



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES SEPTEMBER 2020

The GT conservation team received 196 new cases for England in September, 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					
Ashton Court	Avon	E20/0303	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of the site to provide residential apartments including affordable housing (social rented and shared ownership) across five buildings between 4 - 9 storeys, townhouses, flexible retail/café space, public realm, landscaping including ecological mitigation measures, access and associated groundworks. Former Railway Depot, Clanage Road, Bristol. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2020 We are grateful for the opportunity to comment further on this application. We refer to our letter of 16th June and have now reviewed the further visually verified montages submitted by the applicant. We note that the further montages submitted in respect of the proposed development are based on summer photographs, and whilst we understand the time constraints involved in their preparation, the extent of visibility of the development in winter would probably be even greater than that shown. The Gardens Trust still considers that the proposed development would adversely affect the settings of a Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden, Ashton Court Park; two local historic parks and gardens, Bower Ashton and Greville Smyth Park, and the Sylvia Crowe designed landscape associated with Brunel Way / the Cumberland Basin, https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/cumberland-basin . Avon Gardens Trust refers to the letter from Historic England of 21st August 2020 and fully endorses and supports the comments raised therein, that the proposals would harm the setting of Ashton Court's registered

					<p>landscape.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers the proposed development has the potential to cause harm to the settings of a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Ashton Court Park, and the settings of two local historic parks and gardens, Greville Smyth Park and Bower Ashton. Avon Gardens Trust therefore objects to the proposed development.</p> <p>Please ensure that The Gardens Trust and Avon Gardens Trust are notified of the outcome of this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Frenchay Hospital	Avon	E20/0855	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 30 no. dwellings, 2 no. new highway access points, hard and soft landscaping with associated works. Land East Of Malmaims Drive, Frenchay, South Gloucestershire BS16 1PJ. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting land which is adjacent to a locally registered historic park and garden, and forms part of the former designed landscape gardens of Frenchay Manor. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Trust notes that former historic garden features on the application site appear to have been lost, and the visual relationship between the gardens of Frenchay Manor and the application site is largely curtailed by the existing boundary treatments and existing trees, the majority of which are proposed to be retained. Additional tree planting is also proposed along the boundary between the application site and Frenchay Manor. However, the Trust also notes from the submitted Heritage Statement that historic garden features may have existed at the junction between the pleasure garden and the pasture beyond.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to the proposed development but supports the view of the Archaeology Officer of the Council who recommends that a condition be included in any consent granted, that a programme of archaeological work should be carried out in advance of any development, to record any remaining features.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust does not object to the proposed development, but supports the view of the Archaeology Officer of the Council, that a condition should be included in any consent granted, for a programme of archaeological work to be carried out in advance of any</p>

					development, to record any remaining historic garden features. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Wrest Park	Bedfordshire	E20/0677	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION EIA Scoping Opinion: Development of 3,850 new homes including up to 600 retirement units. Also 6 retail units, health centre, and community building.</p> <p>Approximately 2 hectares of employment land, sports facilities and solar park. 35 hectares of woodland and an all-through school. Flood attenuation basins and highways works. Land South of Wrest Park and North of Barton-Le-Clay. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the scoping opinion affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application. The GT has liaised with our colleagues in the Bedfordshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The northern boundary of the site for this proposed new settlement adjoins Wrest Park, a Grade I registered historic park and garden (RPG) site of national significance. The gardens were developed over three centuries by dedicated owners, architects and landscapers of the first importance, including Thomas Archer, Batty Langley and Lancelot “Capability” Brown. There are some worrying features in the request for a scoping opinion which indicate that the concept of a historic designed landscape is not fully understood by the promoters of this development.</p> <p>Water Resources 4.67-4.92</p> <p>The water environment of Wrest Park is exceptionally sensitive, and a small change could have serious adverse impacts on the formal and informal canals within and around the garden site. In turn, such changes could also affect the trees and shrubs which are integral to the site. The “ornamental lakes at Wrest Park” are recognised in Table 4.8 as one of the local baseline receptors, but it is not clear that their sensitivity is being fully taken into account.</p> <p>Cultural heritage 4.148-4.188</p> <p>The registered site is a heritage asset in its own right, as well as the setting for the Grade I listed house and other buildings. It is not just an assemblage of buildings, but a designed landscape with essential relationships between the planting and the structural elements (including the main house, the garden buildings, canals, walks, statuary, parterres etc). As a heritage asset, the gardens also have their own setting in the surrounding landscape. The section on Cultural Heritage proposes an analysis which is ostensibly in line with current methodology, for example Historic England’s Good Practice Advice Note 3 (GPA3) on the setting of heritage assets, but there are some points which give us concern.</p> <p>The tables 4.9 and 4.10 listing assets in order of importance state that</p>

					<p>Grade I (and II*) buildings are of national importance. There should be an explicit acknowledgement that a Grade I RPG is in the same category. The conclusion (para 4.162) that there are no direct impacts on designated or non-designated heritage assets is jumping ahead of the assessment. For a historic garden, there can be direct impacts even though the proposed development is almost entirely outside the registered site (apart from a small area of watercourse running south east of Buckle Grove). Landscape and visual 4.189-4.215.</p> <p>In our opinion the document takes too narrow a view of the “visual receptors” relevant to Wrest Park. The single proposed viewpoint location overlooking part of the parkland is no 14, from Bridleway 15 to the west of the registered site. Historic views within, from and to the RPG - not only from public rights of way - are an integral part of its character and value. GPA3 Part I, Settings & Views (22.12.17) makes this clear: “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.”</p> <p>It also goes on to say: “The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.” This should be borne in mind when considering impacts like noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Trees are hardly mentioned in the document, and it is proposed that arboriculture is “scoped out” of the EIA (para 5.1) because the issues are covered in the chapters on ecology and landscape value. The importance of historic planting at Wrest Park, including specimen trees from different periods, groves, shrubberies, and other features of a designed landscape, is not fully covered by those chapters. As mentioned above, drainage is an important factor affecting the health of the trees, as is potential pollution.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Environment and Climate Strategy	Berkshire	E20/0561	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Draft Environment and Climate Strategy Public Consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposals for a new Strategy on Environment and Climate for the Council. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member

				<p>http://consult.rbwm.gov.uk/portals/cc/decs/decs</p>	<p>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. The key aims of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) are to identify, understand, appreciate, and promote the conservation of historically significant designed landscapes in Berkshire whilst enjoying and caring for our garden heritage, now and for future generations.</p> <p>It seems apparent to us that objectives and actions specifically covering the Historic Environment are not included in the Draft Environment and Climate Strategy. Whilst it is beyond the BGT's remit to comment on where the focus lies on the key themes of Circular Economy, Energy and Transport for this Strategy it is felt that the theme of Natural Environment should either be broadened out to include the Historic Environment or possibly a separate theme on Development could be added. The Strategy should include how new development is dealt with beyond the urban environment and it is the BGT's opinion that the draft objectives are not comprehensive enough to provide a robust Environment and Climate Strategy.</p> <p>Suggestions for showing the contribution that the Historic Environment can make are tabled below but it is for your Officers to determine how the message is best presented within the Strategy document. For example the 'Actions' and 'Measures for success' could be adapted to fall under each of the three Natural Environment Objectives (p30 of Draft document).</p> <p>Objectives Action Measure of Success</p> <p>Protect, conserve and enhance our Historic Environment Work with developers and owners to provide green infrastructure for historic landscapes (parks and gardens) and their settings. New development to provide productive gardens, allotments and horticulture gardens in addition to designated amenity space. 50% of all permissions to include these features by 2025. Planning applications affecting Historic Parks and Gardens and their settings to restore/conservate the significance, special interest, character or appearance of parks and gardens. Development proposals to include an assessment of potential impacts of harm to the parks and gardens and mitigation of such harm.</p> <p>In addition under Theme 3 page 24 of the Draft document a short paragraph could be added or para 3.20 could be expanded to include: The conservation and enhancement of the historic landscapes of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Borough make a valuable sustainable contribution to the quality of the Green Infrastructure adding bio-diversity, opportunities for public recreation and health wellbeing.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft of this Strategy, so important for the Borough.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin Planning Advisor for the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Sunningdale Park (Civil Service College)	Berkshire	E20/0672	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of x5 dwellings with associated landscaping and parking, following demolition of the existing cottages. Gardeners Cottages, Silwood Road, Sunninghill, Ascot. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.09.2020</p> <p>Dear Madam,</p> <p>Gardeners Cottages, Silwood Road, Sunninghill – Construction of 5 dwellings. Application number 20/02123/FULL</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed demolition of Gardeners Cottages, Sunninghill Park and replacement with 5 dwellings. 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 to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Sunningdale Park has been the subject of a number of Planning Applications over the past few years, which have permitted development of parts of the Park for residential purposes, whilst seeking to protect the parts which are registered. Gardeners Cottages are within the registered Park which is Grade II registered Park or Garden.</p> <p>They provide part of the setting of Northcote House, which has its own designation as a Grade II building. Although its most recent use has been as a Staff College or Training College and Government owned, it was occupied as a dwelling up to the end of World War 2.</p> <p>At that time the cottages were occupied by staff, including gardeners, employed on the Estate. Since then the cottages have continued to be occupied as residences. Although they are on the curtilage of the Estate, they form a clear part of the setting as Northcote House is sited on higher ground, giving a view over the entire Park.</p> <p>Following a previous Application, the Planning Authority refused permission for the demolition of these cottages. However, the possibility of</p>

					<p>a renewed Application was left open if the cottages were not found capable of renovation to allow their continued use as dwellings. The present Application argues that they cannot be restored because of their condition and refers to the opinion of building surveyors, as well as showing photos of the properties. We are in no position to reach a judgement on this opinion. But assuming the Local Authority is satisfied that renovation is not possible at a reasonable cost, then we would not seek to oppose the demolition of the cottages and replacement with new cottages on the terms asked for in the current Application. We do think it is important that the style of the present cottages is maintained. They have been rebuilt more than once over the years, but the current style fits the age and style of the mansion house and other properties within the park. They form a part of the setting of this Park and of Northcote House. Additionally the present cottages are enhanced in our view by the trees on the boundary, which should be retained or if necessary replaced by similar.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Charles Elly Planning Advisor BGT</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 28.09.2020 Updated comments from Berkshire Gardens Trust Further to the submission of a short Heritage Statement by the applicant and our site visit to day, I can confirm that I do not think that the proposed new extension and three bay carport would have an adverse effect on significance of the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden or its special features The proposed changes are well within the envelope of the existing built form and the residential area at the former Park Place Farm. I noticed that the three bay carport would extend into the gap between the Bull Pen and the main house, non-designated historic assets, and this would be visible from the curtilage of the site. However, any harm to the relationship between these buildings lies outside of BGT's remit. Your Conservation Officer will be able to advise. In conclusion BGT does not object to this development. Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair.</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/0866	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of former indoor Riding</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>

				<p>School building and outdoor menage yard for sui generis use for the storage of plant hire equipment, ancillary workshop and offices; demolition of front and rear bays of the building, associated infrastructure, external lighting, circular vehicular route to access the site and building, and site access. (Retrospective) Land At The Former Indoor Riding School, Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire. HYBRID</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting this site which sits within a Grade I landscape on the Historic England Register of Parks & Gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The GT/BGT are grateful to have had the opportunity to visit the site in early October 2019 which was helpful for us to understand the layout and current condition of the application site and the surrounding area. We have addressed the above two applications together as we believe that it is not possible to assess either individually without considering the impact on the wider site therefore this is a single response to both of these applications as follows: Historic Context The application site lies within the northern section of the Grade I listed Stowe Park. The Historic England register entry describes Stowe as: 'Extensive and complex pleasure grounds and park around a country mansion. Main phases C18 and early C19, utilising late C17 base, with early C18 work by Charles Bridgeman, Sir John Vanbrugh, James Gibbs and William Kent, and mid C18 work by Lancelot Brown. Stowe was supremely influential on the English landscape garden during the C18.' The Register entry goes on to mention this northern section away from the formal gardens immediately surrounding the house: "The pleasure grounds are surrounded by the parks, now farmland. At its most extensive (1868) the designed landscape and woodland covered c 250ha, increased from c 200ha in 1727. The park is bounded to the north by the major woodland, Stowe Woods, laid out with a network of formal rides, some of which may date from the early C17. This area is partly affected by Silverstone Race Circuit north-east of the Wood. The Fallow Deer Park links the woodland and pleasure grounds. Its backbone is the straight Roman Road which runs diagonally across the site from south-west to north-east and forms the west boundary between pleasure grounds and park." We note that both applications are retrospective. Firstly we welcome how much of the original layout of the Grade I parkland remains and, beyond the application site, is well managed by the current owner. In our previous response dated October 17th 2019, we recommended that the applicant should commission an historic landscape character survey by a recognised landscape historian. We recommended that no works should be considered retrospectively or commenced without such a survey which would provide the informed advice for the applicants to assess the current condition of the application site as well as their plans for the application site and for the future management of the wider undeveloped area. The</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Gardens Trust welcome the report prepared by Dr Sarah Rutherford and particularly note her comments regarding the temporary modular offices, that whilst “this development damages the historic fabric and character for the period of its presence, it is temporary and reversible, without irreversible damage to the fabric. These two latter factors are key to the acceptability of the development.” We maintain that the layout should be retained, that there should be no further creep into the designed landscape and, where possible, the designed landscape should be reintroduced right up to the boundary of the current developed area. There should be no sacrificial areas between the designed and the developed landscapes nor further creep into the undeveloped area whatsoever. We welcome the opportunities being offered through the landscape improvements which the Buckingham Group are proposing to undertake. As these applications are retrospective, some damage has already been done. We understand that the site was in part formerly developed to provide equestrian facilities and, whilst this was apparently short-lived, some of the buildings and structures on the site were erected as part of that venture. Therefore, some of the structures have planning permission already. The Gardens Trust still consider that these existing features are detrimental to the registered park and garden due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proliferation of single storey modular office buildings • external lighting • the extensive car parking area and the choice of materials used for this parking area • the planting immediately in front of the manège building • the tarmac road surface following the route of an original riding • the earth bund <p>As we noted in our letter from October 2019, in the spirit of trying to find a way forward, we also recommend the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the existing riding school building is substantial and does damage this Grade I listed registered park, these proposals do reduce the size and scale of the building. Therefore we support this providing that a condition is imposed that the entire structure is removed once the current usage is finished. 2. We support Dr Rutherford’s recommendations regarding the planting to mitigate the impact of modern structures around the site particularly that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the planting should be low and temporary so as not to create new landscape features b) new planting should be native species typical of the site and used to reflect historic planting schemes c) The existing road and car park surfacing should be broken up to reduce the impact and more sympathetic materials should be introduced where possible d) Planting could be used to break the hard surfacing up further but with caution to
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>our points above regarding points 1a and 1b above e) The west side of Castle Riding Avenue should be replanted with historically appropriate native species f) The diagonal avenue between Silverstone Great Riding and Blackpit Pond should be reintroduced as far as the boundary for the current developed site g) The hedgerows encroaching on the Silverstone Great Riding should be removed h) Again, if the planning authority grants retrospective consent for the current structures on the site, we recommend that this be subject to a time limit which requires that they be removed in the future and that the landscape be returned to its historic condition. Therefore, in conclusion, with regard to these applications, the Gardens Trust recognises the research and sensitive thought that the applicant has invested in producing these proposals and believe that this allows for the project to move forward. We therefore offer no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.09.2020 Further to my letter of yesterday, I would like to clarify a few points. 1. The statement near the top of page 2 'We note that both applications are retrospective' should read 'We note that the application for modular office buildings (19/03172/APP) is retrospective'. 2. The statement in para 6 p.2 should read 'As one application is retrospective (19/03172/APP), some damage has already been done.' 3. To clarify Points 1) and 2) h): The request to remove the entire structure relates only to the modular office buildings (19/03172/APP) not to the existing building which has planning permission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/0867	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of temporary modular offices, external lighting, associated parking, hard and soft landscaping including earth bund, infrastructure works and access, for a period of 10 years (retrospective) [Units 1, 2, 3	As above for E20/0866

				installed during 2015/16; Units 4, 5, 6 were installed 2018]. Land At Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Biddlesden, Buckinghamshire. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/0546	II*	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. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 We are delighted if Bucks Council is prepared to defend a refusal of this application, which we strongly support. Regrettably neither the Gardens Trust (with me as sole part time conservation officer covering the whole of England on 3 days a week) or the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (a small charity whose volunteers have full time jobs) have the capacity to offer additional support. Our time has to be prioritised in responding to applications which come in great numbers all year round. We struggle to keep up as it is. We believe that our submission was sufficiently clear to make the case for our objection, but if Buckinghamshire requires additional information/representation we suggest you engage a reputable historic landscape consultant to take on the case. I am really sorry not to be able to offer more help, but I am sure you will fully understand our capacity issues just do not have any wriggle room for offering additional support. Good luck and do please keep us in the loop re the outcome. Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E20/0677	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement structure of the existing/outbuilding shed. New pitched dormer window to main roof. Brewers Yard, Wotton Underwood, Buckinghamshire HP18 0SB. BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2020 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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the online documentation and welcome the applicant's revised proposals which respect the setting, materials and existing layout of the site. Best wishes, Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer

Hughenden Manor	Buckinghamshire	E20/0768	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2m high height restriction barrier at church car park entrance (retrospective). Car Park, St Michael And All Angels Church, Manor Road, Hughenden Valley. ACCESS/GATES	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2020 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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and understand the practical need for height restriction in this case. However, we are surprised that the National Trust has presented such a damaging solution for a nationally significant designed landscape in its care. In our opinion it is completely inappropriate in the Grade II Registered Park & Garden of Hughenden because of its situation in such a visually sensitive position : by a main drive to the mansion and within view of key features of the design (park gateway, church, drive and lake). With all the resources at the Trust's disposal and inevitable need to deal with similar problems at other properties, it is unfortunate that an alternative solution which is considerably less visually damaging was not used. We therefore OBJECT and urge the Council to refuse the application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Peterborough Cathedral Precincts	Cambridgeshire	E20/0651	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of three storey building and change of use of the land to form University, creation of vehicular access, car parking and associated infrastructure and landscaping. Land At Bishops Road, Eastgate, Peterborough. EDUCATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2020 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 Cambridgeshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have studied the online documentation in particular the Design & Access (D&A) Statement and Built Heritage Statement (BHS) which include consideration of the proposals in relation to the Grade II listed Peterborough Cathedral Precinct and other heritage assets/designations. The concept of a new university for Peterborough is enshrined in the current Peterborough Local Plan 2016-36 (adopted 24.7.2019) which states (LP51) that 'any built development will be confined to the northern part of the site and along the frontage of Bishop's Road.' The D&A explained the various options considered within the 55acre site, and heritage impact was

					<p>the 1st category of assessment when considering the various alternative sites.</p> <p>From the D&A it is clear that the chosen site, currently the Wirrina car park, is under-utilised (p27) and currently contributes nothing to the setting of either the Grade II RPG or the Conservation Area. It has not been possible to undertake a site visit, but the BHS states (6.44) that a 'tall stone wall and mature trees heavily restrict intervisibility between the site and the precincts'. We would also agree with the statement (6.46) that 'the site no longer forms an agricultural backdrop to the Cathedral Precincts' and as such (6.46) 'the site does not make a contribution to the settings of the numerous designated heritage assets that form the Peterborough Cathedral Precinct'. The GT is also happy with the statement that (6.57) 'existing views of the car park will be replaced by views of the landscaped grounds and built form of the new university, although views of the latter will be softened by intervening trees and vegetation which are to be preserved and augmented.'</p> <p>There are various view-points illustrated in the online documentation. We would have liked to have seen some photomontages of the proposed views from within the Cathedral Precincts towards the proposed new university building. In the absence of these we have to take at face value the assertion that (BGS 6.57) the new proposals will 'not harm its heritage significance.'</p> <p>The GT/CGT would feel more comfortable if they were able to see a photomontage of the views from within the RPG towards the new structure. However, we would agree that the landscaping of a currently unattractive site can only be an improvement and are reassured that great care has been taken to make this a sustainable and attractive campus.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cholmondeley Castle	Cheshire	E20/0773	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent</p> <p>Landscaping works to the garden surrounding Old Hall, including re-laying of the drive, new hard and soft landscaping, fencing and the construction of six garden structures: Orangery / Garden</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2020</p> <p>Our colleagues at Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) have made The Gardens Trust (GT) aware of this application in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) in their Register of Parks and Gardens. The above application potentially has a material impact on the significance of Cholmondeley Castle, a historic designed landscape (RPG) which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II.</p>

				<p>Room, Timber Store, Timber Garden Store, Wood Store, Swimming Pool and Glass House. Old Hall, CHOLMONDELEY PARK, CHOLMONDELEY, SY14 8HB. HYBRID</p>	<p>We write to express our concern regarding this application because it does not include a statement of significance against which impacts can be assessed. Modest as the proposals are, they may have an adverse impact on the heritage asset, notably the archaeology of the formal garden. We have liaised with our colleagues in CGT who have visited the park though not the Old Hall which is private. The designated Grade II landscape encompasses the gardens around Cholmondeley Castle and the park, part of which was once laid out as late 17th/early 18th century formal gardens around the Old Hall. The parkland appears to contain some earthworks from this earlier period as well as the formal lakes (whose outlines have been softened over time), gate piers, and gates and railings by Robert Bakewell relocated near the early 19th century Castle. The quality of this ironwork is an indication of the importance and quality of the formal gardens that once existed at Cholmondeley. Several important residences in Cheshire once had extensive formal gardens, for example Eaton Hall, Crewe Hall and Combermere, but all have been lost or extensively altered due to re development of the gardens. At Cholmondeley, the choice of a new site for the Castle has potentially left the archaeology of the formal garden less disturbed and allowed the formal pools to survive.</p> <p>We agree with the Landscape Conservation Statement which states that : "It is recognised that the level of detail required and the length of the statement should be proportionate to the scale and complexity of the proposal. Therefore, given the small-scale of this proposal, the statement is relatively concise." 2.1</p> <p>We also acknowledge the appropriate scale and design of the proposals to provide contemporary accommodation for the applicant. However, the submission must include a statement of significance against which the impacts, tabled in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement can be assessed. The absence of a statement of significance which is the basis of the evaluation of impacts renders the application incomplete.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised whether such a statement is to be provided and also of your eventual decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Brockhole	Cumbria	E20/0765	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Lake source heat pump. Brockhole - The Lake District Visitor Centre,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

				<p>Ecclerigg, Windermere, Cumbria, LA23 1LJ. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cumbria Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the online documentation and are supportive of the LDNPA's wish to replace the existing gas central heating system with a lake source heat pump low carbon system to reduce the impact on the wider environment, and to allow the equipment to be used in an educational way for visitors. Much care has been taken to respect the impact upon views, based on Thomas Mawson's design from the house and terrace towards the lake and beyond. In principle the proposal is sound, and due consideration appears to have been given to trees which might be affected and also to the meadow. What is however not clear from the online documentation, is exactly how the excavations will pass through the formal Mawson garden close to the house. There seems to be no reference to the hard landscaping or planting which might be disturbed during the work, or indication of remedial measures afterwards. We are certain that your officers will also be keen to understand how the proposals will affect these very sensitive areas. We would appreciate far greater detail on this aspect of the work before we are able to comment definitively on this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2020 Thank you so much for getting back to me so quickly with regard to Brockhole. I must apologise for being a bit slow at getting up to speed with this important registered Mawson garden. Looking at the tree survey has made me realise that actually there is something of a lacuna in the application documents in order to adequately assess the impact upon the registered Mawson garden. The Drawing (Appendix 1) is not really very helpful to me as I do not know the garden and its layout at all. Photos would be great, and if they could be annotated to show exactly where the pipes were to run in the formal parts of the gardens, ie. where it might go through paths, borders, walls etc, and what the exact finishes would be once the pipes had been installed, I would really appreciate that. A tree survey is not sufficient to enable me to understand just where the pipework will go in this most sensitive area. The D&A in 7/2019/5700 is pretty vague. Whilst 5.8 reassures the reader that 'the route would be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>close to but not affect a set of stone steps, and would also be restored on completion resulting in no change of character of appearance' that doesn't really tell me a lot. The aerial photo indicates it runs down past wooded area before passing into the meadow where the bulk of the coils are buried.</p> <p>Thanks so much. Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 Thank you for sending the photographs which confirm that the pipes are in unobtrusive places. What the photos also show is the generally low state of planting and hard landscaping. Despite the soil having had time to settle and a whole planting season this year, clearly nothing has happened. I would be interested to see plans of the anticipated planting scheme, or if no detailed one has been drawn up, at least an indication of the type of planting proposed and an indication of when it will be completed.</p> <p>With best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Knightshayes Court	Devon	E20/0729	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline for the erection of up to 179 dwellings, including the conversion of Tidcombe Hall and outbuildings to 12 dwellings, a shop, a cafe, an open sided shelter, community allotments, community orchards, public open space, associated infrastructure and access with all other matters reserved. Tidcombe Hall, Tidcombe Lane, Tiverton, Devon. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the above application which We concur with the comments made by National Trust in their letter dated September 2020, in particular that the proposed development would cause harm to the views, landscape setting and significance of Knightshayes court, a Grade II Registered park and garden. We would ask your Council to consider the points raised by the National Trust in considering this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Clark Conservation Officer</p>
Firle Place	East Sussex	E20/0436	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to wedding (Use Class D1) and filming (Use Class B1) venue</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.09.2020 Thank you for re-contacting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the revised plans for the above planning application. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) a national statutory consultee), and works closely with</p>

				<p>together with minor alterations. Riding School, The Street, Firle BN8 6LP. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>the GT on planning matters. Representatives of SGT have carefully studied the revised documents submitted with the application. The site lies within the boundary of Firle Place, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. The Planning Portal includes two parking layout plans and three documents described variously as parking “Heirarchy” or “Justification”. Adding to the potential confusion, in the earlier version, area “A” is the area in front of Firle Place, while in the latest plan area “A” is the area in front of the pond. To make our comments unambiguous, the text below doesn’t use the label “Area A” but instead describe the areas in words and also shows a full reference to the documents referred to.</p> <p>Original Plans Re earlier plans and in particular a document published on the Portal on 7th July with a title “Planning Hierarchy Rationale” (although the body of the document itself uses a title “Planning Hierarchy – supplementary statement”). This plan showed the area in front of Firle Place as the preferred area for parking. In our letter of 19th July SGT raised an objection to the planning application because the Trust “is not satisfied with the justification for further increased parking activity in the visually sensitive parkland location immediately in front of the house and its formal gardens”.</p> <p>Latest Revised Plans Re latest plans and in particular a document published on the Portal on 11th Sep with a title “Planning Hierarchy” (although the body of the document itself uses a title “Planning Hierarchy – supplementary statement” with a note “Revised Aug 2020”). In this plan, the preferred area for parking is shown as the area adjacent to pond and the area in front of Firle Place is no longer the preferred area.</p> <p>SGT considers occasional parking for the proposed wedding venue in this area adjacent to the pond is preferable to the previously proposed parking location in front of the house. The likely visual impact of parking adjacent to the pond is accepted as low to moderate having regard to the location, its continued parkland appearance and the occasional use only.</p> <p>Conclusion On this basis, and subject to a planning condition that ensures the protection and sympathetic management of the landscape character of the agreed parking area and its use restricted to no more than 30 vehicles, then the Sussex Gardens Trust is content to withdraw its objection to this application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Shortgrove Hall	East Sussex	E20/0095	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two new semi-detached cottages. Land North Of Sparrowsend Cottages, London Road, Newport. RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) regarding the amendments to the above application and we have again liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT). The amendments seem to add up to no more than a very minor alteration to the front elevation, and provision to preserve the spigot mortar. We have noted these revisions to the application, but they do not address any of the concerns we raised in our previous letter, and we therefore continue to object to this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Beth Chatto Gardens	Essex	E20/0837	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid planning application comprising Outline Application for up to 10,000sqm of new mixed use (B1, B2, B8) commercial space and 14 houses, and Full Permission for 71 houses. Existing access amended and new residential access to Clacton Road. Ground Floor, 1 Lanswood Park, Broomfield Road, Elmstead, Colchester, Essex CO7 7FD. MAJOR HYBRID	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The Lanswood Business Park is a successful development which has improved a previous brownfield site. It is now proposed to construct more business units and 85 houses. The site is outside the village of Elmstead Market, outside the settlement development boundary, and is not included in the local plan. In this context, the housing is seen as enabling development to offset the infrastructure costs of the new business units. The development site is located on the south side of the A133 Clacton Road, where the land slopes down into the wooded valley of the Elmstead Brook. The new business units would be located near the existing ones close to the road. The gently sloping valley side would be the site of the housing. In this largely flat London Clay plateau, the valleys are of particular landscape importance. Further west in the valley are the Beth Chatto Gardens. These were designated a grade II registered landscape by DCMS on the advice of Historic England on 21st August 2020 after the application was validated, a circumstance which has prompted this advice letter.

					<p>The proposed housing would not border directly onto the Beth Chatto Gardens. It would be screened from them by woodland, which would be continuous with (though not connected to) the Woodland Garden area at the east end of the Gardens, nor would the housing and the Gardens be intervisible. However, this is an area that seems to be under considerable development pressure. There is an existing approval for eight houses at Forres directly on the north side of the Gardens. The Lanswood application would see the intrusion of built form into the valley leaving the Gardens on the north side partially enclosed by housing. It would thus contribute to the incremental erosion of the wider setting of the Gardens. Setting is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework as the surroundings in which the heritage asset (i.e. the Gardens) is experienced.</p> <p>With the recent designation of the Gardens, your authority should recognise that the Gardens are one of the District's major attractions and amenities, of national importance. Their protection should therefore be a major concern. It is for your authority to decide whether the less than substantial harm to the setting of the Gardens by the housing is outweighed by any public benefit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Garden at Kingcombe	Gloucestershire	E20/0715	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Alteration and extension of existing listed building including the demolition and replacement of a modern extension at Kingcombe, Kingcombe Lane, Chipping Campden, Gloucestershire GL55 6UN. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.09.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that may impact on significant gardens, parks and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>Having looked at the proposals, GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment regarding the impact of this work on Kingcombe's garden setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Woodchester Mansion	Gloucestershire	E20/0733	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed replacement visitor toilet block. Woodchester Mansion, Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Stonehouse. VISITOR FACILITIES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.09.2020</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that may impact on significant parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>Having seen what is currently on site, and also the previous proposal that was commented upon some months ago; GGLT would consider this proposal to be a marked improvement.</p>

					Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E20/0764	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings with construction of new visitor facilities including replacement and new retail space, cafe, toilets, interpretation and outdoor seating. New access path, play area and courtyards, reorganise private parking and associated works at The Old Kennels, Tetbury Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. VISITOR FACILITIES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes; has referred the above proposal to The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) for comment. The Trust has commented on a number of planning applications in this vicinity in the recent past. The quality of the wider Cirencester Park setting is highly significant as a heritage asset; and requires careful management, including the repair and enhancement of its historic features. However, this sector of the Park has suffered visual degradation, and it is considered that clearance and redevelopment offers scope for visual improvement. The proposal to construct a comprehensive visitor centre that explains the importance of Cirencester Park and improves public access is to be welcomed. It is hoped that the detailing of the building's "agricultural" aesthetic will be very carefully handled. This should include the choice and colour of the external materials materials for the buildings as well as the hard and soft landscaping. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf on GGLT)
Woodchester Mansion	Gloucestershire	E20/0779	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Refinishing of two areas of roof; one in Cotswold Stone Slate (Ironing Room) and one in Graded Green Slate (Laundry). There are associated repairs to: structure, masonry, plaster and rainwater goods and repair/conservation of chimneys. Woodchester Mansion, Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Stonehouse. REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have an adverse impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and the wider landscape has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to comment on its behalf. In this instance, the careful programme of repairs to Woodchester Park Mansion proposed by Donald Insall are to be welcomed. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).
Hatherop Castle	Gloucestershire	E20/0818	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey rear extension, timber framed porch and minor landscaping amendments	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 The Garden Trust ,as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that may impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has referred this Application to the Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT)

				(19/02716/FUL) at Netherton Lodge, Netherton, Quenington, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. BUILDING ALTERATION	for comment. Having looked through this submission, GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comments. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Stockley Park: Business park Phases I and II, and country park and golf course	Greater London	E20/0666	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of the site to provide two industrial units providing industrial floorspace (Use Class B1c/B2/B8) and ancillary officers together with associated parking, access arrangements, landscaping and infrastructure. GSK, STOCKLEY PARK, IRON BRIDGE ROAD WEST DRAYTON. LIGHT INDUSTRIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 Since this application was validated in July, Stockley Park has been registered by Historic England as a Grade II registered park and garden with the industrial units and landscaping being designed together (https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1466074). This application proposes to demolish two units and drop in two bigger ones and this may well adversely affect the landscaping structure. Because all the submission docs were prepared pre-registration, there is of course no mention of the RPG. We would therefore suggest that the applicant revises the documentation in light of this. Without due reference being made to this new listing your officers and ourselves will be unable to ascertain what level of harm (if any) these proposals may cause to the registered park and garden. We would ask therefore that the decision is postponed until the revised documents have been put together and we can consider the proposals in the light of the new registration. We would be grateful if you could confirm that this will happen. Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2020 We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance of Stockley Park, a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. We object to this application in its current form. We write as the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Gardens Trust (LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the Gardens Trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the Gardens Trust in

					<p>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 – Stockley Park entry pending) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication <i>The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019)</i>, which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org</p> <p>The application and its supporting documents were lodged before the recent addition of Stockley Park to the Heritage List. It is clear that the proposals have not been designed or assessed with a mind to their impact on the site's heritage significance. In turn, they therefore lack the information that we, and yourselves, require in order to assess their impact.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary....” (NPPF 189) • “ Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; (NPPF 194) <p>We are unable to measure the potential harm to the heritage asset's significance with the application documents in their current form. In particular, we require a heritage impact assessment, and an updated Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal that demonstrates an awareness of the site as a heritage asset as per its entry on the Heritage List at Grade II. We ask that you refuse permission for this application until appropriate supporting documents can be submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Linden Groves For London Gardens Trust https://londongardenstrust.org
Broadlands Park	Hampshire	E20/0604	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from Sui-Generis private use to use as event space (D2). The Orangery, Broadlands Park, Romsey By-Pass, SO51 9ZD. EVENT/FUNCTION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020 I am commenting on the application for change of use of the Orangery on behalf of the Hampshire gardens Trust. The proposed use of the Orangery would lead to its renovation which would be welcome. However the use of the grass area for parking would lead to damage over time. If the proposal goes ahead then appropriate arrangements for parking in the long term need to be agreed. However it would be acceptable as a short term measure to evaluate the viability of the new use. Yours faithfully, Jennifer Adams
Redlands Lane, Fareham	Hampshire	E20/0658	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a 64 bed care home with associated infrastructure. Land At Redlands Lane, Redlands Lane, Fareham PO14 1HN. INSTITUTION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT). We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. This is yet another proposal for this site, which has had at least two previous appeals dismissed in 2014. These dismissals were due largely to the site's close relationship with the setting of the Grade II* listed building and the historic designed landscape which compliments it. This new application has attempted a strategy to detach itself from its historical context by what appears to be a new ownership of this part (as a 1 hectare parcel) and taking advantage of the 'secondary' access direct from Redlands Lane. Although the site is located within a defined urban area, this former orchard and adjoining woodland is nevertheless part of the historic pre-1810 landscape of Bishopswood (previously Blackbrook Grove), which is noted in the Hampshire Register of Historic Parks and Gardens No.1610. Any development of any scale will have an effect upon the setting the southerly aspect of the Grade II* listed building. In this context this cannot be described as neutral or minimal and even additional tree screening would not mitigate any development of scale. This proposal for a 64-Bed Care Home in the form of a 2-storey linear block effectively fills the old orchard leaving only marginal amenity space between building and the boundaries. With the inevitable effect upon surrounding trees and lack of amenity space for residents, in our opinion the scale of this would appear to be a gross over development and the

					<p>design looks to be 'forced' into what is an inappropriate site for it. The closeness of the proposed building would also have a detrimental effect upon adjacent residential properties in Romyn Court at the northwest corner.</p> <p>This application is by far the most detrimental proposal for this site, by imposing a large block of building which would be completely out of character with both the orchard site itself as well as the wider historic landscape. The GT/HGT therefore object to this proposal most strongly as the sheer scale of the development would cause significant harm.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 Further to your email of 17th September attaching comments from Wessex Archaeology, we would like to add these comments to our original response of 9th September 2020.</p> <p>Impact upon historic designed landscape It may be of some debate that the former orchard formed part of the actual formal pleasure grounds, but it physically adjoined the western boundary of the woodland as a contained space, with what appears to be an access at the south eastern end via the woodland on the 1840 map. This looks to have been confirmed by 1868-81 map.</p> <p>The HGT Register does not specifically mention of the orchard, that maybe due to the fact that it was a service facility to host building. How often does one read listing descriptions and they do not mention every single feature or adjacent asset? (Certainly HE have sharpened up their descriptions in recent years to be more comprehensive). It is incorrect to state that the orchard is not connected or related to the pleasure grounds, it always did adjoin it. It was and is historically and physically connected. The orchard may not have been a significant aspect of the pleasure grounds, but it did contribute to the setting. Just because other nearby features of the designed landscape have been compromised does not mean that other existing aspects such as the orchard should be summarily dismissed. By the 1887-8 map the former orchard is clearly part of the overall site to Blackbrook Grove and Blackbrook Lodge with the open fields to the west and south .</p> <p>Impact upon the setting of Bishopswood</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The gardens are designed to form a complementary and integrated aspect and setting to the house itself. The woodland and what remains of 'the north-south avenue' is still a significant part of the historic setting. Whereas the former orchard could be described as a less significant aspect to the designed landscape itself, it does nevertheless contribute to the overall setting of the whole site. It has the benefit of containing the western boundary and protecting old woodland.</p> <p>As always in such matters, it does come down to matter of judgement as to the impact of any proposals for such a site as the former orchard and its relationship to the adjoining designed landscape. The proposed application argues that the development 'would only remove links from the wider setting' - but is this wider setting not part of and contributing to the overall significance of the designed landscape? Due to the scale of this latest proposal it would have a significant impact on this site to the detriment of the immediate surroundings which in turn affects the host listed building including the woodland, which is also to be diminished by intrusive car parking. It cannot be said that this latest proposal for this site will have a minor negative impact. In fact, the impact will be considerable both in physical scale and activity.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hartlebury Castle	Hereford and Worcester	E20/0661	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To erect hand rails to steps from the carriage circle to the Queen Elizabeth Walk, to improve accessibly and safety. To extend estate fencing along top of bank to the sunken garden, to improve safety. To erect hand rails to steps to cafe, to improve accessibly and safety. Hartlebury Castle, Stourport Road, Charlton, Hartlebury. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020</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 Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation, and appreciate that this is a sensible proposal to improve visitor safety. We would like to suggest that the metal work for the hand rails is carefully detailed and specified, and craftsman-built to ensure a satisfactory result.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Shobdon	Hereford and Worcester	E20/0706	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of site including demolition of two life expired poultry houses and one domestic dwelling, proposed construction of 4 poultry houses and one domestic dwelling, together with associated equipment (feed bins, generator, gate house etc). Land at Park Top Poultry Site, Uphampton, Shobdon, Leominster, Herefordshire.</p> <p>DEMOLITION, AGRICULTURE, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2020</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.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation, and whilst there has been a poultry unit on this site for many years, increasing its capacity by just over 50% represents substantial intensification within the Grade II registered Shobdon Park (RPG). The Design & Access statement maintains (Para 4.10) that 'the area of parkland from which development will be visible will be slightly less than 3Ha (none of which contains any Public Rights of Way). This together with the operation of the site remaining unchanged, shows the proposal will have negligible effect on the amenity of this registered parkland.' Your officers will be aware that Historic England in 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, (p2) states 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.' However, despite not being able to undertake a site visit due to Covid restrictions, we understand from the heritage assessment that an irregular shelter belt hides the units from the church and the Shobdon arches and that the increase in size of the poultry unit will have negligible impact upon the RPG. In this instance, whilst not actively objecting, we would like to state that we would in future not be supportive of further intensification (including more poultry units, an increase of the area put aside for mobile homes, or any similar diversification) within the RPG which might adversely affect the integrity of the parkland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Gheluvelt Park	Hereford and Worcester	E20/0821	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed new cycle / footbridge to span the River Severn and associated access paths to the local highway. On land including and between Gheluvelt Park, Waterworks Road on the east</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020</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 Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p>

				side of the River Severn and the restored landfill site, Hallow Road, on the west side of the River Severn, Worcester, Worcestershire. FOOTPATH/	<p>Gheluvelt Park is one of the most recently designated English Heritage Registered historic parks (RPG) in Worcestershire but the area Registered is the more designed part to the east of the application site and separated from it by Barbourne Brook. The open land of the application site was once the filtration fields for the Waterworks company. The only remaining built part of the waterworks is the old pump house which is now an environmental centre and café (pre-Covid).</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and the pylon and back anchor will be situated close to this building where there is already a considerable amount of urban clutter such as picnic tables, litter bins, asphalt parking areas etc. Although the structure will be open to view, we do not consider that there will be any additional unacceptable visual impact from here because of its present use. It is possible that the top of the pylon will be seen from the RPG, but quite possibly not because of the tree cover. However, even if there is no view of the pylon, that should have been stated, including its possible impact upon the RPG, within the Visual Impact Assessment, which seems pretty cursory. There also seems to have been no understanding that Registration by Historic England indicates that this is a site of national importance.</p> <p>However, as far as need goes, the proposal as it will provide a popular cycle and pedestrian route across the river to the north of the city. Sabrina Bridge, to the south, is very well used even though it is quite close to the main road bridge. Another bridge for people accessing from the north will be very well received.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</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 09.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Although we have no objection to the felling of this tree for subsidence remediation, we would wish to see a replacement tree elsewhere on the site as a condition of permission if given.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Moor Park	Hertfords hire	E20/0700	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Installation of security gates at stone arch at Batchworth Lane	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are familiar both with the history and topography of Moor Park and with the work of Robert Adam. We have no objections to these proposals</p>

				entrance and installation of rising bollard, turning areas and fencing on estate road towards the Moor Lane entrance to golf club. Moor Park Mansion, Batchworth Heath, Rickmansworth. ACCESS/GATES	providing no damage is done to the Adam gateway during construction. HOWEVER, we do not understand why the gates themselves are not of the usual Adam design. the void above the gates should be a circle as at Syon Park in London, also by Adam and with gates as originally designed. We suggest that the design of the gates be altered to give the effect intended for an arch of this type, also seen at Dyrham Park Barnet and elsewhere. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
39 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0709	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Trim Oak (TA) by up to 72%, Trim Hornbeam (TB) by up to 85-90%. 39 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LJ. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. These historic trees are part of Sherrardspark wood and part of the heritage of Welwyn Garden City and a key part of the local character. We understand that mature trees need to be managed from time to time but there is no indication in this application that specialist advice has been sought from the council or elsewhere. Up to 72% and up to 90% reduction is not 'trimming', but major tree surgery, and we would trust that the council refuse this application until such time as specialist advice on the amount of pruning necessary for safety reasons has been sought. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
8 Ashley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0719	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce crown 2x Oak trees by 20%-30% and lift canopies. 8 Ashley Close, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LH. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information given in this application we not not wish to comment but do note that application 6/2020/1560/TPO for identical works to these trees has already been granted permission. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0732	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of oak tree. 19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JQ. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.09.2020 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We commented under 6/2020/1701/TPO that no reason was given for the proposed works to this tree. We note that in the current application no advice has been sought from the council. We would suggest that arboricultural advice is sought, from the council or a commercial company, as pruning or other less drastic interventions would prevent the loss of a mature tree which contributes to the local character. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

Hexton Manor	Hertfords hire	E20/0738	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and extension of vacant farm workshop to create one 3-bedroom dwelling for residential occupation by the Hexton Manor Estate, provision of vehicular access, parking area to rear of site and erection of detached garage. Old Generator House, Mill Lane, Hexton, Hertfordshire.CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are concerned at the large extension required to convert this historic generator house into a 3-bedroom dwelling. This would cause harm to the RPG of Hexton Manor, a landscape of national historic interest. It would be contrary to provisions in the NPPF for Green Belt and for Heritage Assets. Heritage Assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved and enhanced. Although we would support a more modest scheme for bringing this building back into use, we consider that these proposals constitute an overdevelopment of the site which causes harm to the RPG. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E20/0740	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Division of Cedar Cottage and annex into two separate properties with new parking and boundary landscape provision. Cedar Cottage, Goldings Lane, Waterford, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2PX. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This development would have an adverse impact on the Goldings RPG, and the listed structures within it, due to extra parking, more traffic etc. EHDC Planning Policies on the Green Belt and on Heritage (HA8), and the NPPF Sections dealing with Green Belt and Heritage Assets specify substantial public benefit and special circumstances as reasons to permit development in RPG and Green Belt. We have seen no public benefit in this application. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
39 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0759	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce Hornbeam and Oak on property. 39 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LJ. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2020 We have objected to 6/2020/2005/TC on the grounds that to reduce an oak by up to 72% and a hornbeam by is major tree surgery rather than trimming, and that no advice had been sought from the WHBC, and there was no evidence of professional arboricultural advice being sought. Trees which are important the the local character should only be pruned for Health & Safety reasons. There appear to be none in 6/2020/2005/TC. Our objection applies to this application if, as it appears, these are the same trees and the amount of surgery proposed is the same. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E20/0767	II	PLANNING APPLICATION External alterations, including insertion of	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.

				windows in connection with change of use of annex to a separate dwelling, creation of parking and access with gates and erection of wall. Cedar Cottage, Goldings Lane, Waterford, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 2PX. BUILDING ALTERATION	Our comments on 3/20/1679/FUL submitted on 9 September 2020, also apply to this application, viz: This development would have an adverse impact on the Goldings RPG, and the listed structures within it, due to extra parking, more traffic etc. EHDC Planning Policies on the Green Belt and on Heritage (HA8), and the NPPF Sections dealing with Green Belt and Heritage Assets specify substantial public benefit and special circumstances as reasons to permit development in RPG and Green Belt. We have seen no public benefit in this application. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
GARDENS TO FORMER AMWELL HOUSE INCLUDING SCOTT'S GROTTA AND GAZEBO	Hertfords hire	E20/0772	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of first floor rear extension incorporating juliet balcony, insertion of roof light and window to flank elevation. 34 Scotts Road, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 9JQ. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2020 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies within the setting of the Registered garden and Listed grotto called Scott's Grotto. On the basis of the information in this application and our knowledge of the site, we consider there would be no adverse effect on the setting, and therefore significance of the heritage assets. We, therefore, have no objection to the proposed works. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Little Guessens, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E20/0788	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Internal alterations and installation of roof lantern to Guessens and erection of a new conservatory to Little Guessens. Little Guessens, 6 Codicote Road, Welwyn AL6 9NB. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The letter from RPS which accompanies this application states that a built Heritage Report, by RPS, has been submitted with this application. We can find no such document online and are unable to comment on this application without the full information. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
40 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0789	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension including insertion of roof lantern in proposed roof. 40 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HQ. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The house and garden at 40 Parkway form part of the setting of St Francis Church, itself part of the Parkway historic landscape. On the basis of the information provided in this application, we do not consider the proposed works would adversely affect the setting of the church or the surrounding landscape.

					Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
13 Pentley Park, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0803	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Sycamore - fell. 13 Pentley Park, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7RT. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. there is no arboricultural report to support felling this tree as opposed to less drastic pruning. If permission is given to fell, we would hope that planting a replacement tree of suitable species is a condition of that permission. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
368 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0808	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Crown reduction of 25-30% to oak tree. 368 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NG. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We cannot comment on the application as no details of the reason for the large reduction in the crown of this mature tree is necessary. We trust that the WHBC own tree officer is consulted prior to any decision being made Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street	Hertfords hire	e20/0811	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey rear extension. 2 The Drive Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8QS. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Ponsbourne Park is on the Local List of Parks & Gardens of Historic Interest in WHBC. HGT is familiar with the park and its landscape history. On the basis of the information in this application, we have no objection to the proposed works. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Westbrook Hay School, Hemel Hempstead	Hertfords hire	E20/0832	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Extension of Lower School Car Park located within the enclosed former walled garden. Westbrook Hay School, London Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire HP1 2RF PARKING, EDUCATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2020 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust. Westbrook Hay is on the DBC list of local parks and gardens of historic interest and has been researched by HGT. We note that the walled garden has already been harmed by the inclusion of the car park in the NW part, which harm will be increased by the extension of the car park. The area proposed for the extension is not currently used for its designed purpose, and we consider that the designs, as detailed in this application, will not adversely affect the wider landscape, nor the setting of the listed mansion.

					Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
20 Monks Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/0842	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey side and single storey rear/side extension. 20 Monks Rise, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NF. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Digswell Mews in situated opposite the back of this property. We consider the setting of the cottages will not be adversely affected by the proposed development as the garage block on the western side of Digswell House Mews effectively screens them. We therefore have no objection. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Westbrook Hay	Hertfords hire	E20/0857	N	PLANNING APPLICATION New fence, railings and gates. Westbrook Hay School, London Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire HP1 2RF. BOUNDARY, ACCESS/GATES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2020 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust. Westbrook Hay historic landscape also incorporates an area outside of the present school premises, now occupied by the Golf course. Views across the boundary, though selective are still important in the reading of this landscape. The proposed fence Type 2 and gates Type C and D, although affording greater security to the school premises are out of keeping with both the rural nature of the site and the setting of a country house of Westbrook Hay. Views through the gates will be severely harmed. The more formal gates A and B and the main gate are in keeping with the property and enhance the setting of the mansion and emphasize the importance of the historic landscape. We assume the decorative railings (Type 1) near the entrance are to complement the gates although a more historic solution would be the traditional estate railings which are to be retained to the east of the entrance. We consider that the fencing Type 2, and gates C and D are not appropriate for a landscape of this sensitivity and will cause harm to the setting, and thus the significance of the listed mansion and the locally listed landscape. We have no objections to the more decorative gates and railings (Type 1 and A,B and main gates) to the north of the site. A better solution to provision of security fencing, and proper screening of it, should be proposed for the majority of the perimeter so as the enhance and conserve the heritage assets , in line with NPPF and DBC policies, rather than cause harm to their significance. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

Penshurst Place	Kent	E20/0601	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Construction of summer house within the curtilage of a Listed Building. The Paddocks, Penshurst Road, Penshurst KENT TN11 8HY. GARDEN BUILDING	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2020</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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and were surprised that neither the extremely brief Heritage Statement (HS) or the Design & Access Statement (D&A) made any mention whatsoever of the Grade II Registered Park & Garden (RPG) of Penshurst Place, or the fact that the application site also lies within the Green Belt and the AONB. This is a regrettable omission, as without it your officers will be unable to appreciate the significance and setting of the heritage assets and what effect this application may have upon them. The application therefore fails to meet the criteria set out within the NPPF (Paras 189 & 190).</p> <p>The architectural consultant has stated in the lamentably inadequate D&A & HS that the intent is not to copy the style of the original house, but to complement it with a timber building containing a large proportion of glass, which from a study of Google Maps appears to replace an existing structure in this location. The application site is on the perimeter of the RPG, well away from Penshurst Place and so is unlikely to affect its setting. However, there is a further outbuilding (Grade I) within the garden of the Paddocks which was a cricket ball factory for Penshurst Place cricket team, and the Paddocks itself - approximately 16m x 4m (64m sq) - is also listed Grade I. The proposed summerhouse is 8m x 6m (48m sq), and as such would occupy in the region of 75% of the plan area of the house. Whilst not objecting to a summer house in this location, in our opinion the proposed building is too large and unsympathetic to the style of the listed buildings and will harm their setting. We would prefer that the size is reduced in order not to dominate the garden and in a more sympathetic style.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Plantation Garden, Norwich	Norfolk	E20/0220	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Conversion of hotel (Class C1) to	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.09.2020</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>

				<p>dwelling house (Class C3), demolition of existing conservatory and brick outbuilding, construction of conservatory, single storey garage, single storey rear extension, internal and external alterations, new boundary treatment and access gates. Plantation House, 4 Earlham Road, Norwich NR2 3DB. BUILDING ALTERATION, CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. Plantation House was built by Henry Trevor in about 1857 who was also responsible for creating the much-acclaimed Grade II Plantation Garden which is in a deep worked-out chalk quarry and abandoned lime works adjacent to the house. The garden layout and main features were designed by Henry Trevor with later advice from the architect Edward Boardman (1833-1910). Plantation House has been in separate ownership since about 1920 : during WWII it served as a hospital and since then has been part of a hotel complex. The Plantation Garden Trust was set up in 1980, achieving charitable status in 1989. By the early 1970s the site, which covers just over one hectare (3 acres) was a tangle of undergrowth smothering the ruins of the various garden buildings including a Gothic Fountain (reminiscent of that designed by Repton for Ashridge in Hertfordshire). The restoration of this very important Victorian garden is a triumph to all those involved over the last 35 years. Plantation House has now been purchased by a keen gardener who is attempting to restore the house, much of which was in a poor state with major subsidence problems resulting from the underlying nature of the soil strata. The current owner contacted Roger Last (former Chairman of Norfolk Gardens Trust) who has produced a garden report and plan.</p> <p>The GT/NGT are supportive of the proposals put forward by the new owner. We are glad to see that the house is being restored as well as the garden attached to the house. The restoration will be of considerable benefit to the setting of the Grade II listed Planation Garden.</p> <p>For further information about the Plantation Garden, your officers may be interested in reading the section in Norfolk Gardens and Designed Landscapes by Patsy Dallas, Roger Last and Professor Tom Williamson published by Oxbow Books in 2013. (Roger Last was responsible for the entry on the Planation Garden.) The hard book version is now out of print, but there are still copies of the paperback edition published in 2017 available from Norfolk Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Raynham Park	Norfolk	E20/0711	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of agricultural field and	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.09.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory

			<p>woodland to camping site for use by 10 yurts (retrospective); installation of associated raised yurt platform bases (retrospective); erection of a covered seating, wash-up and refuse storage area, shower block and two toilet blocks; installation of underground drainage tanks; construction of access track and 11-space car park; construction of 1.2 metre high earth bund; creation of fire pit, and associated landscaping. Land west of Walled Garden, Raynham Hall, Raynham. CAMPING</p>	<p>consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the application documents online and note that 3 of the planned 10 yurts are already in situ under Permitted Development Rights (Amended Planning Statement (APS), Para 1.3). However, the ancillary buildings on the edge of the woodland including the fire pit, are also already built, and we are surprised that the applicants did not seek planning permission before erecting these structures or indeed the construction of the access track, especially as the site lies entirely within the Grade II registered park of Raynham Hall. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment indicates that by the time of their site visit, roads had recently been resurfaced so we have to hope that no Category A or B trees were felled or adversely affected by prior clearance or resurfacing. We also note that para 3.7 of the APS mentions that a 'parking for a minimum of 10 cars would be provided in a clearing in the woodland adjacent to the glamping field'. It is not clear whether this suggests that more yurts could be installed should this application be permitted and the enterprise proves successful. We would also expect parking provision to be linked to whatever plans the applicant has in mind for the walled kitchen garden, as if large events are to be held there, suitable discreet parking provision is crucial. Once the Gardener's Cottage has been restored and extended, if weddings etc are to be held here, far more parking will be required and the GT/NGT would very much hope that planning consent is applied for prior to construction, before any irreversible works are undertaken within the walled garden or its environs.</p> <p>We are glad to note that the applicant proposes to replant trees as per the original parkland planting based on the 1886 OS map. We would suggest that similar species as are already present are chosen. We also consider that the applicant has demonstrated to our satisfaction that views across and from within the RPG will only be marginally affected by this proposal. However, should the quantity of yurts or parking/support structures within the woodland increase in the future, we will reassess our comments accordingly.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Cragside	Northumb erland	E20/0692	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Fit new LPG tank with concrete pad within rear garden including laying pipework within trenching to the property. Burnfoot Lodge, Cragside, Morpeth, Northumberland NE65 7XJ. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020 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 Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We responded in June to a similar application (20/01278/LBC). Burnfoot Lodge is a former entrance lodge to the Grade I registered garden (RPG) of Cragside. It is apparent from Google Streetview that the lodge garden is open to view from the B6344, which is the approach to Rothbury and Cragside for a large number of visitors, and that the proposed siting of the new LPG tank would be clearly visible from the road. Despite the fact that the Lodge is quite well tucked away down in the dene, and any impact to the Grade I RPG from these proposals would be slight, since our previous suggestion of the tank being installed underground will not work due to flood risk, perhaps the tank could be screened from the roadside view by a hedge or some discreet alternative instead? Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Nun Appleton Hall	North Yorkshire	E19/0658	II	PLANNING APPLICATION RECONSULTATION Restoration of house to be as closely as possible to the building shown in Philips Manuscript, excluding wings, including restoration of the interior ground and first floor plans to the 1894 plan, reconfiguration of the west side basement to kitchen and storage space, retention of garage, reconstruction of loggia, and demolition of some areas of 20th, 19th and 18th Century fabric. Nun Appleton Hall, Nun Appleton, Appleton Roebuck, York, North Yorkshire YO5 7BG REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.09.2020 Thank you for re- consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regards to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II, as per the amendments to the above application. 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. YGT has liaised with the GT and is authorised by the GT to respond to this re-consultation. Nun Appleton Hall (Listed Grade II) and its historic parkland and gardens are nationally significant and we support the repair and refurbishment of the Hall to make a family home. This will considerably benefit the heritage asset and we welcome the new documents and the affirmation of high standards of craftsmanship. The history of Nun Appleton stretches back to at least the 12th Century when it was a nunnery. Following the Dissolution, the property passed to Sir Thomas Fairfax (1521-99) and his descendant Thomas, Third Lord Fairfax, as General Fairfax, commanded the Parliamentary forces from

				<p>Amended Plans Amended Description Amended Information (ie Surveys) Additional Information</p>	<p>1654-1650 when he retired. It is this mid17th Century period which is most interesting from a historic designed landscape and garden standpoint although we understand little or almost nothing seems to survive above ground. Like John Aislable at Studley Royal in the early 18th Century and many others, Fairfax spent his retirement laying out his gardens at Nun Appleton designing them formally with a military theme. Andrew Marvell, tutor to Mary Fairfax dedicated his poem Upon Appleton House to her father, General Fairfax and emphasized the natural beauty of the site and the formal gardens. (Please see references and comment below.) The park developed later during the ownership of the Milner family in the 18th Century and later in the mid19th Century when Lady Milner also created a formal garden with a fishpond. A little later she created a terrace along the south side of the house and linked the smaller parts of the garden together, along with draining the park and ordering the embankment of the River Wharfe. The kitchen garden to the west of the Hall may have been built later in the 18th Century; Marvell's poem of 1652 mentions stoves for tender plants (stanza 43) though it is not clear where these were situated.</p> <p>Although this planning application largely relates to works to the house it is important to understand the whole heritage asset including the wider setting, and the relationships between the Hall and the historic designed landscape that the owners/designers intended. Unfortunately, we have never been able to visit to assess the whole area.</p> <p>We are pleased to read that the setting of Nun Appleton Hall is considered in the Architectural Design Statement dated June 2020, (Chapter 8, Pearce Bottomley Architects), and the Planning and Heritage Statement by Montagu Evans dated August 2020 complements the previously submitted Heritage Statement and Historic Buildings Report of September 2017 but is very much more comprehensive and considers at 3.0 Historic Development, the gardens and grounds and at 5.0 Assessment of Proposals, enhancements to the setting of the house.</p> <p>We note that in the Architectural Design Statement at 5.2 Design Response p 14 'Dr Paul Stamper (FSA) was commissioned to carry out a heritage overview and assessment of the gardens and parkland at Nun Appleton Hall. Although the current application includes no alterations to the existing gardens and parkland and any historic features within it, the report was carried out to inform any proposals for the landscape's future management.' We completely support this strategy and strongly and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>respectfully suggest that the applicant undertakes an archaeological survey to determine what can be revealed of Thomas Fairfax's gardens; this would significantly add to our understanding of designed gardens at this time. We also support a Conservation Management Plan for the RPG (Registered Park and Garden).</p> <p>From our limited knowledge of the site we support the Architectural Design Statement at 8.2 p21 which notes that 'The North forecourt will be re-landscaped and resurfaced with gravel to improve the immediate setting of the Hall.' And the approach from Oak Lodge over Guido's bridge (Stone Bridge) and south to the Hall is shown on Jeffrey's County Map of 1771. We also note Section 9 Summary p 23: 'The reinstatement of the cupola will reconnect the house with the setting as it will provide panoramic views out across the estate and will enhance the views from the landscape towards to the house. The Planning and Heritage Statement produced by Montagu Evans sets out the planning policies and impact upon the listed building and should be read in conjunction with this document.'</p> <p>The Planning and Heritage Statement includes a comprehensive section at 3 on Historic Development including on p33 some notes regarding the Gardens and Surrounding Park 3.94-3.96. In Section 4 Statement of Significance we are unsure about 4.33, '350 ash trees in individual tree quads have been planted in the positions shown in the 1909 OS map by the current owner.' Possibly ash trees but we have not been able to determine where they are. Overall, we welcome the points at Section 5 Assessment of Proposals Enhancements to the Setting of the House, 5.49-5.33. However, as we have much to learn about the history of the RPG, we strongly advise that there is archaeological monitoring (watching brief) during any groundworks as set out by the NYCC Principal Archaeologist. And at 5.52 advise that a historic garden specialist/landscape architect is engaged to determine the design for the suitable landscaping scheme.</p> <p>In conclusion we support the repair and refurbishment of the nationally significant Nun Appleton Hall and give the following advice on the RPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a method of recording and preserving any historic features identified/discovered during the works. • Suitable method statements should be prepared regarding the potential impact of any construction activities upon the RPG and the management of such impacts during the work. • a historic garden specialist/landscape architect is engaged to determine
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>the design for the suitable landscaping scheme around the Hall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Conservation Management Plan for the RPG, the implementation of which over many years, will enhance and restore the heritage asset and be a lasting legacy from the present owner. <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> <p>REFS CR Markham, Life of the Great Lord Fairfax, 1870, p365 H Macdonald (ed), Andrew Marvell 2nd ed1956, pp79-107 A Dixon Hunt, Andrew Marvell: His Life and Writings, 1978, pp80-110 Upon Appleton House, stanza 36: 'In the just figure of a fort/And with five bastions did fence/as aiming one for every sense'. This part of the poem is a refection upon war and Fairfax's military career, so may not be an accurate description of the garden. Marvell mentions alleys (stanza 37) and a profusion of flowers (stanzas 37-9). Comment: From our knowledge it appears that the fortifications alluded to by Marvell at Nun Appleton are very early. Vauban and the Dutch expert, Menno van Coehoorn (1641-1704, a leading officer in the forces of William III, Prince of Orange, later William III of England) published works on fortifications. In 1688 it was noted that Sir Henry Goodricke of Ribston Hall, N Yorkshire, was, 'environing his garden with a kind of fortification' that incorporated military-style bastions. He may have been preparing for another civil war in James II's reign. Nevertheless, fortifications at Blenheim were a garden device. Sir John Vanburgh (1644-1726) who had experienced military service himself worked at Blenheim and Castle Howard. At Blenheim he employed fortifications as a nice conceit for a martial genius and at Castle Howard built a massive curtain- wall with towers and bastions on the approach. William Stukeley sketched 'The Duchesses Bastion' at Grimsthorpe Castle (Lincolnshire) in 1736. In 1727 Stephen Switzer included a 'Plan of an Octagonal Kitchen Garden' for The Practical Kitchen Gardener. The octagon of walls is defended by a moat with bastions 'after the latest manner'. I am also reminded of the bastions at Bramham Park, and at Gillingwood Hall, near Richmond both Yorkshire, similarly later than Nun Appleton.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Moreby Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0234	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed building consent for conversion and extension of former garage. Moreby Hall, Moreby, Stillingfleet. BUILDING ALTERATION</p> <p>OUTCOME 28.09.2020 Granted</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for re- consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regards to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the amendments to the above application. 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. YGT has liaised with the GT and is authorised by the GT to respond to this re-consultation.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could please add these comments to our earlier response (19th June 2020).</p> <p>We have studied the amendments, and the letter from Nicholas and Nicholas Ltd dated 10th June 2020 in reply to Anne Simms Conservation Officer Comments dated 27th May 2020. It is clear that the applicant wishes to construct a new dwelling in addition to the 11 apartments within Moreby Hall (2020/0401/LBC & 2020/0413/FULM), and the 9 units of the service wing (approved February 2020).</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement writes that ‘extending the garage has been considered and is found to be the only way to make the ‘desirability’ and the ‘viability’ of saving the garage worthwhile’ (D&A p.2) and that if this is not permitted then ‘demolition should then be considered.’ (D&A p.3). It goes even further to state (p10 Para 6.13) that ‘the conversion and extension of the building is critical to not only the viability the future retention of the building but also the viability of the suitable reuse of the Grade II* Listed Main Hall (which is to be pursued through a separate planning application). Failure to grant planning consent will not secure the future of the application building but also cause further problems in relation to the future viability of the conversion of the Main Hall of Moreby Hall.’</p> <p>This seems quite extreme. If the viability of the entire scheme depends on this garage conversion and extension, we would have expected that pre-application advice would have been sought?</p> <p>The building as it stands is charming in its simplicity. The proposed extension and elevations have the effect of turning it into a strange sort of ‘village hall’ hybrid, with an unattractive flat roof and out-of-keeping wooden extension with large plate glass windows. We do not agree that this ‘properly respects the character and appearance of the listed hall and other listed structures and the Moreby Hall registered park and garden’</p>
-------------	--------------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>(D&A p11, 6.4). Nor do we agree with the Nicholas and Nicholas Ltd., Size of Extension Justification, Second Reason regarding quality of design,' to add an extension only half the size of the existing building would lack the opportunity to generate good and inspiring quality of design and amenity space, resulting in a bed-sit type dwelling not befitting of the location and grandeur of Moreby Hall and not generating the required revenues. The extension therefore must be of a good size to allow a quality of design scope and self-viability through that quality.' Our opinion is that the proposal does not deliver what it suggests; the concept design is unsympathetic to the garage and Moreby Hall.</p> <p>The comments in YGT's original letter still hold true, despite the amendments, and we fully endorse the comments made by Anne Simms, in her conservation officer's report, and the various ways in which this application fails to comply with Local Plan policies and the NPPF.</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>
Beningborough Hall	North Yorkshire	E10/0618	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Revised application for the demolition of later additions to the rear of the dwellinghouse and construction of single storey extension, alterations to attic space to form bedroom suite with roof lights and replacement dormer window, refurbishment of existing outbuilding with glazed link for ancillary domestic use and some new and replacement windows to dwellinghouse. Orchard House, Cherry Tree Avenue, Newton On Ouse, North Yorkshire. DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2020</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 Beningbrough Hall 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>Orchard House is located in the village of Newton-on-Ouse within the Newton-on-Ouse Conservation Area and close to Newton Lodge and the gates of Beningbrough Hall one of the two access points into the park and Hall. The gates and a lodge possibly by James Wyatt, late C18 are listed grade II. Orchard House, in common with many of the houses along the street, is set well back from the front boundary of the site to the east, with the existing outbuildings running along the southern boundary of the site. This planning application is unlikely to have any affect on the setting of the entrance to Beningbrough Hall or the park and we have no comments to make.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Ingleborough Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0834	N	PLANNING APPLICATION to determine if prior approval is required under Schedule 2, Part 6, of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for works to upgrade existing woodland access tracks and to create one new section of track - Ingleborough Estate Woodlands, Clapham, Grid Ref: SD74846997 ROAD	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2020 planning@yorkshiredales.org.uk 21st September 2020 Dear Ms Calvert C/18/146D/GPD O application to determine if prior approval is required under Schedule 2, Part 6, of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for works to upgrade existing woodland access tracks and to create one new section of track - Ingleborough Estate Woodlands, Clapham, Grid Ref: SD74846997 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a historic park and garden site. 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. The area of Ingleborough Hall, Clapham is a non-registered site, but of significance as the home of the Farrer family of whom the best-known member was Reginald Farrer (1880-1920), the traveller and plant collector. The proposed plans show only one track to be upgraded adjacent to the Nature Trail to Ingleborough Cave. This is further north than Farrer's rhododendrons, and in our view would not have a negative impact if the surface is as proposed. We are of a similar opinion regarding the tracks marked for upgrading on the east side of Clapham Beck and the proposed new section of track. We have no further comments. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Bestwood Pumping Station	Nottinghamshire	E20/0748	II	PLANNING APPLICATION South of former Bestwood Pumping Station: Reinstating the historic path around the cooling pond,	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2020 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

				<p>the addition of electricity supply throughout the premises, the repair of the existing decking to the north of the pond and the addition of two small timber structures that will serve as a prosecco bar and a Santa's grotto. North of former Bestwood Pumping Station: Creation of a wedding garden to serve the main venue on site as well as additional parking spaces to cater for the expected number of visitors. Lakeside, Mansfield Road. HYBRID</p>	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation relating to this application which has been submitted with a heritage impact assessment (HIA) but note that there are no landscape plan drawings to accompany the proposals. Some of the work has already begun (such as repairs to the decking) and a 'prosecco bar' has been installed to replace an earlier structure. The planning history provided in the HIA does not make it clear whether the decking had permission in the first place and we would question the installation of the prosecco bar/shed to replace a structure that might also not have approval. The decking may be justifiable to create space for guests at events, but it does not enhance the original design landscape intentions. The prosecco bar has no redeeming design qualities, it is simply a shed, the finished colour is too domestic, and in our opinion, a structure totally without merit. It is also located most unfortunately, very visibly in front of a primary view of the wonderful grade II* listed pumping station, thereby eroding its setting. The choice of materials for new paths is also difficult to understand as there is no 'as existing plan' showing the Victorian paths and their type. We feel that a more sensitive scheme would be to choose materials that match rather than contrast with the original historic paths.</p> <p>There is also no information on the planning authority website (or contained in the HIA) regarding the fencing proposals to the north of the pumping station so it is difficult to judge the impact, but it is concerning to read that a 10 foot high fence is proposed. This is a very high structure, albeit to hide the modern pumping house, but we would question whether this will be successful. If the Santa's Grotto is to be acceptable, it needs to be very carefully positioned with appropriate planting that can enhance the original Victorian planting scheme.</p> <p>Overall, we are very pleased to see the site being invested in, but as per our comments regarding the previous proposals for the site, we are very concerned about the lack of attention shown to the heritage of the parkland. The HIA does not provide any proper examination of the layout, planting and intentions of both the original designs (presumably by Hawksley) or the subsequent more recent changes. As such it fails to identify the components that contribute to the significance of the heritage asset. Before preparing any new scheme, a thorough understanding and</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					evidence base is needed which includes a detailed assessment of the planting, path layout, features and their construction. The park is grade II registered and forms the setting of a grade II* listed building of very unique type. The investments being made are welcomed but are we feel, not focussed nearly adequately enough on preserving and enhancing the heritage significance of the site, and consequently, the results will erode the heritage significance of the assets. We would ask that your officers request more detailed landscape proposals in order that further inappropriate development will not compound the harm already caused. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Badger Dingle	Shropshire	E20/0631	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an agricultural building with hardstanding and automated gate. Proposed Agricultural Building, Land To The South Of Woodland Known As Badger Clump Off, Badger Lane, Badger Bridgnorth. AGRICULTURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2020 In looking at the above application we noticed that there was no Heritage Assessment included in the online documentation. We concur with your conservation officer in that we are anxious to know exactly what impact this may have on the RPG before responding. We would be grateful if you were able to ask the applicant to provide this so we can make a more informed response. Thanks and best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Nynehead Court	Somerset	E20/0607	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of 11 No. close care (Class C2) units with sub-division of Court Gardens Farmhouse to form 2 No. further close care units with erection of an associated community hub facility, landscaping of the walled garden and associated external works and access improvements at Nynehead Court, Chipley Road, Nynehead. INSTITUTION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2020 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 Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation, in particular the Design & Access statement (D&A) and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The application site lies within the Grade II* Nynehead registered park and garden (RPG) and concerns development within and adjacent to the C18 walled kitchen garden which forms part of a group of historic structures within the registered site. The walled garden, which is somewhat neglected, lies at some distance from the mansion which is already a care facility. The applicants are proposing eleven new care units plus a community hub, which skirt the walks on the northern and southern sides and replaces some of the redundant sheds to the east of the kitchen

					<p>garden. The units are all low level and will not be higher than the walls. Their footprint is discreet and the materials have been chosen to be recessive against the background of existing vegetation and in keeping with local built fabric and vernacular. However, we would have liked to have seen the inward facing facades of the units looking more like glasshouses/conservatories to better reflect the original use of the space. The central area of the kitchen garden is to once again be used partially for growing of plants and as lawn. The layout is reminiscent of its original use and all four corners of the walled garden remain visible, so the site can still be clearly read as a walled kitchen garden. We are glad to note that parking has been kept to a bare minimum.</p> <p>In our opinion this has been a carefully thought out, reasonably modest, and discreet scheme, with various dismissed, less suitable previous iterations. The GT/SGT do not feel this will cause undue harm to the setting and significance of the Grade II* RPG and therefore have no objections from a heritage point of view.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wortley Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/0689	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two storey rear extension and window alterations (Listed Building Consent). Park House Cottage, Road adjacent to Wortley Park, Wortley, Sheffield, S35 7DE BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Wortley Hall, 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>Park House Cottage lies within Wortley Hall's registered park towards the south eastern boundary. Park House and its associated agricultural buildings are shown on the OS 1st Edition map published in the 1850's and were possibly built as part of the development of the Wortley Estate during the 18th Century.</p> <p>Wortley has been associated with the Wortley family since the time of King Stephen and significant architects and landscape designers have worked there from Ralph Tunncliffe in the 1730's, and over the further course of the 18th Century, Giacomo Leoni, Matthew Brettingham and John Carr of York – the latter was responsible for the stable block and outbuildings. At</p>

					<p>the beginning of the 19th Century the south front garden terraces of the Hall were completed and also the laying out of the park. William Sawrey Gilpin (1762-1843) is said to have worked 'in a Pricean spirit' (alluding to the important picturesque landowner/writer and designer Uvedale Price) at Wortley (Gardeners Magazine, Vol 16 1840 pp105-08) although the extent of his work is not clear.</p> <p>The separate dwelling, Park House Cottage, was created in the late 20th Century from the easternmost barn attached to Park House. Immediately to the north of the dwellings is the historic drive from West Wood Lodge to Wortley Hall but which now only serves Park House, Park House Cottage and farming access. However, it is the route of the Trans Pennine Trail. To the south of the application site is a late 20th Century timber stable range and to the west of Park House a copse of trees. We understand that the parkland is in agricultural/arable use.</p> <p>The proposed extension which is to the south of the existing building will not be visible from the Trans Pennine Trail although the proposed enlarged east and north facing windows will have a minor impact. The extension, although it has a large window, should have limited impact on views from the south due to the location of the property and not be visible from Wortley Hall. However, regarding the design of the building we defer to the expert conservation advice of your Authority.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make.</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>
Stoneleigh Abbey	Warwicks hire	E20/0595	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a three-bay detached garage and conversion of existing garage to self-contained annex. Tantara Lodge, Coventry Road, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DR. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2020</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.</p> <p>We have looked at the sparse documentation accompanying this application and were surprised to note that the Heritage Statement makes no mention that the site lies within the Grade II* registered park of Stoneleigh Abbey (RPG), or that the lodge itself is Grade II listed. Tantara Lodge is the former east lodge for Stoneleigh Abbey and as such is in a prominent position at the head of the T junction facing Stoneleigh Road.</p>

					<p>The NPPF requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected (Para 189) and as the Heritage Statement fails entirely to even mention any heritage assets, it therefore also fails to comply with the NPPF Para 190 which requires LPAs to identify and assess how the significance of any heritage assets may be affected by a proposal or by development within their setting. Whilst the proposal would not constitute substantial harm to the heritage assets, in our opinion it would detract from the setting of the lodge and RPG without any balancing public benefit (NPPF Para 196). We would have liked to have seen a visual impact assessment of how any new structure would have appeared from within the RPG. It would be clearly visible from the road, as the tree cover is quite sparse to the left of the entrance gates and as such would adversely impact upon the views towards and from the RPG.</p> <p>Your officers will be aware of Historic England's 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. Page 2 states that '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' and also on Page 4 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' In our opinion, the existing garage already has caused harm which would be exacerbated by this additional structure.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust objects to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stoneleigh Abbey	Warwicks hire	E20/0699	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of a residential training centre and associated offices of up to 1,920 sq.m. floorspace and up to 20 bedrooms, with part-time use of bedrooms for hotel use (Sui Generis mix of uses), with	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2020</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) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation, in particular the Design & Access Statement (D&A), Heritage Statement (HS) and Landscape Design & Heritage Statement (L/SD&H), and it is apparent that Dementia Carers</p>

				<p>associated landscape planting and car parking. Plot A, Abbey Park, Stareton Lane, Stoneleigh.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>Count have taken a great deal of trouble to devise a site which is dementia-friendly for their clients, whilst still understanding the necessity of being sensitive to the Deer Park enclosure of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Stoneleigh Abbey, within which Plot A of Abbey Park lies. We are pleased to note that the proposed building has a significantly smaller floor area, approximately half that of the permitted office building and a maximum of 60 parking spaces, as opposed to the 253 permitted, on the Approved Masterplan. We are also happy to note that the applicants have looked at a contemporary interpretation of the local farmhouse/country house vernacular when coming up with their building design. We welcome the lower roof heights and more modest proportions of the buildings and can see the virtue of the glazed portions to maintain views outwards towards the landscape for their clients. We would suggest though, that should the buildings be used in the evenings, consideration is given to using glass which limits night-time glare as well as blinds/curtains to contain light spillage into the deer park.</p> <p>We also are pleased to note that specimen trees within the site will be retained and will be incorporated into views from inside the building where possible. We are also glad to note that the site is screened by woodland to the west (HS 8.4) We also are pleased to see that many pathways will be mown grass and such areas as do need hard landscaping, are to be formed in resin-bonded gravel and screened as far as possible by contours. The Heritage Statement (8.2) is sensitive towards the effect of the visible level changes across the site from the former east drive and the need to be 'particularly responsive to these edges of the site [which] will require careful consideration of massing, scale and height in order to both diminish their impact in view from the East drive and in dealing with the level change from the drive to the built areas of the site.'</p> <p>The GT/WGT are sure that this facility, if approved by your officers, will represent an exemplar for dementia friendly facilities, and improve the lives of many dementia suffers and their carers.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Knepp Castle	West Sussex	E20/0043	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed construction of landscape enhancement features using imported inert material,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and also the Gardens Trust (GT) about amended plans for the above application. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered</p>

				<p>together with the provision of public access and amenity; comprising revised landform and details to WSCC/029/18/SP. Knepp Castle, West Grinstead, Horsham RH13 8LJ. LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>In our earlier response dated 11th May 2020 we stated “Provided it is confirmed the amphitheatre will have smooth slopes rather than terraced steps, the Trust considers the present proposals would turn a rather pedestrian and utilitarian arrangement of landform and trees into a piece of new landscape which complements and extends the aesthetic of the existing park to its longterm benefit”.</p> <p>We note that the revised plans confirm that the amphitheatre will have smooth slopes and for this reason SGT is pleased to support the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Milton Mount Gardens (Worth Park)	West Sussex	E20/0270	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BUILDING WITH FLAT ROOF TO HOUSE WATER PUMPS TO PROVIDE NEW COLD WATER SERVICES TO MILTON MOUNT BLOCK OF FLATS VIA 2 X VERTICAL PIPEWORK RISERS. MILTON MOUNT, MILTON MOUNT AVENUE, POUND HILL, CRAWLEY. MAINTENANACE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2020</p> <p>Thank you for notifying the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) of the above planning application. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT), a national statutory consultee, and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has also brought this application to our attention.</p> <p>In our earlier letter dated 18th June we encouraged the adoption of mitigation measures by way of new planting to lessen the visual intrusion. The updated proposals include planting a screen around the new tank room and new herbaceous borders. SGT welcomes these changes which will reduce the visual intrusion caused by the exterior pipe.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust</p>