



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES NOVEMBER 2020

The GT conservation team received 177 new cases for England and two for Wales in November, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 62 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Stoke Park	Avon	E20/1059	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition no. 6 attached to planning permission P19/3047/F to submit amended plans and alterations to some wording. Restoration of existing historic access route and former carriage ride with a self binding gravel path surface. Stoke Park Estate, South Gloucestershire BS16 1WJ. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a site that falls within the boundary of the designated area of a Registered Historic Park and Garden, which is identified on the national register as Grade II. 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. Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information provided in this application and consider that the proposed line of the cycle route should follow the original C18th. carriage drive. To insert straight lines into a naturalistic Arcadian landscape would visually harm the park laid out by Thomas Wright between 1748 and 1766, around a country house. This route is key as a linear feature, boundary drive lost since 1768. Reference to Fig.36 of the Conservation Management Plan produced by Nicholas Pearson Partnership LLP. Additionally, the intrusion of a 3.0m wide cycle path into Barn Wood, with

					<p>associated work, [some tree clearance, local grading /verge reinstatement either side of the path and disruption to this small area of woodland] seems unnecessary. We would suggest that it could be omitted altogether. Regarding the surface material; we would prefer the self - binding gravel solution, as proposed in the CMP, but we recognise that it would require more maintenance than the bound gravel over tarmac sub-base, particularly as the gradients will accelerate wear and tear. Whilst Natural Quartzite SMA is successfully used in many historic locations, it does require a formal edge treatment [precast concrete edging] and can therefore appear alien in a parkland setting – particularly if the route planning does not follow the historic route. Any unnatural routes and unsympathetic materials will immediately jar within the exposed, undulating landscape setting.</p> <p>With reference to the NPPF policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment, Avon Gardens Trust have considered the impact of the proposal on the significance of the grade II registered park and garden. 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. Avon Gardens Trust supported the original application, 19/01213/FB, in March 2019, but are unable to support this application which seeks to straighten parts of the original historic carriageway, and to re-surface a very prominent and authentic C18th driveway with a substance less sympathetic to its surroundings and long distance views. Harm will be done to the registered park and garden, which will outweigh any public benefit.</p> <p>Therefore, Avon Gardens Trust objects to this current proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Stoke Park	Avon	E20/1062	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for variation of Condition Nos 8 (Materials) and 17 (list approved plans) following grant of planning permission 19/01213/FB for the proposed development of a formal access</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2020 As per E20/1059 above</p>

				route through Stoke Park estate from Sir Johns Lane (Bristol) to Jellicoe Avenue (South Gloucestershire) including access works at Stanfield Close, Romney Avenue and Long Wood Meadows, following historic route and former carriage ride, comprising selfbinding gravel surfaced path and associated works. Stoke Park, Park Road, Stapleton, Bristol. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	
Clic Cottage, Frenchay	Avon	E20/1107	-	PLANNING APPLICATION Relevant demolition of existing flat roof extension and replacement with single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation (resubmission of P19/18430/F). Clic Cottage, Beckspool Road, Frenchay, South Gloucestershire BS16 1NT. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting an unlisted house, within the curtilage of a Grade II Listed House within locally registered historic parkland which sits within Frenchay conservation area. 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 designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that has been provided and on the basis of this we agree with the Heritage Impact statement that the proposed extension would bring back into use this cottage whilst not encroaching on or harming the current undeveloped nature of the parkland, being obscured by the trees which screen the property. Summary: Avon Gardens Trust, therefore, have no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Frenchay Hospital	Avon	E20/1198	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition no 2 attached to planning permission P19/3567/F to substitute plans to illustrate variation in design to	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2020 Thank you for consulting Avon Gardens Trust. As the site of the proposed school is situated on the Old Frenchay Hospital site, and as such has planning permission from the previous application, P19/3567/F, we have considered the information that has been provided and on the basis of this

				<p>reduce carbon output. Land At Former Frenchay Hospital Site, Frenchay Park Road, Frenchay South Gloucestershire BS16 1UU. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>we support the additional feature which will reduce carbon output of the school building. Summary: Avon Gardens Trust, therefore, have no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Sandleford Priory	Berkshire	E18/0053	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for up to 500 new homes, including 40% affordable, a 1 form entry primary school with land for its expansion to 2 form entry, replacement and/or expansion land for Park House Academy School, extra care elderly units as part of the affordable housing provision, access from Warren Road and emergency access from Kendrick Road, a recreational facility for families of children with special needs, green infrastructure including children's play areas and informal open space, pedestrian and cycle links through the site, sustainable drainage and other infrastructure. All matters reserved. Sandleford Park West, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.11.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed Council strategies affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within West Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment again on the most recent planning application for Sandleford Park. We have read with interest the new Heritage Statement which accompanies the amended and additional documents for the above. You will recall that we set out two outstanding concerns in our letter dated 15th June 2018 – the effects on Warren Road and the path leading off from it to Sandleford Priory and the visibility of the 3 storey development on the southern edge of the development. Warren Road approach: The further research interestingly shows that Warren Road was not the original approach to Sandleford Priory from Andover Road which is shown on the 1761 Rocque Map and went slightly to the north in a curve and followed the lie of an extant line of trees. The historic mapping helps to show that at some point between 1781 and 1882 the alignment was changed but we have not found anything in the current Heritage Statement or previous heritage documents on this site to throw any further light on this. It is most possible that this change was not as a result of Capability Brown's plans or Mrs Montague's implementation after his death but carried out by her successors. Notwithstanding the lack of historic provenance for this Warren Road route, it remains an important feature of the current landscape dating back</p>

					<p>to 19th century so we are very pleased to see that the proposals now clearly show that the route alignment, the lines of mature trees and accompanying hedgerows are to be retained along Warren Road and the principal footpath leading off south-eastwards towards Sandford Priory. The masterplan also shows avenue planting leading into the housing off Warren Road which is welcomed as long as it reflects the species and planting distances of the existing tree lines.</p> <p>The plan now shows a car park for the school and adjacent pitches which is set back away from the tree line along the footpath. It is important that the car park does not encroach into this tree line and that the landscape treatment to the car park respects the historic landscape character and the species mix of this rural approach to Sandford Priory from Andover Road.</p> <p>Visibility of proposed houses: Unfortunately, we were not able to download the LVIA montages which might have shown whether the school and 3 storey housing west of Gorse Copse would be visible from Sandford Priory. We do note that there are no proposals to landscape the southern edge of the site in this location. We therefore request that evidence of the visibility is provided as an amendment to SLR16 (as provided in the forerunner to the current Environmental Statement). The 3 storey element on the site perimeter may need to be reconsidered in the light of these findings. In addition, the southern edge between Gorse Copse and Brickkiln Copse should be planted with a mixed tree and hedgerow field boundary to contain the development in this part of the wider pasture/woodlands to the west of the registered Sandford landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>
Langley Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/0959	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission with all matters reserved (except for principal points of access) for the phased development of a screen industries global growth hub of up to 750,000 sq ft (70,000 sq m) comprising: - A visitor attraction of 350,000 sq ft comprising a</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>The application is extensive, and we recognise the need for the large production studio buildings and the need to position these in close</p>

			<p>series of buildings, - 350,000 sq ft of film production buildings (including sound stages, workshops, offices and an external film backlot), - An education hub (25,000 sq ft), - A business growth hub (25,000 sq ft), - Associated parking and servicing, - Green Infrastructure. Land South Of Pinewood Studios, Pinewood Road, Iver Heath, Buckinghamshire, SLO 0NH. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, VISITOR ATTRACTION</p>	<p>proximity to the existing production area.</p> <p>We note that the southern boundary, including the proposed Uxbridge Road entrance to the application site and one of the car parks, is across the road and close to the northern boundary of the Grade II Registered Langley Park. The application site also runs parallel to Black Park on its western boundary, and is in close proximity to the garden surrounding Heatherden Hall on the northern boundary of the application site. While neither of the latter two sites are Registered they are of local to regional significance, although their settings are already compromised to a degree by the current studio development.</p> <p>We cannot see any specific reference to the landscape heritage impact on these three aspects of the proposals, and the various options appear to demonstrate the potential for substantial impact on parts of some/all of these three landscapes. Given the proposed scale of development, it is difficult to assess the levels of impact and their likely effect, whether damaging or not. Our main concern is for the setting, and to prevent tall and intrusive structures looming over the adjacent designed landscapes in visually damaging materials and/or form.</p> <p>If there is a heritage impact statement, we have yet to identify it and it would be helpful to have a direct reference to it if the applicant is able to direct us to this amongst the numerous documents online. If such a document has not been commissioned, we strongly recommend that an objective historic impact assessment is required from the applicants, carried out by appropriately experienced consultants which addresses levels of significance and of effect on the significant elements of the heritage assets.</p> <p>We recognise that this application is in its early stages. At present we do not have sufficient information to be able to comment on whether the scheme is acceptable but would be pleased to review it once the information requested above is supplied. Should this scheme be approved we would urge that permission is conditional upon adequate screening being provided if necessary to mitigate the impact. We understand that the existing shelter belt around the Heatherden Hall gardens is adequate at present and ensures it remains an oasis within the studio complex, although we recommend it is fortified to ensure its depth and longevity.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E20/1028	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Installation of sculptures by Joanna Vasconcelos: "Wedding Cake" and "Lafite," and an 18th century Centaur, together with associated upgrading of car parking. The Dairy, Queen Street, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire HP18 0JW.</p> <p>SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>Waddesdon is an internationally significant Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the proposed application site sits to the north of the main house and formal gardens. The GT/BGT note that the site contains the former dairy building complex which was constructed around 1874 and each building is listed separately Grade II. The GT/BGT also note that the complex was altered significantly between 1992-5 by the garden designers Julian and Isobel Bannerman, which involved extensive rebuilding, extension and restoration. The GT/BGT welcome the informative history of the Dairy as provided by Dr Sophie Piebenga which explained the historic development of the application site.</p> <p>These proposals involved the relocation of two sculptures by Joanna Vasconcelos and the relocation and extension of the car park from the east of the building complex to north of Queen Street. Both sculptures have been granted temporary planning consents for their current positions. The existing car park to the east will be landscaped in order to accommodate the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture.</p> <p>The GT/BGT have considered this application and offer the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We support the relocation of the car park to the proposed new site and would encourage the planning authority to ensure that adequate planting is introduced in order to mitigate the impact of the car park in views into and out of the RPG • We support the landscaping of the former car park to create an appropriate setting for the introduction of the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture • We support the relocation of the 'Lafite' sculpture to the proposed new position at the entrance to the dairy • We do not object to the proposed position of the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture but are concerned about the possibility that it will be visible above the tree line from views around the RPG particularly from the higher ground around the house, and would recommend that the planning authority ensure that any visibility is mitigated by additional planting
-----------------	-----------------	----------	---	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would also request that the planning authority continue to attach a temporary permission to these works in order that their position and retention can be reviewed in the future. • We would like to understand better the proposed future of the rose garden now that the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture is no longer going to be situated there. <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/1063	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a detached replacement house with basement and the demolition of the existing house (renewal of planning approval PL/18/3234/FA). High Meadows, 100 Windsor Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8ST. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT).</p> <p>We can see that this application is an application to renew a renewal (PL/18/3234/FA) of consent (PL/15/02381/FUL) for an application that South Bucks did NOT consult us on the first place! Had we been notified originally we would have had comments to make as the site affects the Grade II* registered park and garden at Bulstrode where Humphry Repton worked.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E20/1080	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of new walking footpath from Welcome Pavilion to Manor and associated ticket office. Waddesdon Manor, Silk Street, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire HP18 0JH. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>Waddesdon is an internationally significant Registered Park and Garden. We regret that further incremental damaging change is required arising from the creation of the car park in its present site in the parkland. We seek assurance that these proposals conclude the subsequent changes associated with this damaging car park development, on which the Gardens Trust was not consulted initially.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and our local representative</p>

					<p>has visited the site. We recognise the practical need to improve the current pedestrian access from the car park to the house.</p> <p>Given these reservations, our comments are therefore :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We encourage the applicant to retain existing woodchip paths wherever possible as they are much more appropriate in the landscape setting. • We recognise the problems arising from the existing woodchip path including the boggy areas arising from heavy rain and heavy footfall, and how this results in pedestrians walking off the path and on the grass resulting in further damage • We agree with the proposed use of parkland fencing alongside the path where it runs by the access road, the ticket booth positioned in the middle section, and proposed route in the west and middle sections of the path. However, we do have reservations about the following aspects : • Moving the path at the eastern section out into the open north of the tree belt causes visual damage from the wider parkland, and we would prefer to see it remain on the existing route if possible. • The durability of the proposed boardwalk on the middle section of the path raises concerns and we ask the planning authority to seek reassurance that the applicant will repair and replace this in the event of damage or wear and tear. • The use of tarmac is historically inappropriate in this type of landscape; we would prefer to see a bonded hoggin or if this is not sufficiently durable, a gravel-finished surface to tarmac to ensure that the materials for the proposed path are in keeping with the existing pedestrian paths nearer to the formal gardens and main house. <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/1116	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New Design Technology & Engineering Building for Stowe School. Accommodation to include workshops, teaching rooms and staff facilities, with associated landscape works to immediate surroundings. Stowe School, Stowe Park, Stowe,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) whose local knowledge also informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and strongly OBJECT to this building. Its construction would irreversibly develop part of the early C18 landscape that is of the highest significance to the ornamental design at</p>

				<p>Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH. EDUCATION</p>	<p>Stowe, the whole of which is of international significance as part of the English contribution to the visual arts worldwide. In our opinion the significance of Stowe at Grade I on the Historic England Register has been downplayed in this case, and the proposed development area has apparently been regarded as a small and minor section of an already compromised landscape which can be lost without substantial harm to the historic design. This is not the case. It can be regarded as nothing but substantial harm in terms of the historic environment of Stowe. Not only is yet another part of this key element of Stowe lost to irreversible development but it continues the precedent for incremental development along this ornamental woodland towards the Boycott Pavilion, encroaching on a previously undamaged section. This will inevitably lead to further proposals in the otherwise undamaged parts of this woodland. The public benefit offered is marginal and does not mitigate the damage caused by the irreversible development.</p> <p>Our objection is based on an understanding of the development area, informed by the 2012 document 'Stowe Conservation Plans: The Western Part of Stowe Gardens and The Course' commissioned by the National Trust, Stowe House Preservation Trust and Stowe School Governors from Dr Sarah Rutherford which was accepted by all parties as the guiding document for the management of this area.</p> <p>SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE</p> <p>The area is within the highly important Rook Spinney laid out by Lord Cobham in his earliest landscape phase in the 1710s and 1720s. This significance is indicated as it was specifically mentioned by Gilbert West in his renowned 1732 poem about Stowe when alluding to the significance of its contribution to the scene, as: 'An ancient Wood (upon whose topmost bough High-waving croaks the unassuming Cor) From hence its venerable Gloom extends, Where, rivalling its lofty height, ascends The pointed Pyramid ...'</p> <p>Within the 2012 Conservation Plan, Rook Spinney is split between Gazetteer Areas 1 (Lady Temple's Spinney, Significance B), and Area 2 (Pyramid Wood, Significance A) in which the development site lies. Rook Spinney was conceived as a flowering shrubbery wilderness bounded on its long sides by Nelson's Walk and The Course to the west, from which it leads as a gentle slope down to Home Park to the east. Although less complex in design than some other Stowe wildernesses, it formed the setting for these key features as well as Vanbrugh's Pyramid (significance</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>A), the base of which survives, St Augustine's Cave (gone) and various other lost buildings and statues. It also forms the immediate setting and backdrop for Area 9: The Course and Nelson's Walk including Lee's Bastion (significance A), as well as the key approach to the mansion along The Course. Pyramid Wood is identified as of the highest significance in the Conservation Plan (A).</p> <p>The area in Pyramid Wood is all the more important as a survival of Rook Spinney, as the north section in Lady Temple's Spinney has already been lost to school development. Pyramid Wood survives intact south of Lee's Bastion as replanted woodland and forms the backdrop for New Nelson's Walk, the southerly extension of the walk above the ha-ha from Lee's Bastion to the Boycott Pavilion. It retains the key historic character even though its integrity has been compromised in its setting by the recent Music School which has irreversibly developed another part of this key area adjacent, as well as compromising the essentially green approach to the mansion along The Course. The significance of Pyramid Wood as set out in the Conservation Plan is as follows:</p> <p>17.2 LANDSCAPE SIGNIFICANCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sylvan backdrop to the Home Park and the screen from New Nelson's Walk. • Part of the sylvan backdrop, above the ha-ha, to the approach from the Oxford Gates and Bridge, The Course and main drive to the mansion. • Formerly a key section of the circuit walk around the Home Park c.1725. • Nelson's Walk formed a green walk from which to observe the park and The Course beyond the ha-ha. • The present drive originated as a path at the edge of the Home Park. <p>EFFECT OF THE APPLICATION</p> <p>The proposed site for the new development survives in Pyramid Wood intact and without irreversible development. Other parts of the area have been subject to incremental irreversible development for decades, most recently the highly damaging Music School next to Lee's Bastion.</p> <p>This proposal contributes to that highly damaging but insidious creep through an area of the highest landscape significance in an internationally significant landscape. This is the first encroachment in the shrubbery woodland dividing the C18 landscape from the C20 school enclave in Home Park. It also sets a precedent for further development in the woodland south of this which will be harder to resist if permission is granted. While the setting of the woodland is damaged by the enclave of school buildings</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>east of the school drive (which originated as a path on the edge of the Home Park), the slope of the woodland south of the music school remains intact. This woodland of Rook Spinney should be considered sacrosanct and, as set out as part of the vision in the conservation plan, a candidate for restoration to the early C18 ornamental woodland character, rather than creeping destruction.</p> <p>DEPARTURE FROM CONSERVATION PLAN POLICIES</p> <p>The proposal departs from the conservation plan policies by permanent development within the area. The policy and recommendations for the area set out in Sections 17.4 and 17.5 should be followed as a matter of high priority:</p> <p>17.4 POLICY</p> <p>Maintain as a 'pretty shallow thicket' (Latapie, 1771), as established by 1779 as a wooded flowering shrubbery backdrop to the Home Park and the division against Nelson's Walk, and conversely as the backdrop to The Course above Nelson's Walk, screening views of modern buildings from the Course.</p> <p>17.5 RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain the woodland, thin where necessary, and underplant as a 'pretty shallow thicket' with flowering shrubs against the Walk. 2. Reinstate as part of the sequence of wildernesses and of the circuit walk around the Home Park. <p>ALTERNATIVE SITES</p> <p>There is no master plan for the school grounds to inform an understanding of the context of this site within the long-term aspirations for the school facilities. There is also no effective options appraisal of alternative sites which addresses both the practicalities and operational drivers for the school, and the historic significance of the various sites that have been considered. In the previous application for this building submitted earlier this year (20/00476/APP) a helpful options appraisal was submitted on which we commented. From the information supplied we concluded that the sites least damaging to the historic environment were two within the school campus to the north of this site. Surprisingly, a similar appraisal document has not been submitted with this application.</p> <p>Regarding other options, we reiterate that the least damaging to the historic environment would be within the main school campus, and so acceptable in this respect within an already developed campus area, not on an undeveloped area of ornamental woodland. The assessment of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>current facility is focussed on the potential disruption to the school's delivery of education and the viability of the structure in this position. If the school is investing in new structures, their priority should be the right solution for the internationally important historic designed landscape of which they are custodians, rather than the easy solution. The analysis and conclusion to develop on this site is not sufficient grounds for developing previously undeveloped land.</p> <p>The present site of the current facility is acceptable as it is already developed and within an area of the campus without historic merit to the existing 18th century buildings and landscape.</p> <p>In our opinion the proposed site is unacceptable and is highly damaging to the historic environment. As noted above, it will result in irreversible loss of a key, unaltered 18th century area of the landscape. It will continue the incremental development along Cobham's early 18th century Rook Spinney, which should be halted. This ornamental woodland area is key to the Course, Nelson's Walk and the approach to the mansion along the Oxford Drive.</p> <p>MITIGATION WORKS</p> <p>The mitigation works proposed, both for screening the building and other proposed restoration works to other areas of Stowe, cannot compensate for the loss of this area to irreversible development and the precedent this proposal sets for further development alongside Nelson's Walk.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We therefore urge that the application is REFUSED. 2. A permanent presumption against development should be adopted in the woodland alongside Nelson's Walk south of Lee's Bastion and the music school. 3. Instead of developing this area it should be restored as set out in the 2012 Conservation Plan. 4. An alternative site should be selected in part of the already developed school campus. <p>Yours faithfully, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/1121	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of outbuilding and open-air swimming pool (resubmission of PL/19/3372/FA).	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2020 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>Jarretts Hill, Bulstrode Park, Oxford Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8TA. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response which we would be grateful if you could take into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Bulstrode is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and perhaps the best surviving non-Royal classic Dutch garden in the UK. William Bentinck, 1st Duke of Portland was William and Mary's collaborator and friend, and heavily involved in the creation of their gardens at Het Loo and Hampton Court. Much of his garden is still there, or at least the western Pleasure Gardens are. It is therefore a very important survivor, shown beautifully in the 1730s map/survey aerial view. When Repton worked at Bulstrode he importantly left the surviving Pleasure Grounds intact and he clearly shows the surviving north-western trapezoidal Wilderness with its surviving two circular ponds and the Lime Avenue leading to the long canal (which might arguably be re-labelled the 'Bentinck Lily Pond' and 'Bentinck Lime Avenue').</p> <p>This resubmission of an application concerns Jarrett's Hill, a property to the north of the main house at Bulstrode and within the RPG. We note on page 5 of the 'Planning, Design, Transport and Access Statement' prepared by Progress Planning, that there is some debate as to the construction date of the house.</p> <p>We also note that Historic England references both textual and photographic files relating to a property also called Jarrett's Hill dating from 1950-51 which may be the same property. The GT/BGT feel that it would be useful for the applicant and the planning authority to review this information, ideally prior to any decision being made on this planning application, as the contents may inform the decision-making process for this application. The files are not accessible on line but are listed here;- https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/photos/results/?searchType=HE+Archive+New&search=jarretts+hill</p> <p>We note the previous existence of a swimming pool and other outbuildings at the application site and that a recent application for works to the swimming pool and associated structures has been refused.</p> <p>With regard to this specific application, given that the previous swimming pool remains in situ, the Gardens Trust agrees to the principle of refurbishing the pool and the surrounding hard-standing providing that the structure does not project above the ground level and that the hard-standing does not 'spread' beyond the proposed area.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>With regard to the flat-roofed, partially submerged pool house, we acknowledge that such a structure is a requirement for the pool. The Gardens Trust therefore agrees to the principle of a structure to house the plant.</p> <p>Therefore, in order to inform the detail of these proposals, we ask for further information from the applicant as follows, if possible: the above-mentioned historic information should be obtained in order to assess a) whether it offers any further understanding of the history of the site and if so b) can be used to enhance the appearance of the proposals and cause less damage to the historic setting in Bulstrode Park.</p> <p>Finally, we also note a number of previous applications for the same property, in particular application PL/19/2516/FA for single and two storey rear extensions, first floor terrace, front porch with balcony above, which South Bucks did NOT consult us on. Had we been notified originally we would have had comments to make as the site affects the Grade II* registered park and garden at Bulstrode where Humphry Repton worked. This is the second planning application that we have discovered in the last month which the GT was not consulted on and we hope that there are not too many more.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hall Barn	Buckinghamshire	E20/1126	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey side extension comprising home changing room, office, covered players entrance and associated facilities (retrospective). Holloway Park, Windsor Road, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, HP9 2SE. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and we would ask your officers to please take our joint comments below into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Hall Barn is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) with the first landscape park and woodland created by the poet Edmund Waller between 1651-1687. Further works were carried out by his grandson Edmund between 1715-30 with influence from John Aislabie.</p> <p>The application site sits adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the RPG on land which was previously within the park but which was separated from park when the M40 cut across the northern section dividing the park. The football ground already sits within this space where the M40 meets</p>

					<p>the A355.</p> <p>We note the existence of low-profile structures on the site already. This application seeks retrospective consent for the construction of a home changing room, office, covered players entrance and associated facilities. Whilst we have not been able to make a site visit, we note that there is tree cover which appears to mitigate any views from the park towards the football ground so our only concern with the new structures is the red colour which may make the structures more visible in the landscape. The Gardens Trust therefore agrees with the granting of retrospective consent for these structures on condition that the planning authority considers whether the red colour of the structures has an impact on RPG and, if it is felt that it does, that the planning authority should require the structures to be painted either black or green in order to mitigate this impact.</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 Room, Timber Store, Timber Garden Store, Wood Store, Swimming Pool and Glass House. Old Hall, CHOLMONDELEY PARK, CHOLMONDELEY, SY14 8HB. HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2020</p> <p>I have reviewed the Statement of Significance provided by Purcell with my colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust and we have the following comments to make. This document is, in our opinion, a rewording and reworking of previous material and assumptions. The consultants clearly feel and state that the scale of the application proposals do not warrant further investigation. In assessing significance they have only looked at “a desktop assessment of OS data and plan regression, review of data sources, including Listing entries” and undertaken an “on-site evaluation”. OS plans post-date the period of the historic designed landscape around the Old Hall so will not reveal very much information. It is not clear what data sources have been consulted but these do not appear to have included the entry from the Cheshire HER in Revealing Cheshire’s Past http://rcplive.cheshiresharedservices.gov.uk/SingleResult.aspx?uid=MCH5690, quoted below in full:</p> <p>HER Number: 327/3/0 Type of record: Archaeology Name: Formal Gardens at Cholmondeley Hall</p> <p>Summary Extensive formal gardens in the French style were laid out around the Old Hall in the years after 1688 when the French gardener Lecoche (d 1691)</p>

				<p>was sent to work at Cholmondeley, on his death George London (d 1714) was brought in. An agreement of 1694 included details of the canal that was then under construction. In 1695 leadwork was supplied by John Van Nost (d 1729), and Jean Tijou was paid for iron gates. Work by both survives, resited in the Castle grounds. The main gatescreen to the north of the Old Hall was supplied by Robert Bakewell c 1722. In 1724 Macky described the gardens as 'not inferior to any in England', and they were illustrated in the following year in Vitruvius Britannicus. Few traces of those gardens remain other than a north/south canal 100m north of the Old Hall. The canal, 350m long and 25m wide, widens at its north end into a circular pool 90m across. About 100m east of the south end of the canal is a square pool, c 75m in diameter. A tree lined avenue approached the gardens from the south of the old hallh (see 327/3/1). Full documentation and plans are to be found in the Cheshire County Record Office.</p> <hr/> <p>Grid Reference: SJ 544 518 Map Sheet: SJ55SW Parish: CHOLMONDELEY, CREWE AND NANTWICH, CHESHIRE EAST Monument Types • FORMAL GARDEN (AD 17TH CENTURY to AD 18TH CENTURY - 1688 AD to 1730 AD (throughout)) Protected Status: Registered Park or Garden (II) Full description Extensive formal gardens in the French style were laid out around the Old Hall in the years after 1688 when the French gardener Lecoche (d 1691) was sent to work at Cholmondeley. On his death George London (d 1714) was brought in. An agreement of 1694 included details of the canal that was then under construction. In 1695 leadwork was supplied by John Van Nost (d 1729), and Jean Tijou was paid for iron gates (Cholmondeley Papers). Work by both survives, resited in the Castle grounds. The main gatescreen to the north of the Old Hall was supplied by Robert Bakewell c 1722. In 1724 Macky described the gardens as 'not inferior to any in England' (CL 1973, 155), and they were illustrated in the following year in Vitruvius Britannicus. Few traces of those gardens remain other than a north/south canal 100m north of the Old Hall. The canal, 350m long and 25m wide, widens at its north end into a circular pool 90m across. About 100m east of the south end of the canal is a square pool, c 75m in diameter. Surrounding earthworks are slight and denuded (1). Full</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>documentation and plans are to be found in the Cheshire County Record Office but plans were published by Campbell in 1725 (2 & 3). Little remains of these gardens apart from some fishponds to the north of the site of the old Hall and other items which have been moved to the Castle Gardens; gates and screen 1722 by Bakewell (SJ 5348 5126), gate to Temple Gardens c.1695 by Tijou (SJ 5375 5114), urns by Van Nost 1695 (SJ 5370 5114) (4) & (5). The long canal with its circular end forming the main axis of the garden survives in slightly altered form. A tree lined avenue approached the gardens from the south of the old hall (see 327/3/1).</p> <p><1> English Heritage, 2001, Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, GD1629 (Report). SCH2822.</p> <p><2> Campbell C, 1725, Virtuvius Britannicus, 3/79 (Maps and Plans). SCH3663.</p> <p><3> Cholmondeley Estate, C12th-C20th, Cholmondeley family of Cholmondeley, records, DCH/A/397 (Manuscript). SCH406.</p> <p><4> English Heritage, 2005, List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (Digital Archive). SCH4666.</p> <p><5> IPC Media, 1897-Present, Country Life, 19/7/73 Jackson-Stops G (Newspaper-Magazine). SCH993.</p> <p>It is our understanding that creation of the formal landscape around the Old Hall was started before improvements to the hall were undertaken, indicating the importance of the designed landscape to the family. It is possibly the only formal, 17th century landscape in Cheshire where London and Wise were involved and where documentation, rare in itself, survives. Other formal landscapes of the period at Eaton Hall, Crewe Hall, Combermere Abbey and Dunham Massey have all been lost or substantially altered. We are uncertain what the evidence is that the landscape at Cholmondeley was swept away. Certainly some elements were relocated and planting may have been removed, but given the survival of the pools and gate piers it seems unlikely that there was wholesale remodelling of the land.</p> <p>For these reasons we consider that the early designed landscape of Cholmondeley has greater significance than attributed by the consultants due to its archaeological interest or evidential value. Therefore, we request that a watching brief is placed on all excavation works to ensure that any evidence of the earlier landscape is carefully recorded.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Rode Hall	Cheshire	E20/1138	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Extension of existing visitor car park at Rode Hall and Gardens. Rode Hall and Gardens, Church Lane, Scholar Green, ST7 3QP. PARKING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.11.2020 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. The above application has a material impact on the significance of Rode Hall a historic designed landscape (RPG) which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this response although they have been unable to visit the site of the proposed car park due to current restrictions. We write to object to the application which we consider provides insufficient information on which a decision can be made. We consider the significance of Rode Hall to lie chiefly in its architectural and artistic interest. The Repton and Webb landscape is a fine composition of designed spaces of parkland, woodland and water enveloping the hall, associated buildings and gardens which include a grotto, obelisk and icehouse, all listed Grade II. It is complete, intact, and unspoilt. We appreciate the need for change to support enterprises that enable the survival of such special historic places, and are aware of the success of the snowdrop opening days and the monthly farmers market. Our concerns regarding the application are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement includes a paragraph titled 'Heritage Impact' but fails to assess Significance as required by the NPPF p189, and therefore the impact on that significance. The visual impact of the proposed development upon the entrance drive and approach to the hall should be considered. There is no indication that alternative solutions and locations have been considered for car parking. • The Arboricultural report lacks information about what trees would remain and the screening they would provide. Given the extent of hard surfacing and proposed pruning clearance of 4m, raising the tree canopies, it is likely that any screening would be limited, notwithstanding the hedge of elder and hawthorn. • The existing car park and the proposed car park area were both historically woodland, part of the designed woodland belt that surrounded the hall, ancillary buildings and walled garden. Although the trees proposed for felling are mid 20th century, and not themselves of historic

					<p>significance, the pattern they replicate is. The established woodland helps mitigate the impact of climate change. There is no indication of how or where woodland might be planted in compensation, nor the species this would contain. This is of concern as inappropriate planting or location could have an impact on the significance of the designed landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information submitted does not include the design of the car park e.g. levels, and location of excavated soil; it does not show how it would be integrated with the existing car park, or how the traffic would flow, information which should be part of the application in such a sensitive site. What is the justification for the 150 parking spaces? • Application form, 16: the applicant has answered 'no' to the question "Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? " Given the location of the car park within designed parkland, an area classified as 'wood pasture' - a BAP priority habitat, surely the answer should be 'yes'? <p>We would be grateful to be advised if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer Cc. Sue Bartlett, Cheshire Gardens Trust Conservation Coordinator</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E20/1226	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The removal and replacement of the glass greenhouse structures of both the Vinery and Potting house which includes the timber, glass, doors, casements and winding mechanisms. The installation of temporary concrete copings to plinth walls post removal. As part of the final phase, the replacement of the timber structures and glazing with an aluminium framing system. TATTON PARK, KNUTSFORD DRIVE, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE, WA16 6QN. GLASSHOUSE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2020</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust wishes to register its objection to this application for listed building consent to demolish the Vinery and Potting House without an agreed programme and timescale for appropriate replacement. We confirm that points made in our letter concerning the previous application 19/5312M Tatton Park: listed building consent for demolition of the vinery and potting house, regarding the significance of these glasshouses as part of a collection of glasshouses at Tatton, stand. The Tatton estate is important because of its completeness with hall, home farm, lodges, designed landscape, pleasure gardens, kitchen garden, glasshouses and orangerie. The Walled Kitchen Garden is an important component of this completeness with head gardener's cottage, flued wall, bothy and specialist glasshouses. It should be noted that horticulture students are regularly brought to this Kitchen Garden since it is one of the few remaining complete sites where historical methods of food and flower production and the way of life of garden staff can be studied.</p>

					<p>The wooden glasshouses that have now deteriorated were carefully designed in the early 2000s to replicate the original glasshouses. They were completed with beaver- tailed glass and used original window opening mechanisms, elements of authentic and historic fabric which should be retained and reused in any reconstruction. The proposed replacement of these wooden glasshouses with aluminium framed glasshouses as indicated in the application will result in a loss of significance. The existing and proposed elevations indicate a considerable difference between fenestration patterns, with the proposed aluminium glasshouse having glazing bars of equal weight and large glass panes in the doors and windows of end elevations. The visual impact of the proposed changes upon the historic setting has not been fully assessed.</p> <p>We are concerned that there appears to be no proposal to protect the Grade II listed kitchen garden wall against which the glasshouses lean during the period between demolition and reconstruction.</p> <p>If permission to demolish is granted, it must be conditional on an agreed programme and timescale for appropriate replacement of the vinery and potting house superstructure.</p> <p>We support the more detailed comments made in the letter from Historic England.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Conservation and Planning Responses Coordinator, Cheshire Gardens Trust cc. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, the Gardens Trust</p>
Auckland Castle Park	County Durham	E20/1027	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of three shipping containers for the secure storage of golfing carts and equipment. Bishop Auckland Golf Club, Durham Road, Bishop Auckland DL14 8DL. GOLF, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the online documentation for the above application and are surprised to note that the Heritage Statement (HS) fails to mention that the application site lies within the Grade II* Bishop Auckland Registered Park and Garden (RPG). As far as we can ascertain the site for the Auckland Golf Course containers would be screened from the Castle peninsula by the intervening woodland on the far side of the Guanless valley. However, as we have not been able to undertake a site visit, it has not been possible to check whether it may just show from the higher areas of the park to the</p>

					<p>north (the old approach drive from the east and The Pyramid?). If it is visible it would be fairly distant. The Heritage Statement (HS) says that the containers will be sited where the former Steward's House stood and that they will be screened by the club house from the High Plain direction and the existing boundary wall and plantings will screen them from the south. We would have liked to have seen a visual impact assessment to ensure that our concerns re visibility are groundless, and an indication that the applicants recognise the sensitivity of the site as this is not entirely apparent due to the omission of mention of the RPG within the HS.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE TO DH DRAWINGS 27.11.2020 Thank you for copying us into your email to Hilary Sperring of Durham Council. I am sorry you seem to have taken offence at our, I thought perfectly reasonable, response to the above application. I am glad to hear that your client is very aware of the heritage sensitivity of the site as it was not apparent from the online documentation which failed entirely to mention the crucial fact that the site lies within a Grade II* RPG. I feel sure that had you been in our position, you would also have found this concerning and not hesitated to point it out. My colleagues (all volunteers) in the Northumbria Gardens Trust do generally make site visits, but they are also professional people with their own jobs to attend to and with lock-down some things are less easy. I am sure that when circumstances allow they will visit the site, but you will also be aware that responses to applications are time sensitive and we need to respond within the allocated time frame. Had the online documentation been more comprehensive and lock-down not intervened, we would not have had to ask for a VIA to reassure us that the containers would not adversely affect the setting of the RPG. I am the sole, part-time conservation officer for the Gardens Trust and am based in Gloucestershire which effectively would have precluded a visit even in non-Covid times. It is unfortunate that we were not consulted about the previous application for 6 containers – it is a problem we encounter frequently and it is impossible to police every local authority around the country and check their weekly lists. As a statutory consultee we should be consulted about any planning application which has the potential to affect any grade</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>of RPG. We often remind LPAs of their statutory responsibility when cases such as this come to our attention, but if we are unaware of something we cannot act upon it.</p> <p>If, when my colleague(s) have had time to undertake a site visit, it is appropriate to amend our response we will do so.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer cc. Hilary Sperring, Durham Council D Perris, Secretary Bishop Auckland Golf Club</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2020 Further to our letter of 13th November regarding the new shipping containers for storage at Bishop Auckland Golf Club, one of my colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust has been able to make a site visit over the weekend. They have confirmed that the containers will not impact upon the Grade II* Bishop Auckland RPG and are sufficiently distant to make their impact negligible.</p> <p>We are pleased to be able to confirm that under these circumstances we have no further comments to make upon the application, except to add, that a second letter would not have been necessary if the applicant had submitted a more focussed and detailed heritage statement with the application documents in the first place.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
West Cemetery, Darlington	County Durham	E20/1145	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge of conditions relating to new chapel and improvements to crematorium, Crematorium, West Cemetery, Carmel Road, North Darlington, DL3 8RY MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020 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). One of their members has recently visited the site on our behalf and their local knowledge informs this joint response. <p>The new chapel sits in open land but fully enclosed by development with no realistic means of gaining an easy exit onto public roads that could have facilitated a one-way system. Consequently, all vehicular traffic will need to return eastwards, through the cemetery back onto Carmel Road North. While this is far from ideal, it is unavoidable and the provision of passing</p>

					<p>places will help alleviate the situation. The existing wide verges will hopefully avoid any damage to adjacent graves and monuments. Similarly, the relatively confined area at the entrance and lodge already induces slow speed and careful driving which we must hope will ensure the protection of this attractive entrance. However, we hope the Council will monitor the condition of the main drive and entrance once the new facilities are open and address any issues that may result from any excessive use. Only in this most public central drive and entrance might any increased traffic flow threaten the fabric and character of the registered landscape.</p> <p>Of course, the greatest architectural assets within the cemetery are the fine chapels, and linking spire, work of the noted architect J. P Pritchett. Obviously, they are not a part of this application and the earlier planning approval. Situated at the NE corner of the cemetery, they are remote from the proposed improvements, but that isolation brings with it threats to the fabric of these redundant buildings, redundant presumably since 1962? Fortunately, the area does not seem to suffer from excessive vandalism or anti-social behaviour and, despite long closure, their external fabric appears to be in reasonable condition. In large part this would seem to be due to the vigilance of the local authority in ensuring regular repairs and removal of vegetation, etc. The recent NGT visit noted only one slipped slate and relatively small sections of grass growing in gutters. What state the interior of the buildings are in we do not know, and how adequately they are ventilated is also a matter for concern. Reuse, of course, is highly desirable and the only sustainable way forward. Our NGT colleagues hope to make contact with your new Conservation Officer, to offer support on this matter in the near future.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Corby Castle	Cumbria	E19/0196	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Structural Works To Stabilise Embankment With Piles And Concrete Rafts; Construction Of Retaining Wall, Stone Steps, Coping And Estate Fencing (Part Retrospective) (LBC). Cascade Steps, Corby Castle, Great Corby,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2020 Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to the new and amended documents for the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cumbria Gardens Trust (CGT) and we would be grateful if you could consider this as our joint response. We have read the proposals and noted the structural amendments to the balustrading, removal of lighting etc and appreciate that under the circumstances this is the best that can be done. We have to accept the results of the structural survey and take on board that the unauthorised</p>

				Carlisle CA8 4LR. LANDSCAPE, GARDEN	<p>works have fatally compromised the stability of the cliff face and their removal could be even more catastrophic, possibly structurally endangering the cascade and listed structures. We are glad to note the proposed mitigation works and the planting palette proposed to soften as far as possible the disastrous building works. We concur with Historic England's additional suggestions for mitigation.</p> <p>It is incredibly shameful that despite Corby Castle being a heritage asset of the highest significance, such disastrous work could have been undertaken without permission, and apparently without severe penalty. The setting of the cascade has been severely compromised in perpetuity and future generations will rightly condemn us that this should have happened on our watch, when awareness of our irreplaceable heritage legacy has never been higher.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Compton Acres	Dorset	E20/0998	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings and erection of assisted living/extra care accommodation (class C2) with communal facilities and car parking. Carisbrooke, 172 Canford Cliffs Road, Poole, BH13 7ES. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, INSTITUTION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2020</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 Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. Canford Cliffs is a prosperous area which has historically had many large houses within generous gardens. Many of these have been demolished and blocks of flats erected on the sites. The proposed new building would be towards the front of the application site, and the tree strategy suggests that much of the vegetation is to be retained and looked after during building work. The main cause for concern as far as the GT/DGT are concerned, is the possibility that this tall new building may adversely affect views from the Grade II Compton Acres registered park and garden (RPG). We are unable to find any image of the site, either existing or proposed, from Compton Acres. It is possible that due to tree cover there will be little intervisibility, but in the absence of such information we would like to submit a holding objection until this is resolved to our satisfaction. There is also the possibility that should this application be permitted, other blocks of similar or greater height may be permitted in future, which would adversely affect Compton Acres.</p> <p>We would request that your officers ask the applicants to provide a Visual</p>

					Impact Statement from Compton Acres, both during winter and in summer. We are aware that there is already development between the two sites, but it is difficult for us to visualise how effective the existing tree cover is. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung
Herstmonceux Castle and Place	East Sussex	E20/0970	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDING TO PART HORTICULTURAL/PART RESIDENTIAL AND PROPOSED CONTINUED USE AS PART HORTICULTURAL/PART RESIDENTIAL ON A PERMANENT BASIS WITH ASSOCIATED INSTALLATION OF FLUE FOR LOG BURNER. WILD FLOWER BARN, CHURCH ROAD, HERSTMONCEUX, BN27 1QJ. CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL WILD	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2020 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. The site is located on land within the boundary of Herstmonceux Castle and Place, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England (HE) with a Grade II* designation. Any new residential occupation of an existing building within the boundary of a Park and Garden included on the HE Register risks having an adverse impact of the park's significance. Similarly, a chimney added to a barn, as here, may have an adverse impact. We have not been able to undertake a site visit. The site appears to be well screened, so the harm in this case may be less than substantial. However it is possible there would be glimpsed views of the barn and chimney, or smoke from the chimney, from the centre of the park near the Grade I Registered Castle building, particularly in winter, which is likely to cause substantial harm to the Registered Park and the setting of the Grade I Castle building. Sussex Gardens Trust therefore has reservations and objects. If, nevertheless, the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve the application, the Trust suggests that strict conditions should be attached to limit any approval to the present applicant and for the current use. This would ensure the site couldn't later be lawfully occupied in a more conventional manner. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Belchamp Hall	Essex	E20/1016	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing studio/stable to provide an additional unit of holiday accommodation. Belchamp Hall,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2020 I am commenting for the Essex Gardens Trust representing The Gardens Trust. Belchamp Walter Hall stands in a II* registered landscape dating from Tudor times but mainly 18th century in character. This proposal will have no landscape implications and we have no objection.

				Church Road, Belchamp Walter, Essex CO10 7AT. CHANGE OF USE, HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION	Best wishes David Andrews FSA, IHBC
Killigrews, Margaretting	Essex	E20/1111	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of garage and construction of single storey building for garaging, storage and staff accommodation, with rooms in the roof. Killigrews Main Road Margaretting Ingatestone Essex CM4 0EZ MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2020 I am commenting for the Essex Gardens Trust representing The Gardens Trust. We have no objection to this application, but would observe that if the building is to complement its setting, then good materials should be selected, and it would look better without a random scatter of rooflights in the east pitch. David Andrews FSA, IHBC
Lambeth Palace	Greater London	E19/0432	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Phased mixed use development including up to 417 residential units and comprising: part redevelopment and restoration, conversion and extension of former Fire Brigade Headquarters building and demolition of the existing extension and re-provision of obelisk to provide a new fire station (Sui Generis), a new London Fire Brigade museum (Class D1), residential units (Class C3), a ten storey hotel (Class C1) with up to 200 bedrooms and a flexible retail/lobby space (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/C1), and a rooftop restaurant with ancillary bar (Class A3); demolition and redevelopment of the central workshop building to provide buildings of up to twenty-six storeys plus basements, comprising business floorspace	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.11.2020 SUBMISSION FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY Helen Monger, Director On behalf of the London Gardens Trust Planning Inspectorate Reference no. APP/N5660/V/20/3257106 London Borough of Lambeth Ref: 19/01304/FUL 1.0 Summary The Trust objects to the proposals put forward because the two tall towers included in the Proposed Development will have significant impact on a number of protected views and detract from the value of several historic landscapes. This damage has been under-estimated in the assessments put forward to date. 2.0 Introduction 2.1 I am the (Executive) Director of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust a registered charity, no1042337, and a company limited by guarantee registered in England & Wales, no2935176, trading as the London Gardens Trust (LGT). It is affiliated to the national Gardens Trust (GT). 2.2 I have worked at LGT since 2016. Prior to that I worked at the National Lottery Heritage Fund (then Heritage Lottery Fund). 2.3 In my personal capacity, I have been a resident of Lambeth since 2002. I was Chair of Kennington Oval and Vauxhall Forum from 2014-2018, a non-political umbrella group bringing together local community organisations, businesses and residents, in the North

			<p>(Use Class B1), a gym (Class D2), retail units (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential units (Class C3); development of land to the rear to provide a eleven storey building plus basement, comprising a flexible commercial unit (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/D2/B1) and residential units (Class C3); all together with associated areas of new public realm, hard and soft landscaping, basement and surface parking, servicing, means of access and plant and equipment. (The reference for this application for Full Planning Permission is 19/01304/FUL but there is also an associated Listed Building Consent application related to these works with reference 19/01305/LB). Please use reference number 19/01305/LB to view the application documents for this proposal This application is a DEPARTURE APPLICATION: The proposed development is a departure from site allocation "Site 10 - 8 Albert Embankment and land to the rear bounded by Lambeth High Street, Whitgift Street, the railway viaduct and Southbank House SE1" of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015). This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which is available for inspection</p>	<p>Lambeth area. The forum has undertaken community consultations on a draft Neighbourhood Plan and secured funds from Locality for this purpose.</p> <p>3.0 London Gardens Trust (LGT) role in the planning process and the importance of Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>3.1 The London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust is affiliated to the Gardens Trust. In 2015 the Gardens History Society merged with the Association of Gardens Trusts, the umbrella group for county and new body, called the Gardens Trust, took over the Garden History Society's role as a statutory consultee. It continues to provide expert advice to planning authorities on this specialist area, which is a material consideration, but one on which most planning authorities do not have in-house expertise. The Trust fulfils that duty through a combination of its own staff and volunteers within the network of county or regional gardens trusts, such as the London Gardens Trust (the LGT). As member organisations of the Gardens Trust, these county or regional trusts, work in partnership with it and are authorised by the Trust to respond on its behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>3.2 As LGT's Patron, Hal Moggridge recently submitted in his proof of evidence to the Victoria Tower Gardens Planning Inquiry ""Urban green spaces provide aesthetic and recreational opportunities for urban dwellers and promote their physical, psychological and general well being (Grahn, Ivarsson, Stigsdotter, & Bengtsson, 2010; Thompson et al., 2012; Wolch, Byrne, & Newell, 2014)". Thus opens the November 2019 number of the Journal 'Landscape Research', stating in a few words a widely acknowledged, well researched and important reason for safeguarding our urban parks."</p> <p>4.0 Parks and Gardens of historic importance in the vicinity of the proposal</p> <p>4.1 The London Garden Trust Inventory: Since 1994 the LGT through original historic research has endeavoured to document the history of parks and gardens across London. The LGT provides free public access on its website to that research with an Inventory, for over 2,500 parks, gardens, squares, churchyards, cemeteries and other sites of historic interest across the whole of London. This is an ongoing project. The LGT seeks to embed the importance of these landscapes within the Greater London Historic Environment Record</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>with the planning application documents. Hard copies may be obtained for a fee from Lichfield, 14 Regent's Wharf, All Saints Street, London, N1 9RL, UK Open for comment icon, 8 Albert Embankment And Land To Rear Bounded By Lambeth High St, Whitgift St, The Railway Viaduct, Southbank Hse Together With Land Corner Of Black Prince Rd And Newport St London. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>and Local Plans so these vital historic features of London's green spaces are given as much protection as possible within the planning system.</p> <p>4.2 The following historic landscapes will be impacted by this development: Old Paradise Gardens; Pedlars Park; St Mary's Garden; St Mary's at Lambeth churchyard forming the Garden Museum; Lambeth Palace Gardens; and Victoria Tower Gardens.</p> <p>4.3 The Garden Museum is a Rule 6 Party in the proceedings. The LGT endorses the Garden Museum's opposition to this proposal in relation to the parks and gardens listed above and defers to their concerns in relation to Old Paradise Gardens; Pedlars Park; St Mary's Garden and St Mary's at Lambeth churchyard forming the Garden Museum's open space save to add in Appendix 1 I have provided a few paragraphs (mostly from the LGT's Inventory) which detail each of these historic greenspaces in the surrounding vicinity and provide an overview of their significance.</p> <p>5.0 Observations on impacts to Registered Parks and Gardens by the Application</p> <p>5.1 The comments that follow, are additional observations of where the Trust believes there are detrimental impacts which are not covered elsewhere – these focus on the protection of two Lambeth Palace Gardens and Victoria Tower Gardens.</p> <p>5.2 The proposals at 8 Albert Embankment have had a long gestation. A previous scheme, 10/04473/FUL was rejected at Appeal in 2013 because the Inspector concluded that the loss of daylight and sunlight to Whitgift House and 2 Whitgift Street represented a shortcoming in achieving a fully sustainable development, outweighing the benefits of the scheme. That scheme proposed towers up to 16 storeys which the Council had resolved to refuse on a variety of grounds including a failure to relate satisfactorily to the adjacent townscape in terms of height, massing and scale. Although not given weight at the Appeal, these lesser towers were considered inappropriate, and Lambeth took the opportunity to insert an additional statement to that effect into the submission version 2015 of the Local Plan in the site-specific Policy PN2 Site 10 (the statement that the site was inappropriate for tall buildings had not appeared in the first draft consultation of the new Local Plan in 2013).</p> <p>5.3 The current proposals involve two towers, the East Tower (or Eastern</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>Garden Building) with 24 storeys (81.64m AOD) and the West Tower or Central Square Building at 26 storeys (88.62m AOD), much taller than those causing concern in the earlier rejected scheme where the tallest towers were 54m and 44m respectively.</p> <p>5.4 The site falls within the Vauxhall SPD and VNEB OAPF anticipates taller buildings along Albert Embankment of up to 80-90m in height. The Vauxhall and Albert Embankment Tall Buildings Assessment (2018) also assesses building heights against a maximum AOD height of 90m. Both the SPD and OAPF require that tall buildings contribute towards the creation of a varied skyline and avoid appearing cumulatively as a “uniform wall of development” (OAPF p120) in strategic views. The Lambeth Local Plan acknowledges the OAPF and notes ‘the heritage sensitivity of the site makes it inappropriate for tall building development’ . It is therefore acknowledged that the two proposed towers represent a departure from the Local Plan as they do not comply with the principles established for this site.</p> <p>5.5 Further paragraph 194 of the NPPF states ‘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:</p> <p>(a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;</p> <p>(b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.</p> <p>The Towers proposed at 8 Albert Embankment will be highly visible and detract from the heritage assets as follows:</p> <p>A) Impact on Lambeth Palace Gardens</p> <p>5.6 Lambeth Palace Gardens are registered on the Historic England National Heritage List for England as Grade II and form the setting of the Lambeth Palace which is Grade I. Since the C13th Lambeth Palace has been the London home of the Archbishops of Canterbury. The gardens of the medieval palace were once 8 ha., but the current garden is half that size and extends north from the Palace with the boundary wall along Lambeth Palace Road. References to various garden features occur from the C14th, and included at different times</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>a 'Great Garden', herb garden, vineyard, rabbit garden, orchards, fishponds, walks and formal gardens with a raised terrace walk. These features have largely disappeared although an outer moat and inner 'serpentine canal' survived until the mid C18th. In 1901 an area of c.4 ha. to the east was separated to form a public park, Archbishop's Park. The remaining garden was renovated in the 1920s, with further changes occurring under successive Archbishops throughout the C20th. They are the biggest private garden in central London after Buckingham Palace Gardens. These gardens are opened to the general public on a regular basis, at the discretion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, for functions including the North Lambeth Parish Fete and other charitable garden events attracting several 1,000 people per year.</p> <p>5.7 The Application Site is located within protected vistas. Policy 7.12 of the London Plan (Implementing the London View Management Framework) states that development should not harm, and where possible should: "make a positive contribution to, the characteristics and composition of the strategic views and their landmark elements. It should also preserve or enhance the viewers' ability to recognise and appreciate strategically important landmarks in these views and, where appropriate, protect the silhouette of landmark elements of World Heritage Sites as seen from designated viewing places." The Applicant goes to some length to assess in a scoping exercise whether to consider certain elements of the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site but omits to consider the setting of Lambeth Palace and its surroundings.</p> <p>5.8 From within the gardens the proposed towers will detract from much of the Lambeth Palace Garden experience as evidenced by the wireframe views depicted in the Landscape and Visual Assessment analysis provided by the applicant. View 8 Cumulative p166 (reproduced below in Fig 1) demonstrates that unique amongst the recent developments in the OAPF this design chooses to depart from the current skyline of the Blore building and stands out as a visual intrusion detracting from the aesthetic design of the historic environment creating an important setting for Lambeth Palace. As can be seen in this wireframe, from within the Gardens, although Westminster Tower and 81 Black Prince Road are visual intrusions which already detract from the setting of the Grade I listed Lambeth</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Palace. However, when adding the proposed new towers, cumulatively this will have a very significant impact, creating a wall of intrusion.</p> <p>Fig 1. View 8 Cumulative p166 from Lambeth Palace Gardens looking back to Lambeth Palace</p> <p>5.9 Further, there is no attempt to review the impact from the new public viewing platform in the new Lambeth Palace Library looking back over Lambeth Palace and its Gardens – see Fig.2 below which is a photomontage based on a photograph taken on 20th April 2020 by the Director of the Garden Museum. Unfortunately the Applicant does not supply a wireframe for analysis. Lambeth Palace Library (16/07054/FUL) was approved by Lambeth Council in April 2017. In reaching their decision the Lambeth Council Planning Application Committee took into account:</p> <p>“new public views over the Westminster World Heritage Site and Lambeth Palace and onto the Registered Garden, which would be provided by the proposed development.” 1</p> <p>when balancing the harm identified to the designated heritage assets and the public benefits that they considered would outweigh this harm. By allowing this visual intrusion to create this cumulative impact of significant harmful intrusion it will reduce the the ability to appreciate the heritage assets and the public benefits which were an anticipated planning gain flowing from the permission for the new library building including its viewing platform.</p> <p>Fig 2. Projected view from Lambeth Library viewing platform, based on Photograph taken by Christopher Woodward 20th April 2020</p> <p>B) Impact on Victoria Tower Gardens</p> <p>5.10 The Gardens were created in 1864-70, following the embankment of the Thames by MBW's Chief Engineer Sir Joseph Bazalgette, although Sir Christopher Wren had conceived of a continuous embankment in 1666. The gardens run south from Victoria Tower Lodge and gates to Black Rod Garden (Grade 1) and the Houses of Parliament to Lambeth Bridge and were extended c.1914. The layout comprises a central lawn, with perimeter paths, mature trees and shrubberies. Within the gardens are a statue of Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst (Grade II), Auguste Rodin's Burghers of Calais (Grade I)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>and the Buxton Memorial Fountain by SS Teulon (Grade II*). The park itself is Grade II on the Historic England National Register of Parks and Gardens in England.</p> <p>5.11 The Landscape and Visual Assessment submitted with the application P51 para 4.106 for Victoria Lodge and Black Rod Gardens states: “The value of the listed buildings is exceptional. Due to the confined nature of the setting of the lodge and gates, the distance of the Proposed Development from the lodge and gates and the screening provided by trees surrounding Victoria Tower Gardens, the Proposed Development would not be discernible within the setting of the listed lodge and gates, so they are scoped out of further assessment.” Very similar statements to ‘scope out’ impacts from this Site’s development, are given for the Burghers of Calais at paragraph 4.110 and Buxton Memorial at paragraph 4.193.</p> <p>5.12 In the recent planning inquiry to consider building the UK Holocaust Memorial and Learning Centre, it emerged that the health of the plane trees at Victoria Tower Gardens may be significantly reduced. The current screening exercise places great reliance on the existence of the trees to mitigate the worst impacts of the likely visual intrusion from this Site. In any event the screening during the winter months when the large plane trees are no longer in leaf, the mitigation will be far less than the screening exercise presents.</p> <p>5.13 In particular, the walk along the River Wall within the park is likely to see a significant alteration. The river view is considered a major asset of Victoria Tower Gardens, to the extent that one of the major benefits put forward by the Government in support of their controversial plans for a UK Holocaust Memorial and Learning Centre is to build a fully disable accessible ramp to encourage more people to enjoy this unique historic setting. The Landscape and Visual Assessment p68 para 4.43 notes the value of the registered park and garden is medium. The susceptibility of the gardens to the Proposed Development is considered to be medium having regard to the existing urban setting. Its sensitivity to change is moderate. View 10 Cumulative p166 (copied below as figure 3 below) shows the likely impacts on this view. The current river prospect is of the tapering listed St Thomas’ Hospital building and campanile descending to the lower calm of trees around Lambeth Palace and the Garden Museum, before rising again with the gentle curve of Parliament View from 27m</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>to 38m. This gives the park the sense of space, and peace so needed in an urban context for wellbeing. The bulky redbrick Westminster Tower is an abrupt anomaly in the view, with the townscape settling to very different heights from the Plaza hotel onwards towards the cluster of towers at Vauxhall. The proposed new building would contribute unwelcome bulk and height behind the International Maritime Organisation building, forming a wall with the anomalous Westminster Tower. The cumulative effect on the view of one of the Towers at 8 Albert Embankment would therefore be a significant impact on this historic London skyline from a much treasured public view, detracting significantly from the value of the park.</p> <p>Figure 3.Landscape and Visual Assessment View 10 Cumulative from VTG (at the river wall)</p> <p>5 Conclusions</p> <p>Contrary to the current assessment put forward in the applicant’s Heritage Statement and by Lambeth Council in the advice to the Lambeth Planning Applications Committee, the cumulative effect of this proposal on the aesthetic appreciation of several important registered landscapes has been underestimated. It is submitted that these proposals will significantly detract from the public benefits offered for other consented or potentially consented schemes and irrevocably damage the setting of two registered historic landscapes.</p> <p>Greater weight needs to be given to the heritage and visual impacts and loss of public benefits than has been done to date. As a result, the Trust recommends this application should be refused as an unjustified departure from the Lambeth Local Plan for this site.</p> <p>Appendix 1 – Other Parks and Gardens in the vicinity of this development that will be impacted</p> <p>1. Old Paradise Gardens</p> <p>This park, formerly known as Lambeth High Street Recreation Ground (and Whitgift Street Park), was previously a burial ground provided to the parish by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1703. It was extended and a school added by Act of Parliament in 1816, but by 1853 was full and closed to burial. In 1880 it was decided to convert it into a public garden, which opened in 1884. This was one of the first new open spaces created in this way in London. Gravestones were moved to boundary walls, the mortuary was left standing, as was a watch house although this has now gone.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The recreation ground was extended in 1929 . Since re-landscaped, it has grassy mounds, a water feature, with shrubs and spring bulbs planted. In 2013 refurbishment was completed with a small children’s play area and the park was renamed Old Paradise Gardens. The enclosing walls of the former burial ground are listed Grade II on the Historic England register. The gardens are designated as Local Green Space in Policy KOV 1 of the emerging Kennington Oval and Vauxhall Forum (KOVF) Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>2. St Mary’s-at-Lambeth Churchyard and the Garden Museum In 1976 the Tradescant Trust was formed and campaigned to save church and churchyard for conversion into a museum and conference centre for garden history. The church was deconsecrated in 1977. The site has particular importance for garden history since 3 generations of the Tradescant family of plant collectors are buried here. By February 1979 sufficient funds were raised and restoration began, the former churchyard behind the church laid out as a C17th style knot garden. The Museum of Garden History, now renamed the Garden Museum, was officially opened in 1983 by HM Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother. Among the monuments in the garden is that of the Tradescant family of 1662, and also that of Admiral William Bligh of 'The Bounty', erected in 1817 – both of these are listed Grade II* on the Historic England Register as is St Mary’s church now used by the Museum. The walls, railings, gates & gatepiers to south & west of church are listed Grade II.</p> <p>3. St Mary’s Gardens St Mary's Gardens were laid out by Lambeth Borough Council in 1932/33 on what had been part of the old road when the new Lambeth Bridge was built. It is named after the adjacent parish church. An earlier layout that had a central paved area with a pergola and central water feature was replaced in 2008 by a new landscaping scheme. Planting was undertaken by the local community as well as Putting Down Roots, the horticultural project run by St Mungo's homelessness charity.</p> <p>4. Pedlar’s Park This park was created in 1968 and it does not have any formal planning registration status, though it has very substantial amenity value for the local community. It was built on the site of the St Saviours Salamanca Street National School (1870). In 2006 substantial improvements were made and the park was expanded to include the nearby Salamanca open space (named after the 1812 battle of Salamanca in Spain won by the Duke</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					of Wellington). The park is named after the 'Pedlar of Lambeth' who, legend has it, donated 1 acre of land for the nearby St Mary's Church -now the Museum of Garden History. The pedlar is depicted in a stain glass window within the church. The park has been extended more recently by the Vauxhall Gardens Estate Tenants and Residents Association (VGERTA) across the road creating Hayverley Garden Point in 2016 and together they form a critical part of a 'Green Corridor' which runs along the whole of Vauxhall Walk to Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens (formerly Spring Gardens) and City Farm. Pedlar's Park and Vauxhall Walk are designated as Local Green Space in Policy KOV 1 of the emerging Kennington Oval and Vauxhall Forum (KOVF) Neighbourhood Plan
Osterley Park	Greater London	E20/0868	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the demolition of existing building and car park and erection of buildings to provide up to 1,677 residential homes, plus up to 5,000 sqm flexible non-residential space comprising commercial, business and service space, and/or learning and non-residential institution space, and/or local community space, and/or public house/drinking establishment, and/or a mobility hub, along with associated access, bus turning, car and cycle parking, and landscaping arrangements. TESCO SUPERSTORE, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5NZ. MAJOR HYBRID	<p>SARAH RUTHERFORD WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2020</p> <p>I write in a personal capacity regarding the damaging effect of these developments on two designed landscapes of international significance – Syon Park and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. I have been a professional garden historian and historic environment adviser for over 25 years including as Head of the English Heritage Parks and Gardens Register. I have seen and studied many English Landscape Parks, including Lancelot 'Capability' Brown's landscapes. I frequently review planning applications on behalf of the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust to advise the Statutory Consultee, The Gardens Trust, on cases, including a continuous stream relating to Brown's landscapes. My book on Brown was published by the National Trust in 2016. I am co-author of an authoritative study for The Gardens Trust identifying the risks to the more than 230 surviving Brown landscapes, which found that serious damage has been inflicted on the fabric and setting of many and is a continuing risk.¹</p> <p>I object most strongly to this development because of the damaging effect it will have on the Arcadian landscapes of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, which is a World Heritage Site (WHS) and also Grade I Registered, and the Grade I Syon Park which in addition forms part of the buffer zone for the WHS.</p> <p>It causes 'substantial harm' to the setting of these heritage assets as follows:</p> <p>The Artistic Merit and Vulnerability of Syon and Kew</p> <p>The English Landscape Park is justly celebrated as Britain's most important contribution to the visual arts. Lancelot Brown (1716-83) was Britain's greatest and most prolific designer of this art form. His work is the best of this great British artistic legacy, at the forefront of an artistic and</p>

					<p>horticultural revolution with significance and resonance worldwide. His own unique legacy is an unparalleled group of at least 230 landscape parks with which he is associated and it has worldwide influence. Brown's genius in landscape artistry and engineering is the pinnacle of this quiet revolution and internationally significant. We</p> <p>1 Dr Sarah Rutherford & Sarah Couch, Vulnerability Brown Capability Brown's landscapes at Risk (2017, for The Gardens Trust).</p> <p>should celebrate it, acknowledge its influence and do our best to preserve his legacy. The tercentenary of his birth was celebrated to great acclaim nationally and internationally in 2016, but professional experience shows clearly that the setting of many of his landscapes have been over many decades, and are still, continually damaged by inappropriate and extensive development, often via an incremental stream of schemes for individual sites. This is despite the added attention and research carried out as a result of that anniversary. The pressure for damaging change to the essential setting of his work is increasing not decreasing, particularly in urban areas.</p> <p>The two landscapes have been linked design in artistic terms since the early C18. Syon is an outstanding example of a landscape park and garden by Brown, the most important landscape gardener. It marches in tandem with the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, in which Brown laid out a royal landscape park, the two being linked visually across the River Thames and by his contiguous designs in similar style and character. It is the most important such pairing of his work, in which the preservation of the Arcadian character of these two English landscape parks is of the utmost importance. Syon is for this reason included as part of the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone for Kew. Detailed research carried out recently into Brown's involvement at Syon indicates it is of still greater significance, sufficient that it should form part of the WHS in its own right for its close design links with Brown's work at Kew.</p> <p>The Effect of the Proposed Development</p> <p>In national planning policy, Registered parks and gardens have the same importance as listed buildings, scheduled monuments, and other 'designated heritage assets'. In particular to be acceptable, substantial harm to Grade I and II* listed buildings/ registered parks and gardens should be 'wholly exceptional'. The Heritage Statement submitted with the application states that 'there will be a minimal effect on the setting of heritage assets further afield, such as ... Syon Park ...', and no effect on the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Kew World Heritage Site. The proposed scheme will, on balance, preserve the setting of heritage assets and not cause harm to their heritage significance, and will bring significant public benefits.’ (para 5.14) Unfortunately this is untrue and reflects a faulty appraisal which has not understood the significance of the unspoilt setting to the design or recognized the substantial level of damaging visual intrusion into the Arcadian landscape. The development will cause substantial harm. The visual effect of the proposed development would damage to an unacceptable degree the historic setting of these internationally significant ‘Capability’ Brown designs which together are recognised as a unique contiguous pairing of his outstanding design skills. Specifically, these landscapes were designed and united visually by Brown across the river with a typical prestigious parkland character based on a rural grazed ornamental grass sward with scattered trees and clumps, threaded through by drives to the house. At Syon the character of the parkland and associated views in such a sensitive design would be compromised by the alien appearance of the proposed development, together with the setting of the Grade I listed Syon House. At Kew the riverside views would be compromised in the views to Syon which forms the critical backdrop and ‘borrowed landscape’ of the royal landscape. Of the two development sites that on the Homepage site will be the more damaging, being taller. The appearance of modern buildings in any form above the skyline of trees will damage views from various key places in Syon Park and Kew Gardens as they protrude above the Syon landscape. The TVIAs indicate the considerable and disruptive appearance of the development above the tree belt seen from the south drive of Syon and doubtless it will be visible from other places.² This will compound the existing serious damage in views to the north particularly by the ‘Kew Eye’ next to the M4 and the GSK building close to the development site. Similarly serious damage will be caused to the Kew setting as the development will also be visible from seminal views from Kew riverside opposite Syon House, in views of the house with its mature planted Brown backdrop from the Syon Vista and from the Isleworth Ferry gate (see photograph below). Worryingly, this has not been identified in the TVIAs.</p> <p>The Undamaged Nature of the Westerly Views This precious Arcadian setting has been compromised to a considerable degree to the north of Syon and to the north-west of Kew by tall developments between the river and the M4 including as noted above the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>'Kew Eye'. These were built incrementally and without design sensitivity or coherence, and the setting of both landscapes is likely to be further damaged as a result of pending applications.</p> <p>Miraculously the westerly setting of both landscapes in this unique and unspoilt half mile stretch of the Arcadian Thames has not been compromised to any great degree in this way – yet (see photos below). The undamaged nature of the westerly views from the Kew WHS is particularly sensitive at the riverside end of the Syon Vista and from the environs of the nearby Isleworth Ferry Gate when looking across the river at Syon House: the Arcadian view is of Syon House and the tree belt beyond with a glimpse of the Gillette tower within the tree belt which can be read as a more distant quasi church tower. The proposed scheme will be seen above the tree belt to the right flanking the Gillette tower and will be clearly visible. The proposed development is the bellweather and herald of a trend of large-scale schemes along the Great West Road corridor which if allowed to impinge will cumulatively and still further damage these as yet largely undamaged historic views and the Arcadian character that is so important to their design. This is the opportunity to establish a precedent that future buildings must not be visible from Syon or Kew which ensures the long term safety of this key aspect of their Arcadian landscapes and our cultural heritage.</p> <p>The Opportunity to Resist an Unacceptably Damaging Precedent I urge the Council to take a robust approach to ensure rigorously that this and future developments are not visible in the historic views of both Syon and Kew. If this development is visible it sets a harmful precedent for all those hopeful developers that follow it to argue for buildings which are as tall, and like the setting north of Syon will cumulatively create still greater harm and destroy what remains of the vulnerable illusion of Arcadia which is enjoyed by millions of visitors to both Syon and Kew. The present proposal may well be the catalyst for ICOMOS to consider putting the Kew WHS on their at risk list given the</p> <p>2 Homebase TVIA 20 P_2020_3099, views 13-15. Tesco TVIA 20 P_2020_3100, views 14-15</p> <p>cumulative damage occurring to the setting and views. We are stewards of our precious and fragile heritage for future generations, and we have the responsibility not to squander it for the financial benefit of those who have no stake in the damage they inflict.</p> <p>Conclusion</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>In summary, if this development is approved then:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The international significance of the two landscapes will be compromised by the substantial harm caused by an ill-judged and insensitive intervention in the setting which future generations will deplore. 2. It will set an unacceptable precedent for further damaging development in a vulnerable part of their setting which has not yet been greatly harmed. 3. There is a substantial likelihood of the Kew WHS being put on the ICOMOS At Risk list of WHS. <p>For these reasons I urge you to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Dr Sarah Rutherford c.c. ICOMOS UK and ICOMOS Headquarters, Paris The Gardens Trust The Georgian Group London Parks and Gardens Trust The Isleworth Society</p>
Syon Park	Greater London	E20/0871	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for the demolition of existing building and car park and erection of buildings to provide 473 residential units, a replacement retail foodstore with additional commercial, business and service space, and a flexible community space, and ancillary plant, access, servicing and car parking (400 customer spaces and 105 residential spaces), landscaping and associated works.</p> <p>HOMEBASE LTD, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5QE. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	As per E20/0868 above
Water Close, Winchester	Hampshire	E20/1049	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new dwelling with associated works. Land</p>	<p>A J DAVIDSON WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2020</p> <p>I write to record my strong objection to this proposal on the following grounds.</p>

			<p>Adjacent Water Close, Colebrook Street, Winchester, Hampshire. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The garden will be largely destroyed as a result of the construction of this house which will include the entire garden, not just that shown on drawing no. 394.PL01. Note that the red line extends around the entire existing garden plot. 2. This garden forms an attractive and tranquil “incident” when approaching the cathedral through Water Close. The proposal will detrimentally affect the enjoyment one has when approaching the cathedral through the protected cathedral wall. The path is permissive and in the control of the cathedral. The intrusion of a new dwelling in this location will harm this approach which forms part of the setting of the cathedral close. 3. It will detrimentally affect the setting of 34 Colebrook Street which has enjoyed the garden as part of its surroundings for over 60 years. It will diminish the historic associations with Sir Peter Smithers who created the garden and once lived in Colebrook House. 4. It is an important and highly valued part of the conservation area and links parts of the historic town. It contributes positively to the character of the conservation area and the setting of surrounding listed buildings. Not only is it visually attractive, but the gentle flow of water expresses a characteristic of the area which is an historically important element of the area being associated as it is with the medieval Lockburn and the Itchen river system of drainage in the area. 5. It will impose an incongruous architectural element in the streetscene which takes no cues from surrounding design features or elements normally associated with the assessment of coherent character. Massing, form, materials etc are all wrong for this street. 6. If the trees survive the construction period (which is highly dubious) it will result in the ultimate call to remove the protected Magnolia trees due to their proximity to the proposed building and the likelihood of causing shadowing or physical abrasion. It will be difficult for the council to refuse such calls if the trees start to cause physical damage. This will further negatively impact on the character of the area and the historic associations with the garden’s creator. 7. It will require disturbance of the buffer to the scheduled monument behind the Close Wall. Archaeology has not been mentioned as part of the justification. 8. It will remove an attractive designed landscape from public enjoyment at a time when public access to open spaces is most important.
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>Paragraph 193 of the NPPF requires that “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). It should be recognised that the “asset” is more than just the individual plot – it is the conservation area and the setting of numerous listed buildings including the cathedral.</p> <p>Paragraph 194 says “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...”</p> <p>Paragraph 196 says “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use”.</p> <p>There is no public benefit to this proposal. There is only harm. The loss of character of the area should not be underestimated in terms of the visual impact, disturbance to a tranquil setting and the loss of public amenity. Relevant policies to consider in terms of heritage and design include (but not exclusively):</p> <p>Local Plan Part 1: Policy WT 1 “Spatial planning will be achieved through... ensuring that all new development is of the highest design quality in terms of architecture and landscape, fully considers and respects the context of its setting and surroundings to reflect local distinctiveness, and the historical and cultural heritage of the Town, and makes a positive contribution to the quality of the area.”</p> <p>Policy CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character “... will support new development which recognises, protects and enhances the District’s distinctive land-scape and heritage assets and their settings. These may be designated or undesignated and include natural and manmade assets associated with existing landscape and townscape character, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, listed buildings, historic battlefields and archaeology. Particular emphasis should be given to conserving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and ILPP2 – Policy WIN 1 – Winchester Town “Within the defined settlement boundary of Winchester as shown on the Policies Map, planning permission will be granted for development which accords with the Development Plan and is consistent with the following principles aimed at delivering the Vision for Winchester Town: i protect and enhance the special character of Winchester Town, including its setting, heritage assets and treed skylines; ...” <p>Policy WIN 2 – Town Centre Within the defined town centre as shown on the Policies Map, planning permission will be granted for development which accords with the Development Plan and is consistent with the following principles aimed at delivering the Vision for Winchester Town: [...] iv enhance the sensitive historic environment of the town centre and its heritage assets...”</p> <p>WIN 3 – Views and Roofscape “Development within and around Winchester Town which accords with the Development Plan will be permitted, provided: i views that are integral to local character and distinctiveness are maintained, in particular views of treed skylines which connect Winchester with its setting; ii important views and vistas to and from the key historic features shown on the Policies Map (and listed below) are protected; iii roof designs are sympathetic to the character of the Town’s historic roofscape in terms of bulk, grain, form and materials and make a positive contribution to the roofscape; ...”</p> <p>Policy DM26 – Archaeology “Where there is evidence that heritage assets above or below ground and their settings are known or suspected to exist, but their extent and significance is unknown, planning applications should incorporate sufficient information to define the significance and extent of such assets, as far as reasonably practica-ble. Where appropriate, applications should include: • the results of desk based assessment/field evaluation; and • an assessment of the effect of proposals on the assets or their setting...”</p> <p>Policy DM27 – Development in Conservation Areas “New buildings in Conservation Areas should:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>i. respond sympathetically to the historic settlement pattern, views, plot sizes and plot widths, open spaces, townscape, roofscape, trees and landscape features;</p> <p>ii. are of a height, massing, materials, plan form, roofscape and grouping of buildings in scale and harmony with adjoining buildings and the area as a whole. The proportions of features and design details should relate well to each other and to adjoining buildings;</p> <p>iii. include good quality building materials appropriate to the locality and sympathetic in colour, profile and texture;</p> <p>iv. ensure that walls, gates and fences are, as far as possible, of a kind traditionally used in the locality.”ayout, tranquility, sense of place and setting.</p> <p>LPP2 – Policy WIN 1 – Winchester Town “Within the defined settlement boundary of Winchester as shown on the Policies Map, planning permis-sion will be granted for development which accords with the Development Plan and is consistent with the following principles aimed at delivering the Vision for Winchester Town:</p> <p>i protect and enhance the special character of Winchester Town, including its setting, heritage assets and treed skylines; ...”</p> <p>Policy WIN 2 – Town Centre Within the defined town centre as shown on the Policies Map, planning permission will be granted for development which accords with the Development Plan and is consistent with the following principles aimed at delivering the Vision for Winchester Town:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>iv enhance the sensitive historic environment of the town centre and its heritage assets...”</p> <p>WIN 3 – Views and Roofscape “Development within and around Winchester Town which accords with the Development Plan will be permitted, provided:</p> <p>i views that are integral to local character and distinctiveness are maintained, in particular views of treed skylines which connect Winchester with its setting;</p> <p>ii important views and vistas to and from the key historic features shown on the Policies Map (and listed below) are protected;</p> <p>iii roof designs are sympathetic to the character of the Town’s historic roofscape in terms of bulk, grain, form and materials and make a positive contribution to the roofscape;</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>..."</p> <p>Policy DM26 – Archaeology “Where there is evidence that heritage assets above or below ground and their settings are known or suspected to exist, but their extent and significance is unknown, planning applications should incorporate sufficient information to define the significance and extent of such assets, as far as reasonably practicable. Where appropriate, applications should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the results of desk based assessment/field evaluation; and • an assessment of the effect of proposals on the assets or their setting...” <p>Policy DM27 – Development in Conservation Areas “New buildings in Conservation Areas should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. respond sympathetically to the historic settlement pattern, views, plot sizes and plot widths, open spaces, townscape, roofscape, trees and landscape features; ii. are of a height, massing, materials, plan form, roofscape and grouping of buildings in scale and harmony with adjoining buildings and the area as a whole. The proportions of features and design details should relate well to each other and to adjoining buildings; iii. include good quality building materials appropriate to the locality and sympathetic in colour, profile and texture; iv. ensure that walls, gates and fences are, as far as possible, of a kind traditionally used in the locality.” <p>Policy DM29 – Heritage Assets “...Works which would cause an unacceptable level of harm to the special interest of heritage assets or their setting, or would lead to the unsympathetic subdivision of their grounds, will only be permissible in exceptional circumstances, or in the case of higher grade heritage assets in wholly exceptional circumstances...”</p> <p>I trust that the planning authority will recognise the considerable deficiencies in this proposal and refuse it on the strongest grounds. Kind regards Alison J Davidson Pg Dip Cons, IHBC</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.11.2020 As you will be aware, the Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee for proposed development affecting all grades of site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. As such we would not normally comment on an unregistered application site such as the one</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>above, but having discussed the application with colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT), we feel that this site is of sufficient heritage importance, that we cannot let the application go by without commenting. Indeed, so strongly did the HGT feel about the site, that they approached HE about its possible registration under the Gardens Trust/Historic England three year collaboration 'Compiling the Record' project which aimed to find the best examples of landscapes designed between the end of the WWII and the early 1990s. Many sites around the country were submitted for consideration, and in the end only 20 were included at this stage.</p> <p>Water Close was not included as it did not meet strict national criteria, but its importance was recognised by HE whose assessment concluded that it is : A garden of strong local significance, not least for its intended purpose to enhance public enjoyment, and it lies in an area of high historic importance where there are potential claims to group value..... is a good example of classical design for a small urban site, that pays homage to local materials and remains unaltered and legible.' We strongly support our HGT colleagues in the comments they made in their letter of objection dated 6th November 2020. In our opinion, it is highly likely that in the future this site may qualify for listing, and if this development goes ahead, the entire Water Close Garden will be destroyed, making it impossible for future generations to appreciate Sir Peter Smither's original design intent with the watercourse as the pivotal point of his creation, to reflect the cathedral and provide an aesthetic focus of the garden and visual reminder of Winchester's waterways heritage.</p> <p>We would urge your officers to consider the future heritage of your city and refuse this application.</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 side of the River Severn and the</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2020</p> <p>Further to my letter of 28th September, I have received further information from colleagues in the Hereford & Worcester Gardens Trust, confirming that the pylon will be glimpsed from many locations within the Registered park. We would therefore like to request that this very visible element be sited on the west bank of the river instead where the bridge would have less impact upon the park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

				restored landfill site, Hallow Road, on the west side of the River Severn, Worcester, Worcestershire. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY	Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Moor Park	Hertfords hire	E20/0700	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Installation of security gates at stone arch at Batchworth Lane 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	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member and authorised to respond on their behalf, We have no objection to the positioning of the 2 sets of rising bollards as detailed in this application. However, the set at Location 2, on the approach drive from Moor Lane, appears to have a fence leading from it across the parkland, as illustrated and marked on the sketch maps. Historically this is an English Landscape Park, and as such is open parkland to the mansion. Dividing the landscape with fences will harm the Grade II* Registered Park by inappropriate interventions. We have seen no justification for this harm. We would suggest that if extra barriers are required to stop vehicles circumventing the bollards then planting should be employed as at Location 1. With the fencing as indicated in this application we OBJECT to this application. Kate Harwood Conservation and Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E20/1043	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of single storey detached garden room to provide gym and home office. Mandevilles, Bonks Hill, Sawbridgeworth, Hertfordshire CM21 9HS. GARDEN BUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03/11/20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Mandevilles lies within the setting of the Grade II Registered parkland at Pishiobury and within the historic landscape of that estate. Views northwards across the parkland focus on the termination of the avenue at the end of Newton Drive, to the east of Mandevilles. We consider that the existing tree cover surrounding this property and the single storey building proposed on the footprint of an exiting outbuilding, would mean that the new garden room would not be visible in views across the landscape. We therefore have no objections. Kate Harwood
6 Willow Grove, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1057	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of apple tree. 6 Willow Grove,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.11.20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. As no reason has been submitted for the felling of this tree and no expert

				Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NA. TREES	advice sought, we would suggest that this is clarified before any decision is made. Kate Harwood
290 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1089	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree. 290 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NQ. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE: 03.11.20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We note that no independent advice has been submitted with this application nor any advice sought from the council. We would advise that this is obtained before the application is determined. From the evidence it would appear that this tree is of no historic value in this former Capability Brown landscape , so we would have no heritage objections to its removal. Kate Harwood
Meadow View, Kentish Lane, Hatfield	Hertfords hire	E20/1091	N	PLANNING APPLICATION 2 no. pitch roof side dormers to the north elevation, roof-light to the south elevation and window to west elevation. Meadow View, Kentish Lane, Hatfield BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.11.20 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member.. We commented on application 6/2020/2047/HOUSE for an extension to this property. The current application includes a much larger roof extension and dormers than the previous one. We do not consider that his would cause unacceptable harm to the landscape although it would affect the present modest appearance of the house, which reflects its place in the hierarchy of buildings at Camfield Place. Kate Harwood
1 Northaw Place, Northaw	Hertfords hire	E20/1100	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a domestic tennis court with surround fencing. 1 Northaw Place, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NQ. SPORT/LEISURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 17.11.20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The landscape of Northaw Place was historically open to the north of the house, and is largely intact. We note that various features have been introduced to the parkland north of the new courtyard development to the west of the mansion but this is largely screened from the house views northwards. We consider that a tennis court with associated fencing, of whatever colour, would compromise the historic integrity of the views of the mansion and thus harm the significance of both mansion and landscape. Kate Harwood
Baldock, Bygrave & Clothall NP	Hertfords hire	E20/1110	N	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Consultation on proposed changes to the examiners' report	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 21.11.20 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member, on these changes to the examiner's report. We have studied these proposed changes and the examiner's report and are satisfied that they be accepted by NHDC Kate Harwood

Pendley Manor	Hertfords hire	E20/1112	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey modular clubhouse with kitchen & serving area, WC's and a multi use open plan space. Tring Tornadoes, Tring Town Football Club, Cow Lane, Tring, Hertfordshire, HP23 5NS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 17.11.20 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on this application. The proposed site is within the AONB, the Green Belt and a Locally Listed historic parkland. It is in an area previously undeveloped and with open views across the parkland and the wider countryside. We consider that the new building will not blend in with the landscape and if it were to be given permission then a considerable amount of screening from trees and shrubs would be needed to mitigate the harm to the landscape. This is especially so as there is extant permission to fell one of the trees on site. Kate Harwood
Garden Cottage, Danesbury Park Road, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E20/1118	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a replacement two-bedroom residential annex, erection of a replacement brick wall and alterations to the existing hardstanding and grass verge following the demolition of existing one-bedroom residential annex, stables building and boundary fence and the removal of shipping containers and builders yard equipment and materials. Garden Cottage, Danesbury Park Road, Welwyn AL6 9SE. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 18.11.20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Garden Cottage lies within the historical frameyard and glasshouse area of the Danesbury Walled Garden with the site of the current stables block being in the working yard of this area. On the basis of the information in this application we do not wish to comment. Kate Harwood
5 Swanley Bar Lane, Little Heath	Hertfords hire	E20/1146	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension. 5 Swanley Bar Lane, Little Heath, Potters Bar EN6 1NN. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.20 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. The property lies within the setting of the important early 18th century Registered Park and Garden of Gobions, overlooking it at the rear. Although the Planning Statement mentions the Green Belt no consideration appears to have been given to the effect of the proposed works on this setting of the heritage asset. At the present time, the garden of this property contains sufficient trees and shrubs to prevent any glare from the new windows affecting the parkland. We therefore have no objection to the proposed extension. Kate Harwood

6 Holly Walk, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1165	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell Hornbeam T1. 6 Holly Walk, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7EJ. TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 20.11.20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This tree is part of the character of this area and a part of the ancient Sherrardspark Wood. We are concerned that no advice has been sought from the council as to less drastic solutions to felling to solve the perceived problem of lack of light for the neighbours. We would urge that every effort is made to retain this tree, perhaps through pruning as necessary. Kate Harwood
Temple Dinsley	Hertfords hire	E20/1180	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Section 73 Application : Change of use and extension of school dormitory (C2) to form 6 no. dwellings (C3), incorporating the following listed building works; demolition and removal of conservatory, fire escape stairs and storage sheds; erection of single storey extension to accommodation block and erection of cross wing extension to north east wing; erection of lattice porch to south west elevation. Realignment of boundary wall adjacent the access; formation of amenity, parking areas and associated landscaping (Section 73 application - Removal of conditions 7 and 8 from Planning permission 17/02800/1 granted 09/05/2018). Dower House, Hitchin Road, Preston, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG4 7TZ. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPPONSE. 22.11.20 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust. HGT is a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens, who have authorised HGT to respond to planning matters regarding RPG in Hertfordshire. As Temple Dinsley is a Registered Park & Garden, we are responding on behalf of the GT and the HGT. We have read the Historic Building Record Report by Heritage Network submitted with this application and have no comments to make on the removal of Conditions 7 and 8. Kate Harwood
44 Mymms Drive, Hatfield	Hertfords hire	E20/1197	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a dwelling following demolition of existing. 44 Mymms Drive,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.1.20 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. 44 Mymms Drive lies on the northern boundary of the Registered Park of

				Brookmans Park, Hatfield AL9 7AF. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	<p>Gobions, laid out in the early 18th century by the foremost landscape designer of the time, Charles Bridgeman. Recent research into this site has revealed many more features than originally recorded and increased the significance of the site.</p> <p>We have no comment to make on the replacement dwelling but are very concerned about the large amount of glazing on the southern (rear) of the proposed building. There is very little screening currently between the house and the Parkland; a large amount of glass will cause glare and an inappropriate focus for views northwards up the hill to the detriment of the historic designed views.</p> <p>If permission is granted for this application we would urge that a condition of that permission be to improve the proposed minimal screening outlined in the application with a thicker belt of trees and shrubs.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
16 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1200	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Ivy Clad Hornbeam tree. 16 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JQ. TREES	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESONSE 24.11.20</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note no reason has been advanced for felling this tree as opposed to merely removing the ivy. As the Council has been consulted by the applicant, we would support the council's tree officer if the decision was that felling of the hornbeam was necessary.</p> <p>As this tree is part of Sherrardspark Wood we would support the planting a of a replacement tree.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E20/1207	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Certificate of Lawfulness for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a front porch extension and proposed window openings to dwellinghouse. 17 Ayot Green, Ayot St Peter, Welwyn AL6 9BA. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.20</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property sits within the Registered Park of Brocket Park. We have read the Design & Access Statement: the conclusions therein are not supported by any evidence advanced and no mention is made either of the RPG or the Conservation Area .</p> <p>The property is currently well screened from the historic views, listed house and village by woodland. We would expect this to be maintained to reduce the harm caused by this proposal to the RPG and the CA, if the proposal is granted permission.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>
Shendish Manor	Hertfords hire	E20/1254	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration of summer house including re-instatement of its roof to accord with the original	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.20</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>The grounds of Shendish Manor were laid out by Edward Kemp, the</p>

				design. Shendish Manor Golf Club, Shendish Drive Leading from London Road, Shendish, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP3 0AA	important landscape designer who was an associate of Joseph Paxton. The design and details for Shendish pleasure grounds appeared in Kemp's book on garden design. HGT have added it to the List of Gardens and Parks on Local Historical Interest, though we do consider it, in light of Kemp's involvement, to be of wider significance than that. We support the restoration of the roof of the summer house to its original design and in a suitable material reflecting the original lead roof. Kate Harwood
Oakhill House, Hildenborough	Kent	E20/1173	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of site to include conversion, extension and alteration of existing office buildings and conversion and alteration of Grade II listed office building to create 138 apartments and shared residents facilities, together with 27 houses within the grounds, including access, parking, hard and soft landscaping and areas of open space. Oakhill House, 130 Tonbridge Road, Hildenborough, Tonbridge, Kent TN11 9DZ. CVHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.11.2020 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) wish to make the following comments on Planning Application 20/02245/FL A large proportion of the new housing will lie within the Green Belt where one of the main purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. This proposal is to partially infill the Green Belt land between Hildenborough and Hilden Park. Development within the Green Belt is only permitted in special circumstances, these have not been demonstrated. This site is not included in the Local Plan as an area identified for local housing. The Design and Access Statement states that "the landscape proposals incorporate and largely preserve the existing Tom Stuart Smith designed gardens within the masterplan (ref TM/09/00007)" and the key landscape principals are that "the existing landscape featured will be protected, conserved and enhanced where possible". In addition "high quality ornamental planting will remain.... and will be managed long term to ensure the ongoing beauty of the campus setting". These proposals and principals are all very laudable, but KGT request that should you be mindful to grant this application then conditions are attached to ensure that they are upheld. KGT would request that this site is given the status as a non-designated Heritage Asset on the local Heritage List for Tonbridge and Malling. We understand that a similar status has been granted to High Hilden House nearby. Yours sincerely Mike O'Brien Co-Chairman Kent Gardens Trust
Rauceby Hall	Lincolnshire	E20/1097	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Change of use of the existing dining room to	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2020 I write on behalf of Lincolnshire Gardens Trust. Trustees have no objection to this application. They wish to point out that any marquees (including

				<p>allow use as a wedding venue and the erection of marquee for use as wedding function room area as and when required. Rauceby Hall, Tom Lane, North Rauceby. MARQUEE</p>	<p>those in situ as seen online on Google Earth as of the above date) should be of a temporary nature and only constructed during those summer months that the applicant indicates will be booked for weddings rather than a permanent all-year-round installation. Any more permanent structure would be detrimental both to the setting of Rauceby Hall Grade II and the views of the historic gardens and park, Grade II on the Parks and Gardens Register.</p> <p>Your faithfully, Steffie Shields Chairman</p>
Raynham Park	Norfolk	E20/1035	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing single-storey dwelling and erection of replacement detached two-storey dwelling. 1 The Bungalow (known as Keepers Cottage), Hempton Road, Toftrees, Fakenham, NR21 7DL. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.11.2020</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 Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) who have made a site visit and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and the existing single storey building, whilst in poor condition, sits quietly in the landscape, on the northern boundary of the Grade II Registered Raynham Park and Garden (RPG). The proposed replacement building, whilst partially made of brick and flint, is considerably larger and taller. We concur with the Conservation Officer's statement that 'the proposed dwelling is a much larger two storey affair which is more reminiscent of a rural housing estate than a gamekeeper's lodge, it is likely to impose itself on the site and be more prominent within the landscape.' Whilst we also agree with his statement 'it would probably be difficult in practice to rule out a building with some first-floor accommodation. However, for it to stand the best chance of sitting comfortably within its surroundings, it should really be provided in an altogether more compact form which is perhaps more redolent of estate lodge-type buildings' in our opinion, a smaller, single storey replacement building would be preferable.</p> <p>The GT/NGT would suggest that such a building would still denote that the entrance is a minor one to the estate. The scale of what is proposed would in our opinion, result in a degree of harm to the relationship that currently exists. Any replacement should closely resemble the original building in footprint with a detached garage so that it fits in comfortably with the surroundings and character of the landscape.</p>

					<p>We also have concerns that should this proposal be approved, the site is large enough to accommodate and second or even a third house, and would set a precedent making it difficult to refuse any subsequent application for the remaining areas of the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Easton Neston	Northamptonshire	E20/0937	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline application with all matters reserved for an employment park comprising B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 and/or B8 uses, including ancillary offices (B1a), Sui Generis (selling and/or displaying motor vehicles, showrooms and petrol filling station), and/or A1 and A3 uses, service yards and HGV parking, plant, vehicular and cycle parking, earthworks and landscaping. Full planning application for a new roundabout access from the A43, internal spine road, substation, lighting infrastructure, engineering operations including foul pumping station, earthworks (including creation of development plot plateaus), pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and strategic landscaping including drainage infrastructure. (Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement). Land to the east of Tiffield Road and to the north west of the A43 Towcester.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020</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 Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and note the proximity of the proposed employment park to the north eastern edge of the Grade II* Easton Neston registered park and garden (RPG). Our concerns relate to the impact that the new roundabout would have upon the parkland. It would require substantial additional lighting which would have an adverse effect upon the setting of the RPG at night as well as compromising the views from within the parkland. Currently there is reasonable tree screening, but many of these trees are mature. If possible we would like to see the tree belt screening enhanced to ensure that should your officers permit this application, extra planning would provide longer term further protection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

				OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL	
Wellingborough Air Quality SPD	Northamptonshire	E20/1001	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Air Quality SPD available for view and comment	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the Wellingborough Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document</p> <p>The Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) 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>With regard to this document, the NGT welcome The Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation guidance. We are interested in understanding, protecting and encouraging the enjoyment of historic landscapes and seek to protect them from threats from the built environment, inappropriate use and 'macro' factors like air quality and climate change.</p> <p>Hence it is appreciated that, as the consultative document states, "a vital part of any local authority plans to tackle congestion, improve air quality, promote physical activity and improve accessibility".</p> <p>We support the development of an integrated system of cycle ways to reduce the damaging impact of motor vehicles and any development towards low emission vehicles, be they private or public. Whilst it is recognised that cycle routes have a visual impact in an historic landscape, if sensitively developed as with The National Trust's 4 mile cycle path on part of Brown's circuit carriage way at Croome Court in Worcestershire, the benefits extend to wheelchair users and others also. The careful consideration of appropriate materials such as a gravel or hoggin type path would be in keeping with some eighteenth-century circuit paths and would ensure that the visual impact was acceptable.</p> <p>"The use of green infrastructure, in particular trees to absorb dust and other pollutants" is to be applauded and we are in principle in favour of any criteria that reduce emissions that contribute to climate change and/or ill health. There is a positive opportunity here to mitigate effects with an increase in tree planting and, in some circumstances, perhaps to restore historic planting.</p> <p>To conclude, the general principle is appreciated and agreed in accepting the quest for a carbon free environment. In essence, the planning process is not altered by this guidance and it is noted that the flow diagram on p. 1 ends in every scenario with either a recommendation to the LPA for refusal</p>

					<p>on the grounds that air quality criteria are not met or a neutral comment that air quality criteria are met. It appears that we have the opportunity to comment on any particular proposal.</p> <p>We would, of course, still want to evaluate individual planning applications as they emerge.</p> <p>Carol Fitzgerald On behalf of Northamptonshire Gardens Trust</p>
Cragside	Northumb erland	E20/0994	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent to: refix and realign roof slates including some replacement; renew lead work to roof and chimneys; lift ridge and hip tiles and rebed including some replacement; part repointing to external walls; part repointing and rebuilding of chimney stacks including some replacement stonework; relay flat roof to porch, install secondary glazing to windows; replaster various walls; replace existing oil boiler; alter and repair existing electrical system including installation of extract fans; replace cracked rainwater goods. North Lodge, Cragside, Morpeth, Northumberland NE65 7PX. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the online documentation and whilst the lodge improvements are unlikely to have much impact on the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Cragside. North Lodge is well tucked away, but even so, care must always be taken when siting anything which might impact upon its setting. The Design & Access Statement (D&A) and the Heritage Statement (HS) refers to the curtilage of the Grade I country house but does not mention the RPG designation, which would like to alert your attention to.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cragside	Northumb erland	E20/0996	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION some replacement, renew lead work to roof and chimneys' part repointing and rebuilding of chimney stacks including some replacement stonework, lift ridge and hip tiles and rebed including some replacement, install two hoppers and downpipes, part repointing to external walls,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the online documentation and whilst the lodge improvements are unlikely to have much impact on the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Cragside, Reivers Well is very evident from the valley road and the exit drive behind, so care must always be taken when</p>

				replace existing oil boiler, fit secondary glazing to windows, alter and repair the electrical system including installation of extract fans, undertake various plaster repairs, install new bathroom fittings. Reivers Well Lodge, Cragside, Morpeth, Northumberland NE65 7XJ. REPAIR/RESTORATION	siting anything which might impact upon its setting. The Design & Access Statement (D&A) and the Heritage Statement (HS) refers to the curtilage of the Grade I country house but does not mention the RPG designation, which would like to alert your attention to. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Cragside	Northumb erland	E20/1000	I	PLANNING APPLICATION some replacement; renew lead work to roof and chimneys; lift ridge and hip tiles and rebed including some replacement; part repointing to external walls; part repointing and rebuilding of chimney stacks including some replacement stonework; relay lean-to utility roof; install secondary glazing to windows; replace existing oil boiler; alter and repair existing electrical system including installation of extract fans. The Kennels Cottage, Cragside, Morpeth, Northumberland NE65 7PX. REPAIR/RESTORATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020 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 have looked at the online documentation and whilst the lodge improvements are unlikely to have much impact on the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Cragside. The Kennels Cottage is well tucked away, but even so, care must always be taken when siting anything which might impact upon its setting. The Design & Access Statement (D&A) and the Heritage Statement (HS) refers to the curtilage of the Grade I country house but does not mention the RPG designation, which would like to alert your attention to. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Gilling Castle	North Yorkshire	E20/0904	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of wasteland and replacement with stone chippings to provide parking area (retrospective). Land Off Pottergate, Gilling East, Helmsley. PARKING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2020 Thank you for your e-mail yesterday re- consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) on this retrospective planning application. We agree that the suggestion from your authority's Tree and Landscape Officer that some mitigation may be helpful viz: That the submission of a landscaping plan, with the retention of existing trees and the introduction of lower level planting towards the eastern side and the edge of the car park boundary may help to improve the visual appearance of the site. This would be on the basis of (if the car parking

					<p>spaces were considered acceptable to retain) a non- dig cellular containment system being retrospectively installed as a non-negotiable step. If this were the case, and if perhaps some of this retrospective parking was given over to additional replanting, then this may help to address some of our concerns.</p> <p>However, we defer to the advice from your Conservation Officer and the Howardian Hills AONB Officer who will be able to determine whether these measures will largely remove the harm, and if that is the case, suggest suitable planting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Grantley Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0952	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION P.E. Grantley Hall, Grantley, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 3ET. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2020</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. 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>Grantley Hall (listed Grade II*) is now a five- star luxury country resort and spa with many facilities including a nationally important Japanese garden, which is listed by HE on their Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II. The documents with this Pre-application seem to be duplicated and are lacking in sufficient detail making comments more difficult. We have been unable to find a site plan apart from in the Bird Survey nor have we seen a plan of the helicopter pad. We have noted the flight lines but they only relate to the immediate area of Grantley Hall so we are unable to ascertain the actual proposed flight paths and the impact that they may have on the World Heritage Site (WHS) and Grade I registered historic park and garden, Studley Royal with Fountains Abbey. The document from Pegasus Group dated 24th September only refers to impact on the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Important though that is there is no mention of the WHS which is concerning. There is no appreciation or consideration of the fact that the Grantley Hall estate is only three fields away from the WHS and that flights nearby will inevitably destroy its tranquility and distract tourists.</p>

					<p>We have noted the Grantley Hall Helicopter Access Plan: 96 arrivals will also result in 96 departures ie 192 flights. Flights 9.00 to 19.00 in winter would mean lots of lights. 4 weekend visits per month could mean a helicopter flight each weekend. We not aware of any information about the length of stay of a helicopter if an owner flies in and stays.</p> <p>And how would this work if another helicopter wants to land?</p> <p>There is no mention of the lighting required; how will the landing area be illuminated?</p> <p>And how will the flights be monitored?</p> <p>You will have noted our letter of 22nd November 2018 in response to REF: PP 07383174 18/04483/FUL; The use of land for a helipad. Grantley Hall, Stephenson Bridge to Grantley Hall And West Lodge, Grantley HG4 3ET. In conclusion we strongly object to this Pre-application for a number of reasons which include noise, visual disturbance and the impact of the helipad in the grounds and the surrounding tranquil valley. We remain concerned about the potential impact on the WHS and the setting of Grantley Hall and its registered historic park and garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Parcevall Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/1113	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listing building consent for works to re-roof barn with cement fibre profile sheet roofing panels over a row of sandstone slates at eaves level and to carry out repairs to the barn. Approved 20th December 2019. Henry Simpson's Barn, Parcevall Hall REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2020</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by HE on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as is the case with Parcevall Hall, which is registered grade II and is the only registered historic park and garden (H P & G) within the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust 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 the GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust/Yorkshire Gardens Trust were never consulted on this planning application despite Henry Simpson's Barn being next to the boundary of the registered H P & G, within the setting, and had been incorporated in the views when the gardens were designed by Sir William Milner. Access from the gardens is through a pedestrian gate.</p> <p>We regularly comment on planning applications for your Authority and are</p>

					<p>at a loss to understand why we were not consulted in this case.</p> <p>We are pleased that this fine grade II* listed barn dating from 1737 is being repaired but we are also very concerned about the proposal for a modern roof as we believe it is likely to have an adverse impact, especially on the view from the main path behind the Hall.</p> <p>The mason for the building of Henry Simpson's Barn in 1737 was Joshua Breare, who was also one of the craftsmen on the Bolton Abbey Estate when estate barns were rebuilt in the 1740s. The stone work features examples of decorative "broad tooling" and "pecked tooling" around doorways.</p> <p>The barn is also considered to be very interesting as it is one of the few examples with documentary evidence for the rebuilding of a cruck structure that survived into the C18. Details of the expenditure in 1737 and 1738 for building the barn are also extant.</p> <p>Henry Simpson's Barn featured as part of the "Vision of Sir William Milner" once the renovations and additions were completed, as seen in a drawing by J.D. Harvey, at Walsingham. The views from above the barn over its roof towards the south-east are outstanding.</p> <p>We are appending explanatory notes on the significance of Henry Simpson's Barn at Parcevall Hall which we hope you will find helpful.</p> <p>We request that work to the roof of Henry Simpson's barn is halted, the situation is re-assessed and we are consulted please.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust REF: YGT notes on Henry Simpson's Barn</p>
Worcester College	Oxfordshire	E20/0559	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Network Rail Oxford Corridor Phase 2 Capacity Improvement Scheme The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 Request for Scoping Opinion: Botley Road widening and rail bridge replacement. New station western entrance. New Platform 5 and platform</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for coming back to us with the revised details for the above scoping report and acknowledgement that the replacement Youth Hostel is now not going ahead. Due to the temporary nature of the vibration and noise during the building work, we do not have any comments to make on this aspect of the proposals. However, we do still have concerns that views out from the Gardens and first floor principal rooms of Worcester College may be impacted due to rising ground levels at the College.</p> <p>In our earlier letter we mentioned a 'sensitive area north of this line which may be visible from the Garden in front of the new Massada building which is on slightly higher ground.'. We would be reassured if your officers could</p>

				buildings. Sheepwash Bridge replacement. BUS/TRAIN	request that 'verified views' section drawings are presented to ensure that no harm is done in this response. With best wishes, Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Christ Church	Oxfordshire	E20/1230	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of a temporary building for up to 2 years (Retrospective). Christ Church College, St Aldate's, Oxford. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2020 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation for retrospective permission for a marquee which was installed to make a COVID safe shelter during freshers' week. The application is for two years to cover any further COVID considerations and in the meantime will be used as 'overflow' teaching space and social activities to assist Christ Church in complying with social distancing guidance. The marquee sits at the south end of the Masters' Garden lawn which was made in 1926-7 and is walled and closed to the public (except for private tours). Within the Christ Church landscape Conservation Management Plan it has been assessed as significance level B (where A is the highest). It is a semi-public garden between the Christ Church buildings and Merton Field (to the east). It is normally used by Christ Church students for part of the year for quiet recreation and playing croquet and in the triennial Commemoration Ball. It is also used for events by the Cathedral : weddings, parties, drinks receptions and has been used for the literary festival. There is no known archaeology recorded. The marquee is on the lawn and not under any tree canopies. Although it will impact on the lawn the gardeners are used to repairing damage from events so any adverse effects will only be temporary in this respect although whilst the structure is in situ, it will of course affect views within the garden. As far as we can ascertain without a site visit, we do not think it will be visible through gate to Merton Field (on the east side of the garden) which gives a significant view towards the Cathedral. It might just be visible from the gate to the Broad Walks and Meadow to the south, but there is quite a bit of vegetation inside the gate. The roof might be seen above the walls but the photographs submitted do not show this Therefore, assuming it is removed within 2 years it is a temporary structure

					<p>in a discrete area, with limited and will only have short term impact on the Grade I landscape. We have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dunster Castle	Somerset	E20/1178	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal: Works to Trees in a Conservation Area affected by Ash Die Back. T3923 - Fell. T3422x3 trees - Fell. T3924 - Fell to 2.5m. T3927 - Fell to 6m. T3925 - reduce 2 large limbs to fork. T3928 - reduction of large limb. Dunster Castle Gardens, Somerset, TA24 6SL. TREES</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 32.11.2020</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 understand the need to remove the diseased ash trees within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Dunster Castle. We would hope that once the trees have been felled and the stumps ground away, it will be possible to replace them with new trees appropriate for a parkland setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shrubland Hall	Suffolk	E19/1595	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a petrol filling station (PFS), associated store and 2no. drive thru's and creation of new vehicular access. Land At Norwich Road, Coddendam, Suffolk. HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in relation to new documentation relating to the above application. We have noted the addition of landscape plans to thicken the existing barrier between the application site and Needham Lodge & Shrubland Park Grade I registered park and garden (RPG). Whilst we welcome this we remain unconvinced that the application will not adversely affect the setting and significance of both the Grade II Lodge and the Grade I RPG.</p> <p>Defining substantial/less than substantial harm is not straightforward, and the best articulation of how to assess harm to a heritage asset is contained in the PPG which was amended in 2019. 'What matters in assessing whether a proposal might cause harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.' The application site is undeniably within the setting of both the Lodge and the RPG and we maintain that a petrol/service station with its structures and intrusive lighting as well as a newly opened vista to a main road, are harmful to the setting and experience of the approach and entrance to the estate. We maintain that should this application be permitted it would cause harm to the significance of both heritage assets. Whilst substantial harm implies almost complete</p>

					<p>destruction of a heritage asset, less than substantial harm, as here, does not of course signify a less than substantial issue, and such harm still attracts great weight in the planning balance, requiring clear and convincing justification, outweighing (some) public benefits.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E20/1083	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 130 dwellings and new local centre with associated landscaping and ancillary works. Land West Of Maynard Grove, Wynyard, TS22 5SP. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.11.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Wynyard Park, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>We have considered the information provided in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust. On the basis of this we confirm we have nothing further to add to our comments of 02.07.2020 submitted in response to application reference 20/0439/OUT. If you have any further queries, please contact us, and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course.</p> <p>With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager The Gardens Trust</p>
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E20/1042	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION REPLACEMENT 5 BED DWELLING AND DETACHED REAR OUTBUILDING. 33 SKIP LANE, WALSALL, WS5 3LL. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2020</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>This application affects the Grade II landscape, which is a registered park and garden (RPG), at Great Barr, an C18 landscape park associated with Humphry Repton, John Nash and Sir George Gilbert Scott, and possibly also William Shenstone. The existing house at 33 Skip Lane directly abuts the northern boundary of the RPG. Due to current Covid restrictions a site visit has not been possible, so we have had to rely on the accompanying online documentation to make our comments.</p> <p>As the application is not accompanied by either a Heritage Statement (HS) or a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), it does not presently comply with the NPPF para 189 which requires an applicant to 'describe the significance of</p>

				<p>any heritage assets affected' and also Para 190 which requires an assessment of 'the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset'. No reference either is made to the possible impact of the proposed development on the setting of the adjacent Great Barr Conservation Area. It is similarly also unclear as to whether the Grade II Listed Walsall Lodge (or Merrion's Lodge) attributed to Sir George Gilbert Scott, is visible from the application site, another important consideration. These omissions will have a bearing as to the interpretation of Para 196 of the NPPF as the application will have an effect upon the setting and significance of the RPG (and possibly Walsall Lodge). We need to be able to ascertain what level of harm this may, or may not be. 'Any harm to a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification.' (NPPF Para 194).</p> <p>Should your officers be minded to allow this application, Para 196 requires that 'harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. There is no explanation of what public benefit, if any, this application may have. Clearly there are degrees of less than substantial harm, but without either a HS, VIA or a site visit, it is not possible to assess the extent of harm, which should in any case be clearly articulated as per the NPPF amended in 2019. The landscape at Great Barr is on the English Heritage At Risk (HAR) register. At this stage, with several important documents missing from the application, we have not yet judged the proposals against the The Black Country Core Strategy and the various relevant Policies contained within that.</p> <p>The replacement dwelling would appear to be over twice the size of the existing house. Regrettably no definite size is given for the current house, but extrapolating from the dimensions given on the proposed elevations, it would seem that the new three storey house with a total extra space of 319.6 m sq over and above the area of the existing house, is considerably more than the two storey dwelling of c 142 m sq. It is also not clear where in the garden the proposed large detached rear outbuilding will sit.</p> <p>Taken together, the new build represents an extensive development within a site in the immediate setting of an RPG and the Gt Barr Conservation Area. The rear facade of the new build which faces towards the RPG has extensive glass windows and the roof of the ground floor extension would appear to have two glass domes. When taken with the extra storey and its windows, there will be a considerable increase in light emission towards the RPG. When we responded to planning application number 18/1288 almost two years ago exactly on 21st November 2018, we commented</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>'Should this application be permitted, there is a danger of a precedent being set and all the houses becoming increasingly inflated in scale which would very much alter the character of the boundary.' That application was permitted despite considerable local opposition, so now we are justifiably concerned that should this development be allowed, that is exactly what is happening and can only encourage further similar developments in neighbouring properties, thus eroding piecemeal the setting and status of the RPG and conservation area designations. In such an instance your officers would need to consider 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, which also advises (p2) 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.'</p> <p>The bottom of the garden of No 33 Skip Lane and its neighbours would appear to have a degree of tree cover when viewed from Google maps. There is no Arboricultural Report to allow us to understand the condition of these trees; whether they are in good health or declining etc, and whether the placement of the large outbuilding may affect the rootzones of any of the trees. We would request that the applicant provide such documentation so that it is clear, should this application be permitted, whether further planting may be required to thicken the tree cover. The VIA should include views into the site in winter from the RPG and also from Walsall Lodge showing both the proposed house and the outbuilding so that their impact upon the RPG can be ascertained.</p> <p>In the absence of such documentation, the Gardens Trust would like to lodge a holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer cc Erika Diaz Petersen, Historic England</p>
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E19/1091	I	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Partial demolition and re-building of Forge House including single storey extension to form offices (B1). Former Blacksmiths Workshop, Harewood Estate,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2020 Thank you for this further re-consultation. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT- as you know the Statutory Consultee for proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens - and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. The YGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf

				<p>Harrogate Road. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Forge House (listed Grade II) is located in the Grade I Registered Park and Garden at Harewood House and within the Estate Yard. The Grade I listing reflects Harewood's exceptional heritage significance as a historic designed landscape and is one of only nine grade I landscapes in Yorkshire.</p> <p>The former Blacksmiths Workshop, known as Forge House, lies within the eastern section of the Home Farm at Stank, and was also designed by John Carr and in the style of a courtyard farmstead c. 1760.</p> <p>This estate yard is considered to be significant "because it was one of the first of its kind in a country house estate, illustrating not only architectural innovation but also a progressive attitude to the estate workforce". (Tatioglu, T. G., 2010. See ref below.)</p> <p>We refer you to our letters on this planning application dated 28th November 2019 and 1st June 2020.</p> <p>We have noted the structural survey carried out by Historic England's (HE) structural engineer and agree that the heritage and best conservation option would be to proceed on those lines. Your authority's conservation officer also noted that the applicant should be asked to consider a repair option in line with HE's recommendations. This is necessary to meet the NPPF's requirement that harm to heritage assets should be avoided. The GT and YGT do not have the expertise to comment on the Harewood Estate view that taking down and rebuilding would give a longer lasting structure without further repair.</p> <p>Our concerns over the proposed new opening from Forge House onto the principal drive from Stank to Harewood House, also remain. We consider it will be prominent and detrimental to the designed views and especially of the "Tower" and the attached archway entrance to Forge House.</p> <p>The plans for the proposed contemporary extension do not appear to have changed since last June and our concerns remain. Despite the 'green roof' of the extension, we are not convinced that such an extension as proposed is acceptable in this location given the importance of the estate yard at Harewood House.</p> <p>We suggest that the proposed new extension would harm the views from the Wash House/Brew House to the south-west of Forge House which is similarly part of the elegant 18th Century Stank "village".</p> <p>We note the roadway is stone cobbled but have concerns over the proposed tarmac for the parking bays, as it is inappropriate for an C18 historic landscape.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We again wish to stress the historic importance of the Estate Yard where Forge House is sited and where every building is considered to have been designed by John Carr, so creating a unity of its architecture. "The nearness of the joiners, smiths and plumbers allowed for the movement of people, materials and ideas from one workshop to the next." (Tatioglu, T. G., 2010). The proposal would not only result in the loss of this unity of architecture but also create a central barrier between the workshops, which would be totally contrary to the original concept.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust REF: Tatioglu, T. G., 2010, PhD Thesis, Biographies of People and Place: The Harewood Estate, 1698-1813, University of York</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---