windy and bleak, we suggest that in addition to the wall, the community orchard may require some shelter belt planting. The old fruit tree varieties will also need to be carefully chosen for this site for the same reasons. We recommend that local advice is sought. R.V. Roger Ltd, Pickering is a knowledgeable local nursery. The wildflower/grass blanket green roof will be a beneficial addition but some maintenance will be required 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 the flowering plants to compete with the grasses again the following spring.</p> <p>We suggest that on completion of the development there is some public interpretation which explains the history of the site and its relationship with the wider area.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust does not object to the proposal as submitted but trust that our concerns will be addressed. Please could we be informed of any further, or changed, applications on this site, given its proximity to the Abbey House Gardens.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens</p> <p>Entry date: 2020-07-30 at 3:47pm by Alison</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.07.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust again following our letter of 9th July.</p> <p>We have looked at the additional documents that have been submitted, and are pleased that the applicant has commissioned an archaeological evaluation and revised the Heritage Access and Design Statement to reflect the preliminary trial trenching and subsequent evaluation which allays our concerns. We support an archaeological watching brief during the development work.</p> <p>The photomontage showing the 'before' and 'after' the proposed development from various vantage points is very helpful. The indication is that the buildings will have a much bulkier form/greater massing in a number of views, but overall, we think that the build is sufficiently low key and farm-building-like not to be damaging.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust does not object to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Welbeck Abbey	Nottinghamshire	E20/0510	-	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Secret Play Garden Facilities Together with Pedestrian Connectivity Enhancements, Additional Car Parking and Outdoor Space for Concessionary Stands and Seating. Land At Welbeck Estate, Wellbeck Abbey, Worksop S80 3LL. VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2020</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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>The GT/NGT welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed development at Welbeck Abbey. In principle we are very pleased to see the proposed investment into the parkland and in general we fully support the creation of innovative and interesting play areas for children within the Grade II registered parkland (RPG) where these can be demonstrated to add interest without causing harm to the heritage. To that end, we would like to make some observations which we hope will help Bassetlaw DC in its consideration of the proposals and its NPPF requirements to achieve enhancement to the heritage significance of the registered parkland.</p> <p>The Design & Access Statement (D&A) does not really examine the heritage character of the walled garden and the plot to the south where it is proposed to create the play area. The official register entry does not provide much examination of this part of the parkland, but the early OS maps show that the walled garden and area to the south were laid out to orchard in the late C19th. There does not appear to be any of the orchard planting visible at present, and the opportunity to reinstate productive fruit growing in the walled garden area would benefit the character and heritage significance of the parkland. Orchard planting within the proposed wildflower area in the walled garden would, in our opinion, enhance the proposed scheme, as clearly fruit growing is a significant aspect of all traditional walled gardens, and at present there is very little on display at Welbeck.</p> <p>The arbour detail that is proposed to the east side of the walled garden might also be re-thought to include reference to the type of planting that</p>

					<p>would have occurred in a walled garden. It would be easy to create an espalier walkway of fruit trees for instance, and this would be a reference to the original function and heritage of the walled garden.</p> <p>There are references in the D&A that the proposal presents an opportunity to attend to the condition of the walled garden. Although it is not included on the list of buildings of architectural and historic interest, the walled garden is a significant heritage asset and should be subject to a comprehensive programme of conservation and maintenance. We would recommend that any permission for the present proposals (or any others affecting the walled garden) should be conditional on a suitable programme of repairs (undertaken to conservation standards agreed by the BDC conservation officer).</p> <p>The proposed signalled crossing on the A road is a welcome suggestion. However, the Highway Authority's views on this are not included in the D&A or traffic assessment submitted with the proposals. We are aware that Nottinghamshire Highways Authority has a tendency to request/require high numbers of signals for crossings, despite the Department for Transport's own best practice guidance which allows for a single light column facing each way and the omission of visually intrusive clutter. This crossing falls within the designated registered parkland and will require further consultation. We would recommend that permission for the development is not granted until the exact design of this crossing has been agreed by the Highway Authority. It must be clearly demonstrated that it will not harm the heritage significance of the RPG. We would be happy to provide further input into this process, and would state that any more than two signal columns is likely to be unacceptable to us.</p> <p>The planning statement makes reference to a lack of facilities for children in the area. We would like to draw everyone's attention to Creswell Craggs. This nearby public heritage site includes some children's facilities and is part of the same registered parkland as Welbeck Abbey. The Craggs' facilities are an incredibly significant heritage resource which requires support and consideration during all planning proposals that directly affect it. Clearly the proposed children's play area at the walled garden is designed to act as a draw to families with younger children. This is also the demographic that Creswell Craggs already attracts and focusses its resources towards. We are very concerned that the proposals should be viewed with this issue in mind since the Creswell facility is also part of the same RPG and is run as a not-for-profit organisation. Anything that would</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>harm this facility will, by extension, harm the character and significance of the RPG. We would recommend Bassetlaw DC seek further proof from the applicant that the proposals will not harm the established facilities and business of Creswell Craggs.</p> <p>Subject to the observations being examined and suitable responses to the issues being incorporated into the proposals we would look to support the application for the play area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E20/0410	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed external enclosure to accommodate new central heating boilers & associated services for heating the centre. Refurbishment of bathrooms and kitchens. Global Retreat Centre (Brahma Kumaris), Nuneham Park, Nuneham Courtenay OX44 9PG. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to additional information supplied by the applicant in support of the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>The south west of the building is suffering from some severe cracking and movement and there are proposals for precast RC lintels above door openings and new walls from the outside to be 2 coat sand/cement render with water proof additive and fibrolite blocks. Views to the mansion would probably not be affected but may be by subtle changes in going from softer more rounded lines to elevations to a more angular, regular appearance. Any works to the grade II* building should be carried out sympathetically in traditional lime based render with stainless steel rod fixings perhaps and pre-cast RC lintels on the inner face and natural stone with lime render on the outer face, above door openings so as not to impact on views towards the mansion from the grade I landscape. The suggested amendments to the render would better reveal and enhance the aesthetic, historical, and architectural significance of Nuneham Park, in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E20/0294	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 130 dwellings and new local centre with associated landscaping and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.07.2020</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>

				ancillary works. Land West Of Maynard Grove, Wynyard, TS22 5SP. RESIDENTIAL	<p>We consider that this is not an application where we need to offer detailed comment and advice. There is considerable history on earlier proposals here and we think that the woodland block to the north-west corner of the registered landscape area is robust enough to buffer the effects of the proposed development. Any impact on the setting of the park and garden is therefore likely to be minimal due to the nature of this north-west boundary.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E19/1487	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION REVISED PLANS Application for Listed Building Consent for works of restoration, conversion and development to the Mansion House, Stables and Coach House, Camellia House, curtilage and associated buildings within the Bretton Hall Estate and relates works of demolition, new construction, car parking infrastructure and landscaping for hotel, conferencing exhibition uses, offices, non-residential institutions and associated uses. Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) and Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) 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, following our letter of 14th February. The park, garden and designed landscape at Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park, is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*.</p> <p>We remain dismayed that the proposals for the development of Bretton Hall and the documents submitted pay such limited reference and analysis to the historic designed landscape and the impacts that will ensue from the development.</p> <p>The Site Wide Landscape Masterplan does not show the relationship of the proposals with the YSP Visitor Centre and car park and the new car parking that was being constructed earlier this year. There are no details either of how the development proposals and specifically the car parking and also the marquee at A1 will impact on the views from the lakes and across the valley. We would expect much more detailed Landscape Plans including sections through the site to show how the car parking will be dealt with within the wider topography. Will there be cut and fill and bunding? Will any tree and shrub planting be on mounding? We have been unable to make a site visit to assess the proposals on the ground; vitally important for such a major development.</p> <p>We welcome several aspects of the new 'Bretton Hall Landscape Design Statement' document (dated 31/03/20), specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statement that the red line on the submitted plans will not represent a physical barrier. • The removal of the additional spur road towards the mansion (shown on some previously submitted landscape plans) from the current phase of development, as traffic on this would have been prominent in many views

					<p>from within the estate. However, we note that 'Construction of the north-south spur road to the east of the historic estate' remains as the last bullet point on the June 2020 Scope of Work under 'Future Phase Developments' – and ask that this be reconsidered and removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some changes to the smaller car parks and statements that there will be 'an appropriate landscape scheme' to help screen car parks. We ask for such a scheme to be submitted. • Support for 'woodland thinning' to the east of the mansion, stated to be within the YSP estate. However, as noted and explained in our earlier letter, we ask for a full scheme stating how this will be achieved and then managed. • We note that the car parking to the east of the mansion has moved further south so that it does not impact directly on the stable block. We would like to comment on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'Site Arboricultural Constraints Plan' needs major updating. The resubmitted version looks to be essentially that of its stated date of 28 March 2014 and reflects the buildings, passages and trees of that date. The entry on this document '05/06/20 coordinated with TLA proposed scheme' is misleading as the plan does not show the impact of changes now being proposed, including the considerable additional car-parking. It is therefore impossible to judge how many trees, including many stated as 'moderate' or 'high' quality and value, are being requested for removal even when trying to compare it with the 'Site Wide Landscape Masterplan' dated 04.06.20. • The 'Site Wide Landscape Masterplan' introduces, proposal for 'an amphitheatre space' close to the stable block. We are not opposed to such an addition and appreciate that it will convert a hard space to green landscaping, however we have not noted how it will be used and maintained. • We note that in Phase 2, the Hotel Wing Extension will remove c20 car parking spaces. How has this loss been factored in to the car parking plans and where will the replacement spaces be located? Similarly, we are uncertain as to where further car parking will be located for future phases eg for the four structures (office blocks, we understand previously approved) to the north east of the amphitheatre. • The 'Site Wide Landscape Masterplan' indicates 'key views' from the site but we have been unable to find information about the effect of the proposals on reciprocal views and vistas which are so important to how the
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Yorkshire Sculpture Park will be appreciated by its visiting public. Reference to these having existed in landscape design plans some years ago is largely irrelevant as those plans did not incorporate items now being proposed, such as large grids of car parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note that the new 'Bretton Hall Landscape Design Statement' suggests that the Landscape Agency report of 2010 is the best available account of the landscape whereas as we pointed out in our previous letter, there has been more recent research and publications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study Day organised by the Association of Gardens Trusts, Yorkshire Gardens Trust and YSP, at YSP September 2012. - Karen Lynch, 'Happily situated, in an elegant style': the Development of the Bretton Hall Landscape, c.1760–1830 - Jan Woudstra, The Influence of Robert Marnock on Bretton Hall, 1825–34. - Both papers in Garden History, journal of the Garden History Society, 41/1, 2013 • From our concerns and comments that aspects of the requirements of NPPF paras 190, 193 and 194 remain to be addressed. • We do not agree with the conclusion of the Landscape Design Statement that the documents adequately address NPPF 189 as we have not seen the current specific proposals, nor detailed plans or drawings, for the landscape scheme and its effect on the whole registered historic landscape. <p>We restate below previous concerns/objections, amended as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We remain opposed to the proposal to site a large marquee on the south terrace – Area A1- as it will have a major impact on views from the south; from the lake and beyond. As noted above we remain concerned that there has been inadequate assessment generally, of the development proposals on the wider landscape, views and vistas. • The proposed removal of many individual trees close to the south lawn and east of the hall also needs more careful consideration and an explanation. Again, a balance between opening views for those enjoying the hotel's various function rooms, and the increased visibility and associated increased noise for the large number of visitors to the area immediately to the south. The principle of reciprocity should be a consideration in the felling work, planting and future tree management. • From the documents we are still unclear which individual trees are to be felled, either on any 'as approved' plans nor on the new or revised 'Phase 1 submission'.
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We also still have the following general concerns explained more fully in our letter of 14th February:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YSP Visitors and separation- The YSP had 480,000 visitors and 40,000 schoolchildren in 2017. The application does not describe any separation, or segregation, between parkland visitors and hotel/hotel car park visitors. Mixing traffic and pedestrians is not very safe and even the few proposed new road edge hedge-lines could impinge sightlines of both drivers and pedestrians. In addition, any 'hard' separation (gates, walls, fences) would be a significant intrusion into this (currently open) historic landscape. We remain concerned that a large volume of vehicular traffic will further damage many views across the parkland, increase traffic noise/pollution and result in increased road-crossing safety issues across several parts of the popular family visitor areas. • The Registered Historic Designed Landscape - The Heritage Impact Statement (dated 24.09.19), although understandably detailed about the built heritage unfortunately makes virtually no reference to the impact of the proposed changes to the registered historic designed landscape. We have no before/after views from the landscape, with none from any of the (frequently visited) listed monuments within the landscape. The submitted documents show trees and groups of trees removed and areas of woodland removed or thinned with no explanation. There does not appear to be any mitigation plans for any proposed landscape changes to what was previously approved. In our view there needs to be much further clarification regarding the reasons for removing, or retaining individual trees, eg whether to open up a view (of building(s) or of landscape), to improve screening or to enable adjoining, currently overcrowded, specimens to thrive. In essence there needs to be a clear landscape statement and plan. This should also show where it is proposed to plant new trees, their species and size and reasons for the proposal. <p>In general, we are also unclear as to how the car parking proposals for the development fit with Wakefield Council's declared Climate Emergency and its intention to be carbon neutral by the late 2030's. It would also seem that day events would generate more vehicles than overnight stays. For a development such as this to become anywhere near carbon neutral it would need to have very many electric charging points and probable commensurate compensating measures such as the planting of masses of trees, the building of a solar farm, constructing a huge ground source heat pump or harnessing hydropower. These would likely have a major impact</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>on the landscape.</p> <p>In summary we note the comments of Peter Murray CBE, founding Executive Director of YSP:</p> <p>“What we are trying to do is spread visitors out through the rich and varied landscape – the footfall can cause all kinds of maintenance problems – we want them to explore different parts of the parkland,” he says. “The great thing about the Bretton landscape is that it was designed to be discovered. It’s based on both vistas and secretive areas that create different moods and characteristics. Over the decades we’ve utilised that design quality to organise exhibitions and develop projects”</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc, Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Peel Park	West Yorkshire	E20/0238	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Residential development of 13no dwellings. Former Mount Nursing Home, Bolton Road, Bradford, West Yorkshire. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06,2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Peel Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & 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 consultations.</p> <p>The site of the now demolished former Mount Nursing Home, lies immediately to the north of Peel Park, (at the northwest corner) and due to the topography of the park, which is laid out in the valley, the site prominently overlooks the park and is part of the park’s setting.</p> <p>Peel Park (Grade II*) was the first publicly owned park in Bradford, largely due to the vision and efforts of Sir Titus Salt to acquire funding, and he himself was a generous benefactor. The Mount was one of three villas to the north which were designed not only to be part of Peel Park, which is sited in the Bolton and Undercliffe area of Bradford, but also to be key features. Undercliffe Cemetery (Grade II*), designed by William Gay and considered by Historic England to be his finest work, lies extremely close to Peel Park's southern boundary and is also a conservation area. William Gay also designed the iconic 410 m long grand terrace in Peel Park which features an arched cast iron bridge, dated 1857, to carry the eastern end of the terrace over the carriage drive below. The area of Peel Park and</p>

					<p>Undercliffe Cemetery is an extremely significant heritage asset. The Mount had its own private entrance to the Park's Carriage Drive and the stone gate piers of this entrance are still extant. The original landscaping around the stone building provided a picturesque setting both from within the park and its approach from Bolton Road. Much of the original layout of the gardens remained unchanged until at least the 1930s and can be seen in the 1938 C. H. Woods aerial photo of Peel Park (N2357, C. H. Woods Collection, Bradford Museums and Galleries). This picturesque setting also features in several early postcards of Peel Park.</p> <p>The deciduous trees near the northern boundary in Peel Park partially obscured the views of The Mount in summer, but they certainly did not do so in winter. For half the year when the trees were not in leaf The Mount was clearly visible from Peel Park, in particular from the imposing flight of stone steps linking the site of the former late C19 conservatory to the Carriage Drive. With the recommended removal of self- set trees and the associated ivy in the wall between The Mount and Peel Park this screening will be further reduced. Trees can be lost very easily due to storm damage, disease or felling. We therefore totally disagree with the statement in Paragraph 3.6 of the Heritage Statement that "The existing dense boundary planting on the southern boundary of the application site will ensure that the proposed two storey housing will not be visible from Peel Park."</p> <p>We agree with the Heritage Statement 2.3 re the mature tree cover/TPO area at the west end of the development, but we are unaware of a detailed landscaping plan for the site; the boundaries between the properties and the boundary between the whole site and Peel Park; and recommend that that is progressed. We note the Arboricultural Impact Assessment at 5.3 Mitigation, which also states that there should be a Landscape Planting Plan.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that all but two of the proposed parking spaces are to be hidden from view from Peel Park but would recommend relocating the two proposed parking spaces adjacent to the boundary with Peel Park to a similar hidden location.</p> <p>As the proposed housing will be clearly visible from Peel Park and thus part of the setting, it is important that it is of a quality to be sympathetic in the views from the Park. We do not think that this is achieved in this proposal and we consider that the proposed white render on exterior walls will be particularly inappropriate.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that significance of a heritage asset 'derives not only</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>from a heritage asset's physical appearance, but also its setting'. In our view the construction of the housing as proposed would cause harm to the setting of Peel Park which in this western area also includes the listed lodge with gate piers and ornate gates (grade II).</p> <p>Peel Park is a heritage asset much used and enjoyed by the community and for the reasons outlined above we cannot support this proposal and object to it in its present form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc. Mike Collins, Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Greenhead Park	West Yorkshire	E20/0360	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of extensions, demolition and refurbishment of existing vacant care home and coach house to create care facility (class C2), external and internal alterations and erection of activities cabin (Class C2) (within a Conservation Area). Green View House, 34, Greenhead Road, Huddersfield, HD1 4EZ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Greenhead Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & 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 consultations.</p> <p>34 Greenhead Road is a large prominent three storey unlisted Victorian villa with its rear elevation facing north over Park Drive South and Greenhead Park. Greenhead Park is the significant public park in the centre of Huddersfield formally opened in 1884 and set in a contemporary estate development of which 34 Greenhead Road forms a part. The property overlooks the monumental two-sided promenade terrace and War Memorial. We understand that 34 Greenhead Road was originally called 'Longdenholme', and was built in 1890/1 for Joseph Woodhead, founder of The Huddersfield Examiner and later mayor of Huddersfield and MP for Spenn Valley. It is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and is set within the Greenhead Park/ New Road Conservation Area.</p> <p>Unfortunately, 34 Greenhead Road has been subject to some unsympathetic alterations during the 20th century. In addition, the site has been left vacant since 2012 and has fallen into a poor state of repair. This quality application should bring the buildings and grounds into good use whilst respecting the heritage assets. The existing trees should visually shield the proposed nine new parking spaces – we trust that the trees and</p>

					<p>their root plates will be carefully managed.</p> <p>The only aspect about which we have concerns is the design and finish of the replacement and prominent fire escape on the west elevation which is visible from Greenhead Park. We note that your Authority's Conservation Officer and Huddersfield Civic Society also have concerns about this and trust that a better solution can be found.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust support this planning application subject to the external structure of the proposed fire escape being changed from "perforated metal sheets" to one that is sympathetic to the style of this property in a conservation area and its visibility from the registered Greenhead Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Rushmore Park	Wiltshire	E20/0403	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The restoration and conversion of the Walled Garden buildings on the Rusmore Estate including the construction of a new unit to the north west corner of the site and the extension to the Stable and Bothy buildings. The construction of 17 holiday units and one communal building to the south and east of the walled gardens. Rushmore Walled Garden, The Bothy, Tollard Green, Tollard Royal, SP5 5PT. WALLED GARDEN, HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2020</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 Wiltshire Gardens Trust (WGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and whilst the new block outside the wall to the right of the entrance appears rather intrusive, taken as a whole, the proposal would provide the finance to restore the buildings and walled garden which are in very poor condition. In our opinion, this would be far preferable than the originally permitted caravan park, and we would rather see the repair and repurposing of the existing buildings, than their eventual collapse due to lack of funds. The proposed holiday lodges are discreetly positioned and the standard of the new buildings and renovation seem carefully considered. Whilst the work will impact upon the registered park and garden to some extent, we feel that this work is a reasonable compromise in order to secure the future of the walled garden and its environs.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
WALES					

Nantlwyd House	Clwyd	W20/0003	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a detached dwelling and associated works. Former Bowling Green And Tennis Court Rear Of, The Bungalow, Castle Street, Ruthin</p>	<p>WHGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2020</p> <p>WHGT objects to this planning application as the proposed fence is too high and the proposed new build is too high and too close to Nantclwyd y Dre, overshadowing this important historic landscape. The adverse visual impacts would interfere with the ambience of the site which lies within the Ruthin Conservation Area.</p> <p>The significance of this site to both Welsh and British garden history is huge. The proposed planning application conflicts with the PPW10 to preserve the special interest of sites on the Register of Parks and Gardens of historic interest to Wales (6.1.6) and also impacts on both the historic environment and on the significance and heritage values of individual historic assets and their contribution to the character of place (6.1.9.).</p> <p>There is also a conflict with the LA Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes (3.1-3.5) concerning the statutory protection of Conservation Areas adopted by DCC in March 2015. The Well-being of Future Generations Act 2015 also requires that the environment is recognized as important for health and well-being. The Lord's Garden has for centuries been an oasis of tranquility in the history and heart of Ruthin. The tranquillity as well as the historic environment of the Lord's Garden is very precious within the town landscape and the tranquil experience of this garden should be preserved. This application clearly impacts the historic and Grade II listed landscape garden of Nantclwyd y Dre, (Nantlwyd House (PGW (C) 53) in the Cadw/ICOMOS Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales.) This landscape was once The Lord's Garden, the setting of the Grade I listed building, and has the longest documented history of any surviving garden in Wales. It is the oldest layer of the Lord's Garden that makes it special if not unique.</p> <p>Early History of The Lord's Garden</p> <p>The earliest references to the Lord's Garden are found in the Ruthin Court Rolls - published 1893 by RA Roberts:</p> <p>1358 - Ralph Glover and John Gogh, his servant, went into the garden beyond the lord's fence and removed apples They were both imprisoned in the gaol of Ruthin castle as a punishment.</p> <p>1360 - John Gogh was found guilty of making trespass in the Lord's garden. He was initially outlawed, later imprisoned and fined 2 shillings.</p> <p>1375 - Gronw ap loweth Bolle and his son Dd (Dafydd) were convicted of feloniously and furtively stealing a swarm of bees from the Lord's garden. They were fined £2. (This was a then a huge sum.) (Bolle may have been a</p>
----------------	-------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>beekeeper. Bees at this time were kept in skeps sheltered in bee boles so it is possible this was a theft by the Beekeeper.)</p> <p>Camden asserts that both the castle and town of Ruthin were built by 1st Baron Roger Grey for Henry III. Henry's son was The Lord Prince, who became Edward I. He was given lands in Wales and the Lordship of Chester on his marriage to Eleanor of Castile. This is possibly when The Lord's Garden was first developed. As Edward I brought his campaigns to Chester and Wales he brought his garden culture with him. There is no other surviving example of an Edward I castle garden in North Wales. The castle garden tradition was established by Eleanor of Aquitaine, Eleanor of Provence and Eleanor of Castile. The Queens came with servants including gardeners. Eleanor of Castile is particularly connected to Welsh castle gardens, and had them built at Caernarvon, Conway, and Rhuddlan. A flowery mead and orchard as a pleasure garden was an effort to create a paradise garden. Ruthin Court Rolls suggests that the Lord's garden was such an orchard with the theft of both apples and bees.</p> <p>In 1277 King Edward I granted Ruthin to Dafydd, brother of Prince Llewelyn ap Gruffydd in return for his treacherous help during the invasion of North Wales that year. Edward may have begun construction of a new castle or bequeathed an existing castle to his Welsh ally, which was then strengthened under its new master. (Dafydd also had castles at Caergwle and Denbigh). Ruthin was not a Lordship at this time.</p> <p>By 1282 - War flared up again as the English barons began to help themselves to Welsh lands. The Welsh garrison capitulated in the face of the large army led by 2nd Baron Reginald de Grey, one the three commanders appointed by Edward I in his campaign against Llewelyn ap Gruffydd.</p> <p>1282 - The Lordship of Ruthin was created in 1282 by Edward I, who granted it to Reginald de Grey for his loyalty. Edward visited Ruthin 31 August - 8 Sept. The Lord's Garden was very likely prepared for this visit. In 1287 Reginald de Grey spent the whole of the summer in Ruthin. The garden would have been a very important refuge as the castle was rebuilt and expanded.</p> <p>The setting of a medieval pleasure garden was very important according to Creighton [Castles and Landscapes: Power, Community and Fortification in Medieval England by O. H. Creighton].</p> <p>The Lord's garden provides a fantastic viewing point from which the castle construction could be observed as well as the wider views across the Vale.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Any new build adjacent to this site should respect the prospects from this garden. De Grey's high-status occupation of Ruthin Castle throughout the 1300s ensured that this garden would be protected and maintained. This garden has been valued and maintained as a garden over hundreds of years and was recently restored due to its unique heritage. The 6th Baron Grey de Ruthyn, 3rd Earl of Kent sold the Lordship to the crown in 1508. The garden continued and survived the civil war, unlike the castle, and become the garden of Nantclwyd y Dre. By the 18th century a gazebo/banqueting house had been added, a typical feature of the seventeenth century, to enjoy views and refreshment. The purpose of this feature will be lost if the views from it are compromised by a new build. (This feature can be seen as an eye-catcher in the garden, in the south west view of Ruthin Castle by Samuel and Nathaniel Buck, 1742), and was possibly added by the Wynne family in the early 18th century if not constructed earlier.</p> <p>The high stone garden walls which define this landscape date from the 15th century but parts are earlier, of the 13th century. The brick wall by the gazebo is believed to be 18th century. The garden wall history is significant and relates to the layout of the medieval borough.</p> <p>A more sensitively sited, lower and more sympathetically designed building within the sizeable plot must be possible, to protect the views and ambience of Nantclwyd y Dre which is a very special landscape.</p> <p>Glynis Shaw (Welsh Historic Gardens Trust, Clwyd branch) June 30 2020</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---