



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES AUGUST 2020

The GT conservation team received 158 new cases for England in August, 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, 39 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Castle Park	Avon	E20/0542	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing depot building and erection of temporary energy centre and abstraction platform along the wall of the Floating Harbour including a water source heat pump, thermal store, gas boilers and pumps and associated equipment to generate low carbon, renewable energy for the Bristol Heat Network. Council Depot, Queen Street, St Philips, Bristol BS2 0JB. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development, which would affect Castle Park, which is identified on Know Your Place as a local historic park and garden. The submitted Heritage Statement states that Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy policy BCS22 'requires development proposals to: "safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including: ... Historic parks and gardens both nationally and locally listed" ...'. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered and unregistered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Section 3 of the submitted Heritage Statement states that 'Castle Park itself is a locally registered park and garden as defined by Policy DM31 of the Local Plan.' The Heritage Statement goes on to mention 'the verdant park environment that is evident in views within the park and also from St Philip's Bridge that is identified as an important view in the conservation

					<p>area character appraisal'. At page 18 it states that: 'As a locally registered historic park and garden and general public popularity Castle Park has considerable communal value.' However, there is no detailed assessment of impact to the locally registered historic park and garden in Section 5, although there is a comment under the heading of City and Queen Square Conservation Area, that 'The thermal store will be visible in views from within the park and from St Philip's Bridge, however its location will mean that it is partially obscured by vegetation.'</p> <p>It is not clear how visible the proposed thermal store would be from within Castle Park. This would be an 11m high structure, but no proposed heights AOD for the thermal store or other elements of the proposed development are given in relation to existing ground levels. View 3 in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) is taken from a location within Castle Park; it is not clear if the 'proposed' view takes account of the trees that would be removed on the northern site boundary. The thermal store could be quite intrusive in views from the footpath to the north of the site within Castle Park.</p> <p>It is also not clear from the drawings and details provided how tall the proposed heat pump building would be in comparison with the existing building on the site.</p> <p>The Trust considers that the appearance of the Corten steel abstraction platform against the historic harbour wall could be rather jarring, particularly when seen from St Philips Bridge (View 1 proposed in the DAS). The rich colour of the Corten steel would be hard to compete with and it could be difficult to colour match to the powder coated copper brown, so could look like a mistake.</p> <p>The Trust considers that it is not possible to comment fully on the application due to the lack of a detailed impact assessment on the locally registered park and garden, Castle Park.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers that there is a lack of information on the proposed scheme, and would expect more information to be submitted in order to assess whether there would be any effect on the significance of the heritage asset of the local historic park and garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Bearwood College	Berkshire	E20/0529	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full application for the proposed	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory</p>

				erection of an equestrian facility for training and livery purposes including fifty horseboxes, foaling yard, indoor and outdoor riding arenas, lunge ring and horse walker, reception, office, members clubhouse with bar, parking for 25 cars, three parking areas for HGV horse lorries, and three units of residential accommodation comprising manager's three-bedroomed house, staff two-bedroomed flat and staff five-bedroomed flat, with access via Gravelpithill Lane and Ellis's Hill. Newlands, Mole Road, Sindlesham. EQUESTRIAN	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 Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation, and were surprised that the Design and Access statement, (Paras 5.20 & 5.2) made no mention whatsoever of the Grade II* Bearwood College registered park and garden (RPG) which lies in very close proximity to the application site. Despite this crucial omission, fortunately both the GT/BGT do not believe that the setting or features of the RPG are adversely affected. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Hall Place	Berkshire	E20/0630	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Enabling development of 26 dwellings on Honey Lane, Burchett's Green, Maidenhead, Berkshire. Hall Place, Burchetts Green, Berkshire RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.08.2020 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. One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the most recent planning application for Hall Place. We have looked at the proposals and are familiar with the Grade I listed building and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden. We are also aware of the urgent need to repair Hall Place but we are not able to comment on the Heritage Deficit Statement. The site lies outside of the Registered Park and we believe that the development would not have an adverse effect on the setting provided the tree and woodland cover which screens the site along the edge of the Park to the south-east of the site is retained. We note that Historic England states that it has no objections to this

					<p>development in the letter dated 4 August 2020. Historic England notes that the planning statement indicates that the applicant would be willing to enter into a s106 agreement to ensure that the money raised by the development would be used to carry out repairs to the building. We request that this money is also used as far as possible to carry out any repairs and maintenance to the landscape within the western part of the Park to ensure that the Park and the setting of the Grade I Hall Place are conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Conclusion BGT therefore raises no objections to the current proposals as they stand.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Park Place and Temple Coombe	Berkshire	E20/0697	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Householder application for proposed erection of a single storey side extension, plus erection of a three bay carport. The Dairy House, Park Place, Remenham Hill, Berkshire. BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed Council strategies affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on this planning application within Grade II* Park Place.</p> <p>The site lies within the plateau northern part of the wider parkland of Park Place. It includes the house, in private ownership, which is was extended in 2016 and was formerly a linear dairy and part of the group of buildings known historically as Park Place Farm; with open grounds to the east. The eastern boundary appears largely open to the wider parkland with some individual trees in the grounds and the adjacent parkland. To the north and south the site is enclosed by vegetation beyond which lies the gardens of the adjacent properties. The driveway to the west enters between other buildings. This group are now residential but largely retain the settlement pattern and plot configuration of the historic Park Place Farm. The new extension is shown attached to the extended house east of the Bull Pen. There are no public views of the site and the development area is set</p>

					<p>behind the Bull Pen and other buildings east of the lane. There are likely to be partial private views from the parkland to the east.</p> <p>We note that the Buildings Conservation Officer recommends refusal in part due to the harm to the Registered Park and Garden. We appreciate his comments that the new extension would damage the simple elongated current symmetrical form of the house and displace the current relationship between the Bull Pen and the north wing.</p> <p>However we feel that the proposed development may not harm the significance of the Grade II* Park and the northern plateau parkland landscape in particular. The relationship between Park Place Farm and the wider parkland may not be undermined and the visual impacts might be mitigated with appropriate planting on the site's eastern boundary. These comments do not bear on the impact that the development might have on this non-designated historic building and the Bull Pen. However any new development within the curtilage of The Dairy House may have the potential to harm the relationship between the built form and history of Park Place Farm and the adjoining parkland.</p> <p>As the site is within the Registered Park and Garden and part of the historic group of farm buildings, including its listed buildings and other non-designated heritage assets such as The Dairy House, the applicant should submit a Heritage Statement in support of this application. Views from the parkland should be submitted together with any appropriate landscape mitigation.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Before we feel that we can give our final comments, we request that further information, as described above, is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/0546	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey first floor side extension with balcony and additional sash window to front elevation. Bulstrode Manor Farm, Oxford Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8SZ.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2020</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and object to the application</p>

					<p>due to the exterior effects of the proposal to extend an outbuilding of the main House.</p> <p>It is most regrettable that the building of Bulstrode Manor Farm was permitted in the first place, as in our opinion it caused substantial harm to the appreciation and understanding of the historic designed landscape. The current proposal adds to this harm, especially in such close proximity to the Bulstrode Park canal. This is one of the most significant features of the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) which is one of only some 500 sites at this grade countrywide. This 260m long early-C18 formal canal, likely designed with the assistance of the great designers Henry Wise (1653-1738) and Claude Desgots, is an extremely rare intact survival of this type of feature. Few formal water features in England comparable in date and scale survive unaltered. The rare survivors include some of the most important designed landscapes in England: Hampton Court; Wrest Park, Bedfordshire; Studley Royal, Yorkshire; Chatsworth, Derbyshire; Hall Barn, Buckinghamshire and Shireoak, Nottinghamshire. The Bulstrode canal is comparable in size and style with these outstanding examples.</p> <p>In particular the proposal increases the scale of the building to become unacceptably overbearing as a feature in close proximity to the canal and in the key views northwards along the canal. This pavilion at present harms views along the canal, and it is at least relatively low and unassuming in these views. However, the position of this building in a particularly sensitive area in relation to the canal, increases the visual harm of the proposal with the enlarged scale of the elevation, increased height and more prominent roof.</p> <p>The proposal for this additional structure in such close proximity to the key feature of the Bulstrode landscape greatly increases the already substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. As a matter of principle the visual effect of any aspect of the house should not be increased in relation to this particularly sensitive element of the landscape. There is no justification to indicate that these works are necessary, and we disagree with the assertion in the Design and Access Statement (Section 7.1) that this proposal will preserve the features of interest in the building and gardens, securing the long term viability of the property and grounds. Nor is there any public benefit to offset the harm.</p> <p>We therefore urge that permission is refused for this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/0612	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of outbuilding, shed, fence and associated landscaping (Part Retrospective). Hygge, Main Street, Dadford, Buckinghamshire MK18 5JY. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) on the resubmission of the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) whose local knowledge again informs our joint response. We acknowledge that the applicant has confirmed that the two openings have been reduced to be vertical slit windows rather than garage doors and that, combined with appropriate native species planting, this helps to mitigate the impact of this regrettable application in the future. However, we would ask your officers to ensure that there is a restriction imposed which prevents the later insertion of garage doors or any further alteration to the fenestration, and also that the screen planting is maintained in future. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Great Moreton Hall	Cheshire	E20/0501	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Demolition of three existing buildings within the Walled Garden at Great Moreton Hall and reinstatement as a formal landscaped garden, and their replacement with three dwellings at another location within the estate fronting New Road. Repair and reinstatement of the garden walls and associated original lean-to structures within the Walled Garden. GREAT MORETON HALL, NEW ROAD, MORETON, CHESHIRE, CW12 4RY. WALLED GARDEN, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.08.2020 20/3057C Thank you for consulting Cheshire Gardens Trust on this application. We write to support this application, which will enable the removal of inappropriate past development, allow the conservation of important historic assets, restore the walled garden to garden use, and enhance the setting of the Grade II* listed hall. We have visited the grounds of Great Moreton Hall for research and recording purposes, and our completed report has been made available. We consider the historic designed landscape of Great Moreton Hall to be of great local significance due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the level of survival of the overall landscape structure and of the pleasure garden and kitchen gardens associated with the hall; • the unusual design of the pleasure garden enclosed by walls with bastions and gazebos; • the quality of materials and craftsmanship. We therefore consider that the significance of Moreton Hall, its associated buildings and structures set within a designed landscape, and the benefits to be gained from the proposal justify the development of three houses under “very special circumstances” within the Green Belt.

					<p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Conservation and Planning Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Cheshire Gardens Trust on this application. We write to object to this application as a matter of principle because the proposed development of three houses within the walled garden will result in permanent loss of the space that is the walled garden. We have visited the grounds of Great Moreton Hall for research and recording purposes, and our completed report has been made available. We consider the historic designed landscape of Great Moreton Hall to be of great local significance due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the level of survival of the overall landscape structure and of the pleasure garden and kitchen gardens associated with the hall; • the unusual design of the pleasure garden enclosed by walls with bastions and gazebos; • the quality of materials and craftsmanship. <p>We consider that the significance of Moreton Hall, its associated buildings and structures set within a designed landscape are compromised by this proposal which replaces three 1960s houses at the west end of the walled garden with three new houses, garages and vehicular access which are larger in area and occupy most of the walled garden space. We acknowledge that considerable thought has gone into the design and that the development will enable a contribution to the conservation of historic assets but this benefit does not justify the loss of space, loss of significance and a fundamental and permanent change to the setting of the hall and its designed landscape. The space within a walled garden is often seen as a development opportunity whereas the reverse is true – it is the space together with its defining walls which is of high significance.</p> <p>As can be seen most clearly from aerial photographs, the walled garden is part of a sequence of designed spaces relating to the Grade II* hall which in design and style dominates the whole assemblage. The housing development would result in fragmentation of the walled garden space and change from functional to fussy with individual houses, garages and drives, and compartmentalisation by railings, hedges and arbours. The landscaping may be sympathetically designed but there is no guarantee</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>that it will be retained by future owners.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the 1960s housing detracts from the significance of the heritage assets but permitting housing development in the walled garden does not provide an appropriate solution and prohibits any future restoration as a garden space. Another location for the housing development which would leave the walled garden unobstructed by buildings would be highly preferable.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Conservation and Planning Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Heligan	Cornwall	E20/0554	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Use of land to station portacabins to provide education/demonstration and office facilities. The Lost Gardens Of Heligan, Road From Heligan Gardens Entrance To Heligan Mill, Pentewan, St Austell. EDUCATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2020</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 Cornwall Gardens Trust (CGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. Having looked at the online documentation we asked our colleague in Cornwall if she would be able to look at the site, since the portacabins shown do look pretty large and brutal, notwithstanding the fact that we are told that they will be clad with wood when erected, and are in an unobtrusive area of the gardens. To our amazement, when she visited she discovered that work has already started - foundation and embankments had been put in, and the units were already in place although without cladding. As this application has not yet been decided we feel that this building work is somewhat premature. The Design and Access statement para 5.4 certainly indicates less intrusive work : ‘The main works necessary to bring about the future use proposed comprise the removal of derelict or disused equipment in the form of trailers and surplus materials and the clearance of scrub. Works will comprise primarily new connection to the existing services.’</p> <p>Whilst we are in general supportive of the restoration work undertaken at Heligan and their educational goals, we would have liked to have seen a landscaping proposal indicating how they propose to screen the entrance and north facing edge, and we would also have thought it prudent to at least wait until the application had been decided by your officers before</p>

					<p>the work was undertaken.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E20/0563	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 of AVA/2013/0691 for revised site plan, and revised proposed plans and elevations. Derby Mountain Rescue Team, Ashbourne Road, Mackworth Derby, Derbyshire DE22 4NB. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2020</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 colleagues familiar with the landscape at Kedleston and their local knowledge informs this response. Despite the extant permission for a new building on this site, the GT does not feel that this site is suitable for another enormous building within the Mackworth Conservation area, adding to the cumulative effect of commercialisation, in a greenfield site next to a field of ridge and furrow visible on Google Earth. We also have concerns that this building will give rise to further development in that area as it is next to a factory. Just because there is already harm, does not mean it is acceptable to increase that harm.</p> <p>We would like to draw your officers'/Councillors' attention to wording in relation to conservation areas which has received judicial interpretation by the House of Lords in the case of South Lakeland district Council versus the Secretary of State for the Environment and another as follows: 'The statutorily desirable object of preserving the character or appearance of an area is achieved either by a positive contribution to preservation or by development which leaves the character or appearance unharmed that is to say, preserved.' In our opinion, this application fails that test as it causes harm.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.08.2020</p> <p>Further to our earlier comments, even if the proposed HQ does lie just outside the Mackworth Conservation Area, it is still well within its setting. It will sit next to a huge and already unsympathetic development which will only give encouragement to further development in the area. As we said in our earlier letter, just because there is already harm, does not mean it is acceptable to increase that harm.</p>

					<p>We continue to object to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Plympton House	Devon	E20/0495	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of five executive, detached, 5-bed dwellings and associated garaging, driveways, access and landscaping. East Field, Plympton House, Plymouth, Plympton PL7 2LL. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the proposal for development of the East Field adjoining Plympton House, which is an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and responds to consultations on its behalf in the county of Devon.</p> <p>We have studied the application documents on your website, have visited the site on several occasions and ask you to consider the following comments:</p> <p>The heritage assets of Plympton House comprise the Grade II Registered landscape, Plympton House, a Grade I listed building, the kitchen garden walls, the south wall along Long Cause and two pairs of gate piers, all listed Grade II.</p> <p>The application is for the proposed development of 5 detached houses on land at East Field which adjoins the Grade I listed building and the Grade II Registered landscape of Plympton House. East Field contributes to its historic open green setting and any development on this site would adversely affect the setting of Plympton House.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan allocated the Plympton House site for the development of 14 houses, which was considered to be the maximum number the site could accommodate without harming the significance of the heritage assets. Subsequently, planning permission was granted (reference 15/02230/FUL 15/02229/FUL & 15/02232/LBC) in 2016 for residential development to restore Plympton House, the removal of the later detrimental buildings, the conversion of the existing buildings, and 6 new houses. This means that the development allocation has been fulfilled in relation to the 14 houses. The current application for 5 more houses, in addition to the 14 already built and would exceed the allocation in the Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved 'in</p>

					<p>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 (paragraph 184). NPPF paragraph 194 advises that all harm to heritage assets requires a clear and convincing justification, and that the more important the asset the greater the weight that should be given to its conservation. The proposed development would substantially harm heritage assets of the highest significance, namely Plympton House, a Grade I listed building within a grade II Registered park and garden. NPPF para 195 states Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. We consider that there is no justification for the building of five additional houses as they would not constitute substantial public benefit of a weight sufficient enough to outweigh the harm to the significance of the setting of the Plympton House and its park and garden. The proposed development would cause substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets of the highest significance, namely Plympton House, a Grade I listed building within a Grade II Registered park and garden. The proposed development therefore should not be permitted.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Gardens Trust objects to the proposed development in the strongest possible terms as it conflicts with National Planning Policy with regard to the conservation of the historic environment. We urge your Council to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the further information in relation to the above application for development of the East Field adjoining Plympton House.</p> <p>We have studied the application documents on your website. We do not wish to add to the comments in our letter of objection dated 4 August 2020</p> <p>We urge your Council to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					John Clark Conservation Officer
Poltimore House	Devon	E20/0617	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of up to 200 no. dwellings with associated access, infrastructure and areas of public open space/landscaping; outline planning application with all matters reserved except the access. Land At Park Farm (Phase 3), West Clyst, Exeter.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Poltimore House, a Grade II* listed building within an historic designed landscape included in the Devon Gazetteer of Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest.</p> <p>The site is not allocated for development in the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2030 but is within an area designated as a Green Wedge which extends from West Clyst towards the village of Poltimore. Within Green Wedges, as defined on the Proposal Map, development will not be permitted if it would add to existing sporadic or isolated development or damage the individual identity of a settlement or could lead to or encourage settlement coalescence.</p> <p>The proposed development would extend the urban area of Exeter onto the 19th century parkland of Poltimore House encroaching into its landscape setting, thereby causing considerable harm to the significance of the heritage assets.</p> <p>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 (paragraph 184).</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 194 advises that all harm to heritage assets requires a clear and convincing justification, and that great weight that should be given to its conservation. NPPF para 195 states Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed development would not constitute a substantial public benefit of a weight sufficient to outweigh the harm to the significance of the setting of the Poltimore House and its parkland.</p> <p>We share the concerns of Historic England as set out in their letter dated 21 July 2020 and agree with their recommendations. The Devon Gardens Trust objects to the proposed development as it conflicts with National Planning Policy with regard to the conservation of the historic environment. We urge your Council to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>

					John Clark Conservation Officer
Kingston Lacy	Dorset	E20/0539	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent New grounds source array beneath the overflow car park; new underground trenching to the Kitchen Court; demolition of fuel tank and generator to the north of the Kitchen Court and replacement with sub-station and pump plant building on same footprint. KINGSTON LACY HOUSE, KINGSTON LACY, WIMBORNE, BH21 4EA. SOLAR, ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to this proposed development. The application has the potential to affect the parkland surrounding Kingston Lacy House, a site listed Grade II by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. It is authorised by the GT to respond on its behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The principle of the proposed work submitted has clear environmental advantages, and the new structures to the north of the Kitchen Court will result in an overall improvement to what is there now. The Trust raises no objection to the principle of this proposal.</p> <p>However, there are two elements of the work that have some potential for damage. The first is the extent to which archaeological features are affected by the glycol pipes, and others will no doubt comment on this. The second is the impact on trees, there being two locations where these pipe runs will run through tree'd areas. One of these locations will also have a HV electricity cable alongside. This element of work has the potential for a direct impact on the basis for the designated Grade II park landscape. It is clear from the documentation for this application that thought has been given to this issue, including a detailed report (Appendix C to the Design and Access Statement) by Richard Nicholson. The Trust can only therefore ask that this detailed methodology be strictly adhered to during the excavation of these two sections of trenching.</p> <p>Chris Clarke for the Dorset Gardens Trust, and on behalf of The Gardens Trust</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0547	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of full width rear extension with two storey element. Proposed single storey kitchen extension and dormers at first floor to provide additional bed and bathroom in roof.	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2020</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) whose local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation, and it is apparent that the house is at present well screened by trees and as such is not evident in the wider landscape. However, whilst we cannot object on that aspect, in our</p>

				Garden Cottage, Shortgrove, Newport. BUILDING ALTERATION	opinion the character and materials of the proposed large extension complement neither the existing house or the wider setting. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0556	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling with single storey addition. The Bungalow, Shortgrove, Newport. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2020 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 would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation and it would appear from the photographs of the existing building that it is a former Shortgrove estate building, and one which is shown on the 1897 map. As such we would have expected a Heritage Statement to accompany the application. The proposed new house is proportionate and traditional in appearance, hidden within trees, and we are glad to note that the bricks etc will be re-used as far as possible and that a circular window, as in the original house, is to be incorporated into the new structure. Should your officers approve this application we would suggest that a record/assessment of the original building is made for posterity. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0583	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garden store and home office. The Pump House, Shortgrove, Newport. BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2020 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 would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. The Pump House is a small building which was given retrospective consent for conversion to a dwelling in 2011 (UTT/0221/11/FUL). It is located amongst the buildings that were once ancillary to Shortgrove Hall, which was burnt down in 1966. The house stood in a historic landscape designed in part by Capability Brown, which is now a grade II registered landscape and probably the best example of Brown's work in Essex.

					<p>The NPPF Para 189 requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage asset(s) affected including any contribution made by their setting, and Para 190 requires an applicant to describe the impact that the proposals may have upon the heritage asset. Since this application is not accompanied by either a Design and Access Statement or Heritage Statement it is contrary to the NPPF. The lack of these crucial documents also makes it difficult to assess its relationship to the historic setting. It seems to be close to, but not quite abutting, the wall of the 18th century walled garden. Nor is there any justification for this new building, the fenestration and doors of which lack the detailing that might be expected in a location such as this. A work-from-home unit is already indicated on the 2011 application. The addition of new buildings risks incremental damage to the historic site and its further suburbanisation. In view of this potential damage, and lack of supporting information, we can only object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Berkeley Castle	Gloucestershire	E20/0610	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Relocate the Yurt structure to a new site. Berkeley Castle, High Street, Berkeley, Gloucestershire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.08.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on sensitive heritage assets, particularly gardens, parks and landscapes; has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>This minimal submission to reposition the original yurt raises a number of questions concerning its quality and whether this is an appropriate location- it certainly is more visible.</p> <p>The District' Conservation Officer seemed to have summed up the legal framework for decision-making.</p> <p>However, one cannot but reflect that this seems a great opportunity for improvement being missed. Referring back to the previous submission, might one suggest that the mixed collection of storage is cleared from the previous location, and then ask the question about where it is now being replaced.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Landscaping to Alton West Estate,	Greater London	E20/0203	II II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The application is for a part outline and part detailed planning</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.08.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is</p>

<p>Landscaping to Alton East Estate</p>			<p>permission and the REVISED description of the proposed development is set out below: (a) Phased demolition of existing buildings structures (except Alton Activity Centre building); (b) Mixed-use phased development ranging from 1-9 storeys above ground level comprising up to 1,108 residential units and up to 9,459 sqm (GIA) of non-residential uses comprising new / replacement community facilities (including library, healthcare facilities, youth facilities, community hall, children's nursery & children's centre) (Class D1); flexible commercial floorspace (comprising retail (Class A1), financial and professional services (Class A2), cafe/ restaurants (Class A3), hotfood takeaways (Class A5), business (Class B1), & community uses (Class D1); landscaping; removal and replacement of trees; public realm improvements; access improvements; relocation of bus turnaround area and provision of bus driver toilet facility; improvements to children's play facilities; provision of energy centre & associated rooftop plant enclosure, car/cycle parking & highway works. All matters reserved except for Blocks A, K,</p>	<p>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 LGT 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 LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). The application form seeks permission for: 1. Phased demolition of all existing buildings and structures (except Alton Activity Centre community building); 1. Mixed-use phased development ranging from 1 - 9 storeys above ground level comprising up to 1,108 residential units and up to 9,377 sqm (GIA) of non residential uses comprising new and replacement community facilities (including library and healthcare facilities, youth facilities, community hall, children's nursery & children's centre) (Class D1); flexible commercial floorspace (comprising retail (Class A1), financial and professional services (Class A2), café / restaurants (Class A3), hot-food takeaways (Class A5), business (Class B1), and community uses (Class D1)); landscaping; removal and replacement of trees; public realm improvements; access improvements; relocation of bus turnaround area provision of bus driver toilet facility; improvements to children's play As such this is a major redevelopment which will dramatically and irrevocably alter the character of much of the estate, the setting of the many listed and locally listed buildings which remain, the listed landscape and the coherent relationship between Alton West & Alton East. Key sections of Alton Estate West & East are designated Grade II on the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) and are therefore designated heritage assets in their own right and protected by law. As such their conservation should be an objective of all sustainable development. Substantial harm to, or total loss of, a Grade II registered park or garden should be exceptional. The objections of the London Gardens Trust to these proposals can be sorted into three main issues; 1. The general lack of respect for the original concept and execution of the</p>
---	--	--	---	--

			<p>M, N, O, Q, Portswood Place Nursery and Community Centre and highway/ landscape/public realm improvements. (The Planning Application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement Addendum). Alton Estate London SW15. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>listed landscaping of the designated slab and point blocks, which has led to destructive proposals of a linear path system which harms the key open, free flowing landform of the original grassed areas. The proposed paths cut through the sloping and undulating land and would create an awkward urbanised character to an otherwise 'naturalistic' ground plane, a remnant from the C.18th layout.</p> <p>2. The destruction of undulating historic ground levels through the imposition of large bulky blocks, particularly Blocks O,N,K,M, & Q, with all proposed blocks employing the use of cut and fill creating poor streetscape and use of podium decks.</p> <p>3. The severing of the coherent approach to landscape design between Alton West and Alton East estates.</p> <p>To quote Historic England in their listing report, 'The LCC estates at Roehampton were amongst the most important post-war mass housing schemes built in Britain. The Architects' Department of the LCC was the largest and most influential public architectural office in the world in the 1950s.'</p> <p>'Of all the housing estates built by the LCC, the Roehampton schemes were the most ambitious, receiving extensive coverage in the contemporary architectural press and gaining an international reputation as being amongst the most important low-cost housing schemes of the period. The architectural significance of the Roehampton estates is now well established; all ten of the point blocks at Alton East are listed at Grade II, whilst the five slab blocks set into the Downshire Hill and the pensioners' bungalows at Alton West are listed respectively at Grade II* and Grade II.'</p> <p>Whilst Alton East and Alton West estates drew from distinct and differing strands of European modernism, the LCC teams were united in their rationale to integrate and adapt the inherited landscape features. The Historic England listing report states, 'Alton West was particularly notable in this regard, with Architectural Design noting that the 'importance of Roehampton Lane as a housing estate lies in its expression of a unique relationship to a landscape that includes eighteenth-century buildings designed into the whole picture' (January 1959, p21). One of the intentions of the Alton West team was to form a connection between Downshire House and Mount Clare on the northern and southern slopes of the site. The clear sweep of Downshire Field, a remnant of the C18 landscaping was remodelled by the LCC team to create slight valley rising against the hill towards the north to emphasise views of the point and slab blocks, 'aiming</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>at a feeling of endlessness to the grass carpet' as John Partridge put it (Twentieth Century Architecture, p118). The placement of the blocks allowed clear vistas to be established both towards and from the two villas, underscored in the case of Downshire House through the installation of Lynn Chadwick's 'The Watchers' in 1963, with the three figures positioned to look out over Downshire Field and the slab blocks. Important legacies of the 1770s estate planting survive at Alton West in the mature trees retained around Mount Clare and Danebury Avenue, which defined earlier boundaries, framed views and formed secluded walks. These trees, as carefully integrated within the estate plan, contribute significantly to the richness of the estate's landscaping.'</p> <p>Although now partly obscured by trees, the groundworks of the LCC team still remain and the vistas and views so carefully designed and executed 60-70 years ago area still evident and enjoyed. Far from looking to repair and restore the characteristics above, the present proposals actively harm these principles through the imposition of a trim trail and harmful 'grid' approach to the paths serving the Grade II* slab blocks.</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. As important as the fight against obesity is, there is also a great need for relaxing, open grassland and a duty of care to the iconic landscape design which is designated a heritage asset in its own right.</p> <p>The landscape strategy of incidental planting and clutter will destroy the last vestiges of the listed open grassland landscape.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment will also be clearly visible from Richmond Park designated Grade I. The iconic views of the Alton Estate slab and point blocks from Richmond Park are world famous and unique in this country. These proposals will undermine the elegance of the original layout and cause significant harm to the context and clarity of design intention which has been listed for its national importance.</p> <p>The LGT objects to this planning application on the following grounds: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The destructive cut and fill approach levels out the undulating character of the original parkland and obliterates the snippets of sight lines between blocks from Roehampton Lane which allow appreciation of the original more undulating character and leads to the excessive use of podium decks and poor streetscape.
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The complete divergence from any existing architectural character or streetscape will destroy the link between the listed landscapes to the East and West. • The loss of the mature Lime trees along Harbridge Avenue which were themselves planted to replace an historic Lime tree allee from the historic Manressa House Estate upon which Alton Estate was built. The trees are included as part of Alton Conservation Area in recognition of their importance. • The imposition of a grid like path through Devonshire Field completely undermines the original landscape approach to setting the slab blocks (Grade II*) in the undulating parkland landscape. The new path does not follow any kind of desire line and instead cuts through the original undulating grassland. The proposed routes force in some locations, force through shallow mounds in one case destroying a small stand of trees and completely altering the relationship of the surrounding parkland to the buildings. • The new path is part of the ‘play strategy for Downshire Field’ which is harmful to the listed character as it imposes a cluttered trim trail and alien incidental planting • The design of the proposed play centre at the bottom of Minstead Gardens is incongruous and alien and its height will damage sight lines between Mount Clare and Devonshire Field which even now are reminiscent of the original estate and were carefully planned by the LCC architects to give the impression of ‘endless grassland’ and links with the wider historic context. • The southern elevation of Block Q is overbearing and destructive pushed as it is to the very limits of the listed parkland. Veteran pines on a small mound adjacent, saved during earlier construction phases, appear lost to a needlessly destructive and unnecessary path. • Cutting into the open parkland to create a road-way and bus waiting area will be yet another cumulative loss of character and therefore significance. • Wider views from Richmond Park of the listed estate will be spoilt by the large bulky buildings wrapping around the point blocks in particular. The present iconic view of elegant listed blocks set against a spacious sky will be destroyed. • The large window ‘penthouse’ design of the new blocks will also be highly intrusive at night when they are lit up and highly visible across the wider area.
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation
Richmond Park	Greater London	E20/0536	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Revised Application Redevelopment of the site to provide one new build block of four storeys in height comprising 14 dwellings (Class C3) comprising 12 x 3 bed units and 2 x 4 bed units, landscaped amenity area and playspace, car parking spaces (including disabled spaces), cycle parking, refuse storage and creation of access. Alton One O Clock Centre, Fontley Way SW15 4LY.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.08.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT 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 LGT 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 LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>The site of these proposals is immediately adjacent to Richmond Park designated Grade I for its long history reaching back to the 14th Century. It became a royal deer park after Henry VII built his palace at Sheen, naming it Richmond after his lands in Yorkshire. Initially called New Park, it was enclosed by Charles I who first permitted pedestrian access via ladder stiles in compensation for loss of use of the land by local people. Apart from a period after the Civil War it remained in royal ownership until 1910. When Lord Orford became Ranger in the reign of George II, he and his father Sir Robert Walpole began to improve it, building the lodges to control access.</p> <p>The next Ranger Princess Amelia also attempted to disbar the public, but the rights of public access were upheld in law although it was not until 1850 that carriages were allowed access. During the C20th various recreational facilities have been created including 2 golf courses, sports pitches and a polo field.</p> <p>These proposals are for the redevelopment of the site to provide one new build block of four storeys in height comprising 14 dwellings (Class C3) comprising 12 x 3 bed units and 2 x 4 bed units, landscaped amenity area and playspace, car parking spaces (including disabled spaces), cycle parking, refuse storage and creation of access.</p> <p>The LPGT objects to this planning application on the following grounds:</p>

					<p>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. • The new development will be clearly visible along the boundary and from as far away as The White Lodge • The scheme does not respect the 8m development protection zone around Richmond Park • The proposed design of the new units undermines the coherent design and detailing of the original estate. • The imposition of an additional 14 family dwellings will cause unacceptable additional pressure on the amenity of the existing area with regards 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>
Kensal Green (All Souls) Cemetery	Greater London	E20/0593	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide residential units (Use Class C3) within a new residential-led building ranging in height from 7 to 24 storeys (above ground), over ground floor commercial floorspace (Use Class A1/A2/A3/A5/B1A/B1C), with basement car parking, cycle parking and plant space, landscaping and associated works. North Kensington Gate (South Site)., 115-129A Scrubs Lane, London, NW10 6QU. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.08.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) designated as 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 LGT 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 LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). These proposals affect Kensal Green Cemetery, listed Grade I on the NHLE and St.Mary's Catholic Cemetery which is included in our Gardens Inventory here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=HAF052&sitename=St+Mary%27s+Catholic+Cemetery. This application proposes the demolition of existing buildings and</p>

					<p>redevelopment of the site to provide residential units (Use Class C3) within a new residential-led building ranging in height from 7 to 24 storeys (above ground), over ground floor commercial floorspace (Use Class A1/A2/A3/A5/B1A/B1C), with basement car parking, cycle parking and plant space, landscaping and associated works.</p> <p>This development site is immediately adjacent to St.Mary's Catholic Cemetery which is designated a nature reserve of local importance, Metropolitan Open Land and a conservation area. As a conservation area the cemetery is a designated heritage asset in its own right and also includes specifically listed buildings and monuments to the north of the site. The closest memorial is the Commonwealth Memorial which is very close to the site boundary.</p> <p>The character appraisal for St.Mary's conservation area explains, 'To the south of the crematorium garden is a further secluded garden and a war memorial and cemetery, and beyond this, through a shady avenue, near the southern boundary is a 1914-18 Colonial war memorial and cemetery commemorating servicemen from South Africa, Canada and Australia.' It continues, 'The park-like views help comfort the bereaved, and its diversity, with woodland, scrub, tall herbs, vegetated monuments and grassland with scattered trees is acknowledged as being of Metropolitan significance.' This character will be utterly changed by the building, in extremely close proximity, of a 7-storey slab block with a 24-story high-rise tower attached.</p> <p>The ground levels are such that as approaching from the canal, which is within the Grand Union Canal conservation area, the tower will appear even more dominant and the ground floors and basements given over to car parks will leave a poor streetscape and desolate appearance.</p> <p>The immense height and density of this development will dominate the surrounding designated heritage assets, undermine the contemplative and consoling character of the cemetery as well as the dignified setting for the war memorials.</p> <p>The LGT objects to this planning application on the following grounds: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overbearing height and bulk of the building will destroy local character and appear incongruous and dominant • The impact of such a large development overlooking the cemetery will undermine its character as a designated heritage asset and the setting of the Commonwealth war memorial
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity of the tower and its sub-basements will undermine the character and enjoyment of the adjacent Grand Union Canal conservation area • Noise, and shade during the day will undermine the sites designation as a nature conservation area and at night light pollution will impact on nocturnal wildlife such as bats. <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>
Bengeo Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E20/0466	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Bengeo Neighbourhood Area Plan has been published for comment in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2020</p> <p>HGT is disappointed that the heritage value of the Bengeo area is limited to built structures. Ware Park is an important Local Park of considerable historic interest and the SW quarter has survived with many features of ancient hornbeam pollards, oak pollards, some lime pollards from the southern avenue as well as other avenues and earthworks which still attest to the early deer park and the later ornamental park. HGT has researched this park, but no enquiries were made to us during the preparation of this NP.</p> <p>We consider that the heritage value, as well as its rural landscape value should be acknowledged and protected with policies similar to those for built heritage asset</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Sele Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E20/0467	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN the Sele Neighbourhood Area Plan has been published for comment in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2020</p> <p>The GT/HGT have been involved with the preparation of this plan and are pleased to see the inclusion of Policies to protect both the Goldings RPG and the Locally Important Historic parks and gardens with Sele.</p> <p>We support this plan</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

Gilston Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E20/0489	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Published for comment in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2020 The GT/HGT have been involved with the preparation of this plan and are pleased to see the inclusion of Policies to protect both the Goldings RPG and the Locally Important Historic parks and gardens with Sele. We support this plan Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Temple Dinsley	Hertfords hire	E20/0499	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extension, associated external and internal alterations to and part-demolition of curtilage listed barn to facilitate its conversion to a single dwelling. Barn Adjacent Dower House, Hitchin Road, Preston, Hertfordshire. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2020 We have no comment to make on the demolition of the rear section of the existing barn nor on its proposed replacement. However, we are concerned about the amount of glazing on the eastern facade. Although the site is well wooded and views to the mansion and Lutyans gardens would not be affected, there may be problems with glare/reflection across some part of the RPG landscape. We suggest that sufficient screening is retained or put in the reduce any adverse impact on the Registered landscape. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hatfield Lodge, Newgate Street	Hertfords hire	E20/0564	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Submission of details pursuant to condition 3 (external materials) of planning permission 6/2020/0468/HOUSE. Hatfield Lodge, Newgate Street, Hertford, SG13 8NH. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application, we do not have any objections to the materials proposed. Katre Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Poles Park	Hertfords hire	E20/0572	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed single storey front extension incorporating a new raised roof and alterations to fenestration. Alterations to exterior and to hard standing (resubmission of scheme approved under LPA ref: 3/17/0794/FUL). Gospel Hall, Wadesmill Road, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 0UQ. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The hall is situated within Nun's Triangle, a now-detached part of Grade II RPG of Poles Park. An update to Poles Historic Landscape Appraisal in 2016 highlighted the lack of maintenance of the tree stock, much of which is historic parkland planting and including many oaks, now in various stages of decay. We have no objection to the proposed alterations to the hall and would support efforts to retain and manage the tree stock referred to in this application. We note one oak is proposed for felling and would support any decision on this by the EHDC arboricultural officer. We would support the planting of a replacement oak if the decision is to fell.

					Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
10 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0576	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1x Fir tree and 1x Magnolia tree to rear. 10 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX. TREES OUTCOME 25.08.2020 No objection	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that a recent application was made to fell a Portuguese laurel on this property. As no arboricultural report is included with this application we are unable to understand why felling is the only solution for the alleged defects in these trees. We would suggest that expert advice is provided to justify this solution. As noted in applications for tree felling elsewhere in Densley Close, the number of trees being lost in this location is a source of concern to us, as it harms the character of this historic part (pre-dating the Garden City) of WGC. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
4 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0578	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree (T3). 4 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that an application has already been made to fell 2 oaks at this property under 6/2019/2697/TC. It would appear from the scanty plans supplied that the tree referred to in this current application as T3 is the same as T1 in the previous application. We are concerned at loss of mature oak trees from this historic site which was woodland hundreds of years before the houses were built . As several properties in the immediate neighbourhood are also requesting felling of trees, we consider that cumulatively this will adversely affect the character of this area of Welwyn Garden City. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
5 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0585	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce x1 Hornbeam tree by 2 metres. (T1) Remove x1 Cherry tree. (T2). 5 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JW. TREES OUTCOME 02.09.2020 No objection	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2020 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Although we have no comment to make on the current application, we note that the applicants have already been granted permission to fell a line of Cypress conifers (6/2020/1323/TC). Cumulatively, the loss of trees will have an adverse effect on the character of this part of Sherrardspark Road. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

23 Reddings, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LA	Hertfords hire	E20/0590	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Conifer Tree. 23 Reddings, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LA. TREES OUTCOME 02.09.2020 Approved	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. As no reason for the removal of this tree, which is at the furthest point from the house, is given, we cannot comment on this application. Trees should only be removed if diseased or causing structural problems to a building.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
25 Ayot Green, Ayot St Peter	Hertfords hire	E20/0616	N	PLANNING AAPPLICATION Erection of 3 industrial units following demolition of existing outbuildings. 25 Ayot Green, Ayot St Peter, Welwyn AL6 9BA. LIGHT INDUSTRIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Historic England Register of Parks & Gardens. Hertfordshire 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 to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Brocket Park is an early to late 18th century parkland designed by the nationally important Charles Bridgeman and Richard Woods, much of which survives despite later golf course earthworks. It provides the setting for the Grade I Brocket Hall. The Parkland is Registered at Grade II by Historic England. At the northern entrance at Ayot Green the approach drive enters the Ayot Green Conservation Area.</p> <p>This application lies within the setting of the Registered parkland and close to the historic lodges and the parkland as well as listed cottages in Ayot Green, and the proposed approach road passes through the RRPG itself. It is also adjacent to the Conservation Area and adjacent to a designated wildlife area.</p> <p>The WHBC Policy map also shows this to be within the Green Belt and not in an area designated for any development.</p> <p>The proposed development will cause considerable harm to the significance of the parkland, lodges and other heritage assets, and to the Conservation Area from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise levels • Increased traffic, including goods vehicles, especially though the RPG and Conservation Area • Inappropriate buildings and parking with much hard surfacing <p>We consider that this development is contrary to WHBC's heritage policy (SADM15) which states that proposals that result in less than substantial</p>

					<p>harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be refused unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location significantly outweigh that harm. We consider that there is no public benefit, just harm to the designated heritage assets.</p> <p>We consider that this application also does not satisfy the NPPF's sustainable development environmental objective, nor the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets (NPPF:185). It is contrary to the WHBC Policy on the Green Belt where purpose 3 is to Assist in Safeguarding the Countryside from Encroachment.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust OBJECTS to this development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning: Hertfordshire Gardens Trust And The Gardens Trust</p>
12 Mandeville Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0660	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Oak (T1) - Fell. 12 Mandeville Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JU. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.08.2020</p> <p>We would support the recommendation in the arboricultural report that a replacement tree of suitable species be planted in a more appropriate location on the property, if permission is given to fell the oak.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
51 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0674	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of dead Sycamore tree. 51 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LJ. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that there is no arboricultural report on the website, as indicated in the planning application form. We have no objection to the removal of this dead sycamore.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
395 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0704	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 6x Lawson Cypress trees. 395 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LY. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objection to the removal of these Lawson Cypress trees</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
133 Oakdale, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0707	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension, single storey front extension, and part garage conversion. 133 Oakdale, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7QS. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2020</p> <p>We note that this property backs on the the historic Monks Walk. However, we have no objection to the works proposed in this application.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

Dacorum Local List of Historic Parks and Gardens	Hertfords hire	E20/0712	N	LOCAL PLAN Dacorum Local List of Historic Parks & Gardens	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.08.2020</p> <p>Here are the rest of the sites for the Local List. There are a number of other sites which have some historic merit but I think these are the main ones with most to lose from inappropriate development. I also have copies of the GIS plans prepared by DBC which were sent to me for comment and amendment as needed. I'd be happy to send those on if you require them. Once you've had a look at these, please do let me know if there is anything further you would like.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the encroachment of the Woodland Trust activities on the setting of the Registered Tring Park despite HGT, GT and HE trying to engage with them, including submitting heritage reports, on-site visits and many meetings.</p> <p>We are very disappointed and somewhat upset at DBC's failure to consult GT and HE - statutory consultees - on the application for a car park in Dawes Field which was granted this April. This is a disaster for the setting and therefore the significance of the Registered parkland. We note that the RPG was not even flagged up as a constraint on the planning application website, despite being adjacent to it.</p> <p>We are further dismayed by the WT insistence on planting trees on the downland west of Hastoe Lane despite our explaining that this is also a critical part of the setting, both as a contrast to the formality of the Registered park and a historic site in its own right with a woodland edge walk from the Rothschild Home Farm through Stubbings Wood to Hastoe, which gives (gave) views across the downland (now alas full of trees) to the forest garden at Tring Park, the town of Tring and the Ashridge Monument. I would be grateful if you could draw these comments to the attention of the relevant personnel so that other applications which affect the setting of the RPG can be flagged up for us to be notified.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning: Hertfordshire Gardens Trust Conservation Committee: The Gardens Trust Sites submitted: Woodcock Hill, Golden Parsonage, Heath Lane Cemetery, Lockers Park, Nash Mills, Pendley, Shendish Manor, Stocks, Tring Cemetery, Victoria Wood, Westbrook Hay</p>
Westerham Lodge	Kent	E20/0540	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to create an alternative access with	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.08.2020</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</p>

				alterations to wall and the associated driveway. Westerham Lodge, Quebec Square, Westerham KENT TN16 1TD. ACCESS/GATES	Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. This application is very similar to a previous application 16/03973, which was for an agricultural access from Hosey Hill. This application, at approximately the same location, states that it is for an access to Westerham Lodge, situated to the north, whose current access is located at the junction of the A25 with Hosey Hill. Application 16/03973 was refused by Sevenoaks District Council and an appeal was dismissed. The inspector's comments at the appeal continue to be relevant in respect of this application. Consequently the Gardens Trust and Kent Gardens Trust cannot support this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Holkham Hall	Norfolk	E20/0676	-	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of dwelling (Estate House under NPPF Paragraph 79e) restoration of barns; associated landscape and ecology proposals and change of use of land from agriculture to residential curtilage. Creake Buildings, Walsingham Road, Egmere, Norfolk. RESIDENTIAL OUTCOME 20.08.2020 Granted	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2020 The Gardens Trust has only become aware of this application after reading about it in the national press when it was approved. As statutory consultees for all grades of Registered landscapes we would definitely have expected to be included in the list of consultees, as the application site lies within the wider setting of the Grade I listed Holkham park, only 1km from the Triumphal Arch. It is extremely regrettable that you failed to notify us as per your statutory duty. I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet which reminds local authorities of their statutory duties in relation to registered parks and gardens. I would be grateful that you could please confirm that in future you will ensure that the Gardens Trust is notified about applications which affect all grades of registered parks within your authority's boundaries. Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Marske Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0179	N	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	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2020 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) on the amended plans. We refer you to our earlier letters (17th January, 26th May) and particularly our letter of 13th July which was in response to the further advice and discussions that you have had with officers in your Authority, Richmondshire DC and NYCC Highways and with Marske and New Forest

				<p>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>Parish Council.</p> <p>We agree that the historic buildings will benefit from substantial refurbishment. The consequent car parking problem and its harm to the settings of significant listed buildings in their important historic designed landscape is very difficult to resolve, especially without the availability of additional land away from the heritage assets.</p> <p>Our letter of 13th July looked at the car parking proposals from your colleague Gaby Rose, Building Conservation and the Senior Listed Buildings Officer, which we felt was a better solution. She suggested 6 spaces in a line SE of the kennels (dog house) and lawn alongside the hall, and 8 spaces to the north of the hall. But we note that the amended plans above now have a V-shaped arrangement of car parking between the kennels (dog house) and the hall which includes 6 spaces to the west side of the lawn in front of the kennels. There are a further 3 spaces near the kennels itself. We feel that this is an extra harmful intrusion and wonder why Ms Rose's proposals have not been taken forward.</p> <p>Is the proposed solution in the amended plans the optimum result of several design/redesign iterations? We now defer to your Authority's expertise in this matter.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
York Cemetery	North Yorkshire	E20/0462	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 4 (proposed materials) of permitted application 18/01620/FUL to alter roofing material from 'Zinc standing seam metal roof' to natural slate. York Cemetery Trust Kiosk, York Cemetery, Cemetery Road, York. MISCELLANEOUS OUTCOME 02.09.2020 Approved</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2020 Cemetery, Cemetery Road, York.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting York Cemetery, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens 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>We have no comment to make on this application and defer to the advice of your Authority's conservation adviser.</p> <p>With reference to our letter of 19th December 2018 regarding the previous planning application number: 18/01620/FUL18/01621/LBC (single storey extension and alterations to building to form volunteers centre with associated facilities and tool store (resubmission). York Cemetery Trust</p>

					<p>Kiosk), we trust that a planting scheme has been agreed for the setting of the new building and Lodge. We recommend using a range of plants sympathetic to the Victorian character of the cemetery and note that the existing willow tree adjacent to the listed wall and railings is to be removed. We suggest that there is replacement shrub/hedge planting that will continue the established planted screening and the visual amenity of the conservation area and cemetery, without future damage to the listed wall.</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>
Thorp Perrow	North Yorkshire	E20/0518	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a single storey double garage to front (south) elevation, single storey garden room extension to rear (north) elevation, installation of one window at ground floor of east elevation, one door at ground floor of west elevation and the provision of conservation roof lights in north and west facing roof slopes. Snape Castle Barn, Snape, North Yorkshire DL8 2TJ. BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2020</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 listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Thorp Perrow which 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>Thorp Perrow has pleasure grounds and lakes laid out c.1800 by Adam Mickle II of the Mickle dynasty of landscapers and who's father worked with Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. The park nearest Snape Castle Barn has 17th C origins enlarged in the first half of the 19th C. Thorp Perrow is now probably best known for Its arboretum created by Sir Leonard Ropner (1895-1977).</p> <p>Snape Castle Barn is located to the east of Snape Castle owned by Lord Latimer of Snape in the 15th C and the home of Catherine Parr whilst she was married to the third Lord Latimer. The Milbanks acquired Snape Castle and adjacent lands in the early 19th C when the area was incorporated into the park. Snape Castle and the adjacent buildings including Snape Castle Barn are situated within the registered park and garden at the southern boundary and also within the Snape Conservation Area.</p> <p>We have no comments to make about the proposal for the single storey garage, the windows and the door or the conservation roof lights. The only structure in this planning application with the potential to affect the</p>

					<p>registered park and garden would be the single- story glazed garden room extension on the north elevation which overlooks the registered park. Snape Castle is visible from the arboretum but due to the north-south sloping terrain the lower Snape Castle Barn may not be visible from the arboretum but will be from the registered parkland itself and the associated footpaths. The proposed contemporary metal and extensively glazed structure may be more visible early and late in the day when the sun catches it. We have not noted any information regarding outdoor lighting. The north side of the property overlooking the parkland is laid to grass. The pre-2009 aerial photograph (Fig 27 Heritage Impact Assessment) indicates a line of trees (probably lime) to the north of the buildings, pre-conversion and development. However, as we have been unable to go out on site, we are unsure as to what remains. Although we understand that views from the property are important, it is equally important that reciprocal views from the registered park and garden are sympathetically pleasing. We suggest that there is some tree planting that would soften the views of the extension from the registered park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens	North Yorkshire	E20/0611	II	PLANNING APPLICATION External refurbishment of the building and surrounding areas. The Esplanade Hotel, Belmont Road, Scarborough, North Yorkshire YO11 2AA. REPAIR/RETORATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens at Scarborough which are registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The prominent Esplanade Hotel listed grade II lies within the Conservation Area and overlooks the Valley and Valley Gardens leading to Scarborough foreshore and also the northern end of the South Cliff Gardens. The hotel is a short distance away from South Cliff Gardens across Esplanade Road and the pedestrian Cliff Bridge across the Valley.</p> <p>We note that the external works to The Esplanade Hotel include the removal of a large tree to the north west boundary of the site (Tree 3 on the Proposed External Works Plan), which is causing damaged to the</p>

					<p>boundary retaining wall and the adjacent neighbours' boundary wall. It is proposed to remove two smaller trees (Trees 1& 2 on the Proposed External Works Plan) and an adjacent shrub, to the north of the site between two sections of the existing footpath, which are causing damage to the surrounding footpath and steps structures. All other trees are expected to be retained unless found to be diseased or dying. We understand from the Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement that all proposed repair and refurbishment works to the outside of the building and surrounding areas will be sympathetically carried out and designed to have a sympathetic appearance in keeping with the building. We trust that measures will be put in place to safeguard the setting of the Esplanade Hotel and also safeguard other trees and shrubs during the works. In which case the proposed works should not have any adverse impact on the registered gardens. We have no further comments to make and defer to the expert conservation advice of your Authority.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust has no objection.</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>
Rudding Park	North Yorkshire	E20/0649	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of 220m of hedgerow. Hedge To The West Of Aketon Lodge, Spofforth Lane, Follifoot, Harrogate, North Yorkshire HG3 1EG. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Rudding Park 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>We note that this hedge is under thirty years old, quite some distance from Rudding Park (apart from the early 19C main Rudding Gate with its Ionic Arch, flanked by grade II lodges which are in the village of Follifoot), and south of the A658 road. We do not consider that this planning application should have any effect on the historic designed landscape and have no comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>

					Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
2 Sussex Street, Bedale	North Yorkshire	E20/0685	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of ground floor rooms from A1 use class to Sui Generis nail and beauty salon. 2 Sussex Street, Bedale, North Yorkshire DL8 2AJ. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) 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. 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. However, we are unaware of the relevance of this planning application to us as consultees and query whether it has been sent in error. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc.Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Blyth Priory	Nottingha mshire	E20/0465	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erect Single Storey Rear Extension and Front Porch Extension. Monks Barn, Priory Close, Blyth, Worksop. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.08.2020 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust is pleased to receive this consultation. We note that the proposals affect a non-designated historic parkland (of Blyth Hall) and that this has been considered by the LPA conservation response. We have nothing to add to the advice and comments that the LPA conservation officer provided on 11th August, we are content that issues affecting the historic boundary wall feature will be dealt with adequately if that conservation advice is followed. Jason Mordan
Eynsham Hall	Oxfordshir e	E20/0652	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of modern buildings and extensions, alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of new purpose- built buildings to provide hotel accommodation and guest facilities. Provision of new exit road, car parking, infrastructure, landscaping (to include retention, creation and enhancement of Priority Habitats) and other ancillary works. Eynsham Hall,	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.08.2020 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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge plus a site visit informs this response. We have carefully studied the online documentation, in particular the tree planting proposals, the Heritage Statement and the various Design and Access Statement documents. It is clear that Ennismore has taken great trouble to look at ways of making Eynsham Hall and its Grade II listed parkland (RPG) into an attractive, luxury hotel. The GT/OGT statutory remit is entirely landscape based, and so we will not be commenting upon

				<p>North Leigh, Witney. DEMOLITION, HOTEL/HOSPITALITY</p>	<p>changes to the house, confining our comments to impacts upon the landscape. We see many positives in the quality of the scheme, but do have some concerns.</p> <p>This is a large application affecting a significant landscape and we agree with the planning officer's pre application advice that 'given the extremely sensitive nature of this site, the cumulative impact of the proposals is approaching the site's absolute limit'. The marked increase in the built area within the registered park and parkland taken for parking with alterations to access are a particular concern. We have concerns over the enlargement of the existing car park to the NE of the main entrance to Eynsham Hall. This car park is already all too visible from the major rooms on the first floor of the mansion. D&A 1.3 does not really indicate its visibility from the mansion, nor do the views in the landscape Design Statement Impact Assessment take account of elevated views, and even with additional screening, the increase in size will have a detrimental effect upon the setting of the house, RPG and this important major vista. The increase from some 210 to 302 car spaces will have a significant impact; we note that although listed in the application, the Travel Plan is not available on the WODC planning website. We appreciate that options for parking are limited and fortunately topography helps to conceal new development, such as the new western car park. One of the largest issues for this historic designed landscape is the division of use, leading to new boundaries and boundary planting; the new parking area and associated planting will reinforce this division.</p> <p>We welcome the reinstatement of the walled kitchen garden with its new layout guided by historic precedent, and the considerable improvement that will bring. Due to the plethora of unsympathetic existing buildings, it is currently hard to read its original use, and the new proposals will reveal it once again as a walled kitchen garden, albeit with extensive cottage style accommodation along the perimeter. The proposed glasshouse restaurant is appropriate in this setting and we are glad to see the inclusion of some Eynsham apple varieties in the planting lists. We are also glad to see the removal of the unsightly car park to the SE of the stables area and the replacement of the existing, jarring modern buildings close by. The existing Parterre garden to the south of the main house is overgrown and in poor condition, so we have no objection to the redesign of this prominent area, including the repurposing of the formal pool. We would suggest that the water in the repurposed pool is kept dark and unobtrusive as per sites like</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>Kiftsgate or Westwell Manor near Burford, and that the use of nearby tables/deck chairs is avoided if at all possible.</p> <p>We also have no objections to the work within the western woods of some 30 years of age which are currently unmanaged and in poor condition. The proposed guest facilities within this area are generally well screened and discreet, although we regret that it has not been possible to find an alternative use for the Swiss Cottage with its attractive vernacular design and decorative chimney stacks. We are pleased to see that the tennis court will be relocated.</p> <p>We have some concerns over tree planting proposals in parkland areas. The northern parkland planting retains important mature trees from the earlier and eighteenth century landscape park (including some magnificent oak, common limes and holm oak) and the park to the south is supplemented by Robert Marnock's later typical mix of forest scale broadleaves and conifers which gives parks of the mid-later nineteenth century their distinctive character. Eynsham Hall is a rare and representative example of Marnock's work; Marnock was the leading designer of his time and very influential and his is a significant phase of the landscape design. Historic map overlays reveal that many park trees have been lost and we welcome the proposal to replace lost trees.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the tree survey is not available on the WODC planning website, so we have limited information, but we are not convinced that the proposed planting will respect the historic designed character. The mix of trees on the planting schedule under parkland include many that do not fit with the eighteenth century or nineteenth century parkland character, for example <i>Salix babylonica</i> 'Pendula', <i>Styrax japonica</i>, <i>Sorbus aria</i>, <i>Robinia pseudocacia</i>. In the northern parkland in particular it is important to use the distinctive <i>Tilia x europaea</i> 'pallida' group, preferably propagated from mature specimens on site. We also find the layout on the landscape masterplan has trees too evenly scattered. The plan does not show the northern part of the park but we assume the northern section of the entrance drive is the location of the proposed avenue planting, which we question. As far as we are aware there is no precedent for avenue planting here, but the drive passed through parkland planted with scattered trees and small groups. The species for avenue planting is also unclear.</p> <p>We also feel that the choice of trees for the proposed South Lawn mix are far too small giving this area of light woodland a 'spotty' effect rather than the airy and open parkland aspect shown on historic OS maps and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>originally intended by Robert Marnock, whose planting of exotics in the 1860s is mentioned in the register entry. Amelanchier, Prunus, Betula, Malus hupenhensis and nearby Sorbus aucuparia, whilst attractive, are too small and urban in character and we would far rather see fewer but larger specimens of parkland trees which are more appropriate for an historic design. The dense planting would also reduce the width of parkland. If one of the intentions is to break up the view of the stable courtyard, we consider that forest scale trees would be more effective, perhaps pines or other conifers to balance those on the west side of the mansion. We were able to look at the placing of the proposed reflective pool on the SE border of the South Lawn on our site visit. In our opinion, the proposed new pool, which is intended as an eye catcher to replace the large screened-off original Marnock lake, is far too small and insignificant. We appreciate that ground levels in that area have dictated the position, but we feel a more generously sized water body would be more appropriate. We welcome the clearing of the haha to reveal long views over parkland and the replacement of timber fencing with estate railing in the northern parkland. Finally, given the government's and West Oxfordshire's declaration of a climate emergency and related ecological emergency, we trust that all works will be undertaken to the highest environmental standards. WODC have recently appointed a Climate Change Manager, a Cabinet member for climate change and a working group; it is notable that the council places a high priority on this issues as seen in the draft Area Acton Plan for the nearby Garden village. In this context the cumulative impact of development in the area risks increasing climate impacts. We would hope to see zero carbon construction, an energy plan considering renewable energy generation and alternatives to fossil fuel use, recycling and reuse of demolition material, net gain to biodiversity and sustainable water and drainage management. We would also support a Travel Plan with positive encouragement for alternatives to car access. Although the application lists relevant documents such as a Sustainability and Energy Strategy, Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, these do not appear on the on the WODC planning website. We hope these commit to reduction of CO2 emissions in all activities, although the Planning Statement 7.139 only commits to current (and inadequate) Building Regulations standards. There is substantial demolition planned, and we have not seen any details of the reuse of demolition material, despite the recommendation of WOLP Policy OS3. This will also remain a car dependent development.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Henham	Suffolk	E20/0266	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Extension to Existing HaHa. Ilium House, Henham Estate, Henham, Beccles, Suffolk NR34 8AN BOUNDARY	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2020 Further to my letter of 23rd June 2020 requesting a Heritage Statement to amplify the documentation supplied with the original application, we are grateful that the applicant has now provided this. We are satisfied that the proposals will not adversely affect the setting of the registered parkland and withdraw our holding objection. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E20/0030	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed alterations and improvements to the Warwick Boat Club, to include: demolition of 1no. squash court and part of existing club house, and replace with two storey extension; redevelopment of the Court 11 to create two synthetic clay courts with floodlights; replacement boathouse on the site of the existing boathouse to include a small stores extension; replacement of existing bowls green with an enlarged synthetic bowls green with floodlights; removal of some trees together with replacement planting; remodelling of the Banbury Road access to provide improved access arrangements. Warwick Boat Club, 33 Mill Street, Warwick, CV34 4HB. SPORT/LEISURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.08.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again with regard to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens and their local knowledge informs this latest response. As you are aware, the area of the River Avon west of the modern Castle Bridge is included in the Grade I designation of the historic park and garden, Warwick Castle Park. Following the completion of the bridge in 1793, the river banks were sculpted to create a pleasing effect. This was very shortly followed by the partial collapse of the mediaeval bridge, which was then partially dismantled to create the picturesque ruin we see today. It can therefore be seen that this part of the park was a carefully contrived landscape. The boat club is therefore an important component of the setting of the park. The additional information now supplied has not changed our opinion that this application should be refused. The enlargement of the squash court building still produces an overbearing mass. Since the existing building is visible from at least one of the Bridge End houses, the new one will be even more so. We would dispute the judgement that it is only the view from those houses which is important. The setting of the registered park, seen from the gardens on the south side of the river is also important. We would also challenge the assertion that the impact on the Mill Street houses is less because they mostly have more modern extensions to the rear. They remain listed buildings, back and front, and this should be taken into account as the view down to Mill Street from Caesar's Tower has the boat club forming the setting of the fronts of the houses as well as the rears. It also forms part of the setting of the park

					<p>(including the river), all being comprehended from this single viewpoint. We are concerned that visibility from the bridge is considered to be largely unaffected by the proposal. Firstly, as the screen planting is mainly deciduous, much more of the club will be visible than in the supplied photographs for more than six months in the year. Secondly, landscapes are not appreciated from single points, but rather progressively, here by boats on the river.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned about the damaging impact of light from this application. Light is a negative factor already, but this is not a justification for creating more. There are now to be additional lights for the proposed new bowling green, as well as from the additional tennis court. The large windows and viewing platform intended for the boat house will make an objectionable feature of a building fairly discretely tucked under the bridge abutment.</p> <p>Similarly, the large windows of the squash court building contribute unwanted light pollution. We agree with the Historic England that it would be unrealistic to attempt to deal with this with blinds.</p> <p>It is not in our remit to discuss the traffic and parking impact of increased visitors on the club. Their neighbours have made adequate representations on that score.</p> <p>We wish to conclude by repeating what we have said in our previous responses, that the Boat Club has clearly outgrown its site. The best solution for them, the neighbours and this part of the conservation area must be to move some of its activities elsewhere.</p> <p>We therefore continue to object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.08.2020</p> <p>I am sorry for the delay in getting back to you but I have been away on holiday and am catching up on the backlog.</p> <p>I rely to a great extent on local knowledge from colleagues in county gardens trusts around the country when responding to planning applications. In my first two responses, although colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) did look at them before I sent them, they have subsequently come back to me saying that upon closer inspection (in particular with regard to the view from Caesar's Tower</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>showing the view over the Mill Street houses) in their opinion the RPG is adversely affected to a greater extent than our previous letter indicated. Our concerns regarding lighting were stated in earlier letters and the WGT feels that the boathouse viewing platform/large windows are also harmful. I must apologise for somewhat going back on earlier comments, but especially during lockdown, it is more difficult than ever to make site visits. As I am unable to visit in person, I have therefore taken on board the WGT's opinion of the application as they know the site very well. We do appreciate that the Boat Club is doing its best to satisfy its members' requirements whilst working within the constraints of a sensitive heritage site, two things not easily reconciled, but having understood our concerns, those of Historic England and other bodies, I hope your officers will be able to come to an informed decision about this application.</p> <p>With best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Charlecote Park	Warwicks hire	E20/0511	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 243,181sqm of polytunnels, installation of a rainwater harvesting attenuation basin for associated irrigation purposes and associated landscaping works. Old Pastures Farm, Stratford Road, Hampton Lucy, Warwick CV35 8BQ. HORTICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2020</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. Charlecote Park, a Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) has a rich and varied history and has existed as an estate since before the 12th century. Its subsequent associations with important historic figures such as William Shakespeare, and later Capability Brown (from c1750 for the next decade or so), combined with its interest to many illustrious visitors such as Sir Walter Scott, and the American authors Nathaniel Hawthorne and Washington Irvine, brought its fame to a worldwide audience. There are extensive views westwards and north westwards towards the application site from both the Grade I listed house (built between 1551 and 1559-60) which stands on a level terrace on the east bank of the River Avon, and also from within its surrounding RPG. The West Park contains extensive areas of ancient ridge and furrow and the whole park is still managed as a deer park, as it was in Shakespeare's time. The westernmost boundary of the RPG is only about 50m distant from the edge of the application site, so development here can never be unobtrusive. The principal north-westward view from the house and RPG is already marred by the existing</p>

					<p>polytunnels, and as the two additional fields proposed as the new polytunnel site have a slight slope downwards from their highest northern boundary towards the RPG, the enormous area of proposed polytunnels will be even more visible within the landscape.</p> <p>The WGT previously objected strongly to an earlier polytunnel application for 4.63ha of polytunnels (S15/03650 on 24.11.2015) and in that letter they referred back to an even earlier application (10/0259/FUL) for 4 ha of polytunnels. They commented that the landscaping conditions upon which the earlier permission was granted, did not appear to have been fulfilled and the continued prominence of the existing polytunnels even today supports this assertion and illustrates clearly that mitigation to hide these enormous structures has been unsuccessful.</p> <p>We have read the online documentation, in particular the Archaeology and Heritage Assessment in conjunction with the superceded masterplan which admits (Paras 4.6-4.11) that the house and park are visible from the application site even in summer. It does not however, seem to consider the views outwards from the RPG or house towards the polytunnel site. Para 4.9 states that the 'designated parkland west of the River Avon is not accessible to the public'. Your officers will be aware that Historic England in its publication 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, mentions (p2) that the 'contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.' It goes on to say (p4) that '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' and crucially in this instance (p2) 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.' P5 concludes by stating 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive.' Thirty-three hectares of closely spaced, extremely prominent polytunnels ticks all those boxes. The proposed mitigation screening will take many years to mature, and will never completely hide the sea of prominent polytunnels, as well as altering</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the long distance views enjoyed from within the RPG and Charlecote itself. In our opinion, the harm to the setting and significance of the RPG and house at Charlecote, already seriously compromised by the existing polytunnels, can only be exacerbated by a further 33 hectares (at least 40 football pitches - FIFA standard size for an international football pitch is between 0.62-0.82 hectares) of inappropriate polytunnels. The GT/WGT therefore strongly objects to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Beaumont Park	West Yorkshire	E20/0459	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2 storey building with 3 apartments. 64, Beaumont Park Road, Beaumont Park, Huddersfield, HD4 5JH. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development potentially affecting Beaumont 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>Beaumont Park, was Huddersfield's first public park (officially opened 1883), and in common with many public parks of that time the land around the park was developed with high-status housing in large gardens which created the setting for the park and raised funds to the benefit of the park's development. Ridgemoor, No 64 Beaumont Park Road, was in the cluster of early properties and occupies a prominent location, immediately opposite a secondary, but highly important entrance to Beaumont Park. As its name suggests Ridgemoor is very prominent. We regret that because a handsome grand Victorian building - built to complement the registered park - has not been listed, it has been allowed to fall into disrepair to the extent that an applicant can gain consent to demolish it. We agree that this application looks significantly better than the previous one as it is a single building that approximately maintains the existing building line, and although having a larger foot print than the historic building, is set lower which should reduce the impact somewhat. The car parking arranged to the north, will also ensure that vehicles do not visually impact on Beaumont Park.</p> <p>We understand that this is a contemporary design using good quality materials, however we do have some concerns regarding the large expanse</p>

					<p>of glazing to the larger gable on the south elevation which overlooks Beaumont Park and suggest that this glazed area on the first floor should be reduced.</p> <p>We also understand that a much lower height of hedge (running above a wall) is proposed as compared with all the other new properties and old properties fronting Beaumont Park Road. This suggests that the proposed development will be uniquely visible from some positions just into the park. We suggest that there is a taller hedge on top of the existing boundary wall with some additional standard trees planted within the garden boundary. This will balance and soften the visual impact of the new development whilst retaining some views out to the south.</p> <p>We have no objection to the proposal but trust that our concerns will be addressed.</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>
Thornes Park	West Yorkshire	E20/0492	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retrospective siting of a metal storage container (6m by 2.4m) for storage of bikes and PPE in connection with a tandem club for visually impaired adults. Thornes Park Nursery, Thornes Road, Wakefield. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2020</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 listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Thornes Park, a public park which 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>As you will know Thornes Park consists of three historically distinct areas of landscaping, the earliest dating from the later 18th century. With Clarence Park and Holmfield Park, it forms a large parkland to the south west of the centre of Wakefield, and the features include the earthwork remains of a former motte and bailey castle, a rose garden within the old kitchen garden of Thornes House (house now lost), gate lodges and two drinking fountains. It is a good example of an urban municipal park of the late 19th and early 20th centuries where the layout survives almost intact. It has added interest in a late 18th century landscape possibly designed by John Carr of York.</p> <p>We have found this application rather vague as the documents submitted</p>

					<p>give little information about the location and setting of the metal storage container and without any Heritage Statement. Unfortunately, we have been unable to visit. However, we understand that the location is immediately to the west and alongside the wall of the rose garden, towards the south-west corner of the park. The nearby 'Gardener's House' which probably dates to the late C18 is adjacent to the former kitchen gardens of Thornes House and is said to have been the home farm house. A high brick wall runs north from the house to form the west side of the rose garden.</p> <p>The metal storage container (retrospective siting) is an alien structure in quite a historically and aesthetically significant and valued area of Thornes Park. We appreciate that the container is important for its users, however we also consider that if this application is approved it is important that there is shrubby planting on each side of the container and that it is painted in a subdued colour. We trust that at 2.591m high it will not exceed the height of the rose garden wall. We suggest that the planting/setting of the container is agreed with your Authority's horticultural/parks officers so that it better integrates into the area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E20/0613	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of new vehicular access off Pontefract Lane and alterations to road layout and associated landscaping and drainage. Skelton Gate, Pontefract Lane, Leeds. ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Temple Newsam 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 historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Skelton Gate is located immediately south and east of the M1 at junction 45, accessed from Pontefract Lane. This large residential development site with associated infrastructure and motorway service area is also south of the Temple Newsam estate which lies immediately to the north of the M1 motorway. The land was historically associated with Temple Newsam but any historic links have been broken by the M1 motorway. The proposed access road from Pontefract Lane will open up Phase 2 of the</p>

					<p>development.</p> <p>We understand from the Design and Access Statement that the ecological value of the application area is limited to the hedgerow along Pontefract Lane and some of the grassland beyond but that the access road requires the removal of some low category trees along Pontefract Lane.</p> <p>In 2016 our colleague Kathryn Gibson responded in some detail to earlier planning documents: Planning Application 15/07655/OT and PREAPP/16/200026.</p> <p>In her responses she explained the significance of Temple Newsam, noting the wide extent of the registered landscape and its significance as the setting to the grade I listed Temple Newsam House. Both the park and house are sensitive visual receptors on elevated land with extensive views over the Aire Valley. Britain's most famous landscape designer, Lancelot 'Capability' Brown made a plan for Temple Newsam in 1762, which was the first for West Yorkshire. This has survived and, in spite of his design not having been fully implemented, it sheds light on the design approach of this foremost landscape designer. Temple Newsam estate and house are of course well-loved and well-used by a huge number of people both from near and far.</p> <p>We have not noted any reference to Temple Newsam in the current documents yet the park with the historic Public Right of Way from Dog Kennel Hill continues via a subway for a short distance south beyond the motorway and seems to be a link point with this proposed new access road.</p> <p>Having walked the footpath from Dog Kennel Hill under the subway the traffic noise was almost intolerable. (I wished that I had external sound-proofed headphones with recorded bird song!) However, we should look and plan for the future; it is not beyond possibility that with electric-powered vehicles and much improved tyres and road surfaces that the awful noise and air pollution will be much reduced making the pedestrian experience much more pleasant. I don't know why this area of the M1 has such a noisy road surface particularly now with this large residential development and would hope that could be addressed. With the future in mind could the current proposals make the link road as pleasant and green as possible, well-landscaped, with tree planting and pedestrianisation leading towards the subway under the motorway? This would tempt people living and working in this new development area to walk through to the Temple Newsam park, thus maintaining a link, and also fulfilling Leeds</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>City Councils ambitions about people loving and appreciating their parks and keeping fit and healthy. Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Longleat	Wiltshire	E20/0599	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of temporary sculpture for a period of 7 months from 16/03/2016 to 16/10/2016 on existing hard standing in front of Longleat House. The Estate Office, Longleat, Horningham, Wiltshire BA12 7NW. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2020 We have received the attached email from a member of the public who has brought to our attention the fact that the Gardens Trust was not consulted on a planning application affecting Longleat, a Grade I registered park and garden (RPG). As you are aware the Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee for all grades of registered landscapes, and as such we would have expected to have been notified about anything to do with Longleat. It appears from our correspondent's email that as well as not consulting us, the bronze lion does not have planning consent. We would certainly have wished to comment had we been consulted. I am therefore attaching a copy of the Gardens Trust's planning leaflet, a summary of all the applications we have been consulted upon, and Sarah Brown's email. We trust that you will be able to make sure that in future we are always consulted, and if there are any other outstanding applications which we should be made aware of, we would be grateful if you could send us details. Yours faithfully, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>