



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES DECEMBER 2020

The GT conservation team received 158 new cases for England in December, 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, 37 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Kings Weston House	Avon	E20/1255	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 5 no. floodlighting columns and a 50-seater stand. Shirehampton FC, Penpole Lane, Bristol BS11 0EA. SPORT/LEISURE	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2020</b></p> <p>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 and therefore it is a site of special interest, warranting every effort to preserve it.</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Kings Weston House [1710-25, listed grade I], designed by Vanbrugh, lies approx..550m north east of the application site. An east/west track, a former carriage drive, provides an almost straight route of about 500m between narrow blocks of woodland and describes the southern edge of the former pleasure grounds. To the west the track leads 1km through an informal avenue of European limes [c 1700s] to Penpole Point. Most of the open parkland of Kings Weston Park lies south of Shirehampton Road. The</p>

					<p>site, which is the subject of this planning application, lies to the north of Penpole Lane, just before the junction with Shirehampton Road, and just within the boundary of the Registered Park and Garden of Kings Weston House. The grounds of Kings Weston House are managed as public open space by Bristol Council.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information provided in this application and think that the introduction of five, fifteen metre high flood lights onto a pitch surrounded on three sides by the trees of a Registered Park and Garden, will harm the significance of this heritage asset. In addition, the erection of a fifty seater stand within this same area will be seen as an over development in terms of its present use resulting in a loss of historic and visual character.</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, which the Trust considers has not been provided in this instance.</p> <p>Therefore, Avon Gardens Trust objects to this current proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Page Park	Avon	E20/1303	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of first floor side and a two storey rear extensions to form additional living accommodation. 2 Park Road, Staple Hill, South Gloucestershire BS16 5LD. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a house, which is opposite Page Park, a municipal park recorded in the Avon Gardens Trust Gazetteer for South Gloucestershire. 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.</p> <p>The significance to this application, of Page Park, formerly part of the Hill House estate, given to the public in 1909 by A.W. Page, and laid out over the following few years, is that the surrounding roads are lined with houses</p>

					<p>of that period. The park contains an elaborate shelter with clock tower in the centre of the park; a hexagonal bandstand; drinking fountain circa 1910, which Avon Gardens Trust recently contributed towards its restoration; fine wrought iron gates, 1913; and a WW1 cenotaph. Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that has been provided concerning this application and on the basis of this we consider that the proposal amounts to a two storey, flat roofed addition, on two sides of the house, clad in timber effect vertical cement tongue and groove weatherboard which does not reflect the character and materials of the main dwelling house and surrounding properties. It contravenes the Policy H4 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan, which advises that extensions should respect the massing, scale, proportions, materials and overall design of the existing property and the character of the street scene, and surrounding area.</p> <p>Summary: Avon Gardens Trust, therefore, objects 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</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for facilitating access to the photomontages. Appraisal photograph 04 produced by WYG represents an important historic view from Sandleford Priory which to date remains much as it was, undisturbed by modern development. We have sought throughout to conserve the nature of this view and thank West Berkshire for its support in achieving this objective. Based on Appraisal Photograph 04 the proposed housing should be screened by woodland and mature trees but care should remain to retain the unspoilt nature of this historic view which contributes to the aesthetic significance of the Priory. We remain of the view that the southern edge between Gorse Copse and Brickkiln Copse should be planted with a mixed tree and hedgerow field boundary to contain the development and contribute to the long term screening.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair. cc: The Gardens Trust</p>

				drainage and other infrastructure. All matters reserved. Sandleford Park West, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury. MAJOR HYBRID	
Ascot Place	Berkshire	E20/1300	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Engineering works for the construction of an all weather manege and conditioning riding track. The Spinney, Forest Road, Ascot. EQUESTRIAN	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2020</b></p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are a member of The Gardens Trust, a national body which recently published a guidance leaflet to explain the place of historic designed landscapes in the planning system, the importance of assessing their significance &amp; the role of Trusts in raising awareness of historic designed landscapes as heritage assets. In addition, there are statutory consultation obligations for local authorities regarding the consultation &amp; advisory role of Gardens Trusts at national &amp; county level.</p> <p>On behalf of the Berkshire Gardens Trust, we would like to see appropriate conditions to ensure that the work set out in the Tree Preservation Report is carried out. If that is done, then the concerns we had about the damage to the historic setting of Ascot Place with its tree-lined approach will be met.</p> <p>We also note that one of the problems can be caused by floodlighting outside facilities. Whilst this may be necessary in some instances, we suggest that the Planning Authority inserts conditions to control this and ensure it is not a nuisance to neighbours.</p> <p>We also note that Forest Road is becoming more built up, which may not be desirable in this Green Belt where traditionally the use has been for horses.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us. Yours sincerely, Charles Elly DL, Planning Adviser to the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Dullingham House	Cambridgeshire	E20/1208	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building consent Construct a new timber framed garden room/store in the rear garden of the property. 22 Station Road, Dullingham, Newmarket, Suffolk CB8 9UP.	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has received three concurrent applications for separate addresses within Station Road, all of which are all individually small and building related. Our reason for commenting on all three is due to the</p>

				MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<p>possible cumulative effect of them upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Dullingham. The above application for No 22 Station Road, as well as 20/01374/FUL for No 33 Station Road, both lie within the RPG. Neither of these applications, or the final application 20/01347/FUL for No 45 Station Road (which lies adjacent to the RPG) has a Heritage Statement which mentions the registered park and garden. The above application is well screened from the RPG due to tree cover, and our only comment is that these trees should be protected so that the site does not become more exposed. The merits of the proposed garden room are outside our remit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dullingham House	Cambridgeshire	E20/1223	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single-storey side extension to create improved utility, storage and entrance spaces. Deer Park Barn, 33 Station Road, Dullingham, Newmarket, Suffolk. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2020</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>The Gardens Trust has received three concurrent applications for separate addresses within Station Road, all of which are all individually small and building related. Our reason for commenting on all three is due to the possible cumulative effect of them upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Dullingham. The above application for No 33 Station Road, as well as 20/01524/LBC for No 22 Station Road, both lie within the RPG. Neither of these applications, or the final application 20/01347/FUL for No 45 Station Road (which lies adjacent to the RPG) has a Heritage Statement which mentions the registered park and garden. The Design &amp; Access statement for 20/01374/FUL mentions in Para 1.6 the Grade II house and that Repton laid out the parkland but fails to refer to its registration or the application site's position within the Grade II RPG. In this application, our only comment is that of the three, this one is the most exposed within the RPG with little tree cover. However, the issue for your officers to decide is whether the building, which has already been extended in the past, justifies this current work.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Dullingham House	Cambridgeshire	E20/1224	II	PLANNING APPLICATION New garden room. Solomons, 45 Station Road, Dullingham, Newmarket, Suffolk. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has received three concurrent applications for separate addresses within Station Road, all of which are all individually small and building related. Our reason for commenting on all three is due to the possible cumulative effect of them upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Dullingham. The above application for No 45 Station Road lies adjacent to the RPG, and 20/01374/FUL for No 33 Station Road and 20/01524/LBC for No 22 Station Road, both lie within the RPG. None of these applications has a Heritage Statement which mentions the registered park and garden. The Parish Council's comments touch upon the effect that this proposed development might have on the RPG but the application site is well screened by trees. Our only comment would be that one of the trees in particular is quite close to the proposed new building and as it grows larger we can see that the applicant may seek to have it felled. We would suggest that should this be the case that your officers put in a condition that it be replaced with a tree of similar stature rather than a smaller, purely ornamental variety.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Heligan	Cornwall	E2/0554	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Use of land to station portacabins to provide education/demonstration and office facilities. The Lost Gardens Of Heligan, Road From Heligan Gardens Entrance To Heligan Mill, Pentewan, St Austell. EDUCATION	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again with regard to amended plans for the above application. We are pleased to see that the applicant has revised their thinking and followed the advice of the AONB and that the new layout is now single storey. This makes far less impact on the RPG and is an improvement on the earlier version. Once the planting suggested has begun to mature it will mitigate any effect of the Portakabins almost completely.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Windlestone Hall	County Durham	E20/1270	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Comprehensive restoration of Windlestone Hall into a principal	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

			<p>private residence with 2no. internal staff apartments, with conversion of former staff service wing to 4no. Private apartments. Restoration of the 'Old Stables' and conversion to staff accommodation and low-carbon estate energy centre. Restoration of the Hall gardens, walled garden with public access and 'Gardener's Cottage'. Restoration of the 'Clocktower' with Clocktower Stables' courtyard and conversion to mixed-use commercial (small office, cafe/coffee shop, small retail units). Reinstatement of a lake and island to north east of Hall. Reinstatement of the estate chapel and ilex avenue east of main access road. Restoration of 'North Lodge' and use as estate office and car park. Repurposing of former basketball court as estate car park. Enabling development of 13no. 4 and 5 bed-detached dwellings at 2no. Locations north of the Hall, Windlestone Hall, Windlestone Park, Windlestone, Ferryhill DL17 0LX. HYBRID</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We welcome the proposals to resolve the long and sorry story of Windlestone's decline in recent years and are generally supportive of the scheme. However, the lack of detail on proposals for the landscape in the application means that we feel unable to comment on the application as far as it affects the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Windlestone (RPG) and must therefore submit a holding OBJECTION to the application at this stage. There is also some confusion within the online documentation as to the grading of the RPG at Windlestone : The CP has the landscape down as both Grade II and II* (Heritage designations - 2.3.5 and elsewhere).</p> <p>The comprehensive Conservation Plan gives an excellent grounding for the way forward with Windlestone and it is disappointing that the D&amp;A Statement then seems to gloss over the question of the impact on the designed landscape, with the statement: 'The environment around the hall will also be restored or altered to match the original arrangement or a layout which is derived from a traditional country house setting.' This is too vague to inspire confidence that what is coming at least respects the existing designed landscape. While elements of the structure of the existing garden are proposed for repair it is difficult to be confident that what remains has been properly recorded and that this is informing the project, particularly as new structures are proposed within the existing gardens.</p> <p>The D&amp;A statement goes on to state that: 'The garden layout shown here is indicative and is intended to illustrate the intended character for the gardens as the context for new and existing buildings... The gardens are not an accurate replica of previous gardens on the site. The proposed layout derives from the evidence available which are photographs and historic Ordnance Survey maps. In both cases the evidence is incomplete. A new garden has been designed which uses some of the axial and compartment relationships seen on this evidence but mainly it seeks to recreate the character of formal enclosures and appropriate planting within this area. The area is intended to form an appropriate character for a country house garden associated with a house of status such as Windlestone Hall.'</p> <p>This clarifies the intended approach to the development of the new garden proposed within the RPG. An indicative layout is however not sufficient to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>make proper conclusions from at this stage. The evidence may well be incomplete but an opportunity now arises to add to that evidence by improving the recording of what survives (as a minimum requirement) and ideally using that information to inform the new proposals. Perhaps there is more detail to come further along in the planning process?</p> <p>As the scale of the historic Ordnance Survey plans and the existing/proposed overall site plans do not provide sufficient detail, and the current degree of survival needs to be represented, we would welcome a proper measured survey of the surviving garden elements within the area of the RPG which will be affected by the proposed development. The plans accompanying the Arboricultural Assessment document are of some assistance towards this end. It may be that this is in hand and will be forthcoming but until this is available it is not possible to give a proper conclusion as to what will be lost by redevelopment.</p> <p>Similarly, the more detailed survey and analysis of the existing landscape that we advocate could include techniques such as Lidar. Such work might reveal earlier features and ground modelling, and it would be important to identify and possibly incorporate these in any reworked garden layout. The designer of that new landscape might embrace the opportunity of both respecting the geometry, form and content of past gardens, where they are significant, whilst also adding a contemporary and contextual twenty-first century layer, representative of this important phase in the life of Windlestone.</p> <p>Until more detail of the proposed garden and landscape layouts is available, based on thorough survey and analysis that can inform the design, it is not possible to reach a proper conclusion on the scheme as it affects the RPG. Within the grounds we would not wish the need for new events spaces (around new buildings designed for income generation) within a rather tight site, to overshadow the need for conservation. If those architectural matters are satisfactory to the local authority, we hope that by the imposition of landscape conditions or reserved matters on any planning and listed building approvals, this essential investigation of the existing gardens can proceed in tandem with work on the buildings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Athelhampton	Dorset	E20/1312	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 3 phase substation following	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory



				<p>approval of Renewable Energy scheme for the estate.          ATHELHAMPTON HOUSE,          ATHELHAMPTON ROAD          ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. Planning approval has already been granted for elements of the energy-efficient proposals at Athelhampton : the PV array at the back of the greenhouses in the service yard, and the ground source heat-loop under the main lawn. The two additional proposed elements will be permanent features within the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG). The substation will not be visible from the public garden although it does lie within the RPG. The site of the Tesla battery building will, we presume (having been unable to undertake a site visit), only be visible from the riverside board walk if you walk in an anti-clockwise direction, which most visitors do not. We also assume that since these additional elements were not part of the first application, the original proposals were deemed insufficient and the system has had to be slightly reassessed subsequently in order to work at maximum efficiency.</p> <p>We concur with Historic England's recommendations for various mitigation measures.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,          Margie Hoffnung          Conservation Officer</p>
Beaminster Manor	Dorset	E20/1343	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION          Provision of a temporary construction compound, to service a water mains upgrade project. The temporary compound will be reinstated upon completion. LAND NORTH OF, 44-54 THE GREEN, BEAMINSTER. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to this proposed development. The application has the potential to affect the parkland area linked to the Beaminster Manor House, a site listed Grade II by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. It is authorised by the GT to respond on its behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This application is on the southern edge of the parkland, which extends from the Manor House itself northeast up the slope to the eyecatcher some 950 metres distant. The eyecatcher itself is not formally included within the national designation but is included in the Dorset Garden Trust's Local List.</p> <p>This proposal is temporary in operation, and is for important infrastructure. The Trust has no objection to this proposal relating to its</p>

					particular interest, subject to a condition requiring the land to be returned to its existing state, and thus suitable for continued agricultural use. Chris Clarke
New Hall, Boreham	Essex	E20/1341	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 6 residential Lodges. Localised external works and alteration to position of on site access road. Ormond House, New Hall School, The Avenue, Boreham, Chelmsford CM3 3HS. EDUCATION	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.12.2020</b> I am commenting on behalf of the Essex Gardens Trust representing The Gardens Trust. New Hall is a grade I listed building set in a registered landscape, representing the site of a royal palace located in a former park with elements of a designed landscape around the house. This historic site is under considerable pressure, located between extensive new residential development to the west and gravel quarries to the east. Added to this are the expansionist plans of the school which occupies the historic building and seems unaware of its responsibilities to the heritage assets and the constraints that these might place upon its growth plans. This is reflected in the absence, as with previous applications, of a heritage statement. Bunkhouses such as the ones proposed are not a long term solution to problems of staff accommodation, nor are they in keeping with a site such as this. They would not look like the low key agricultural-type outbuildings they are intended to resemble. We would like to register an objection to this application. David Andrews
Danson Park	Greater London	E19/1478	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of the existing dwellings and erection of a part 1/2/3 storey building to provide a 70 bedroom nursing home, with associated access alterations, car and cycle parking, landscaping and amenity space. 2, 4, 6 And 8 Danson Road, Bexleyheath, Kent. DEMOLITION, INSTITUTION	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2020</b> Thank you for alerting The Gardens Trust (GT) to amendments on the above application which we originally responded to on 11th February 2020. We maintain our strong objection, in particular, to the two-storey elevation stretching along the park entrance. We do not feel that the retained hedgerow will mitigate the visual impact of this new building upon the setting of Danson Park, and the contemporary style fencing indicated is also very alien to the aesthetic of the park. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
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	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We are responding to both the above applications in one letter as they are inextricably linked. A colleague made a site visit over

				<p>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>	<p>the weekend and the following comments are based on their observations and the supplied online documentation.</p> <p>We disagree with the developer's assessment of magnitude of impact and the significance of effect upon the Registered Parks &amp; Gardens (RPG) of Grade II* Osterley, Grade I Kew and Grade I Syon Park. In our opinion, their assessment of significance of effect is inaccurate for its appraisal of the effect on views from all three, unrealistically minimising the effect and damage inflicted, and omitting a number of key views.</p> <p>Osterley Park will be the worst affected, suffering the greatest physical change. Paradoxically, the impact on the significance of Osterley is not necessarily as great as on Kew World Heritage Site (WHS) or Syon (within the WHS zone and which has potential for inclusion in the WHS). Even so, at Osterley these are major incursions into what is still an Arcadian haven in a busy part of west London. The flat park has the feel of heathland: i.e. expansive with extensive sweeps of sky space. The schemes by rising above it offend the designed spirit of place in that sense. While big buildings have appeared around the site - GSK, Kew Eye - these are further away and lower than the proposals. The current proposals will have a considerably greater effect than these existing developments.</p> <p>At Osterley, using the Gillette Tower as a reference point (as the developments will be taller and will flank it), it is apparent that the development of the Tesco site will be more damaging than that at Homebase as it is nearer and larger. In this respect View 7 is misleading as the view chosen, and View 8 shows clearly that the buildings will be highly visible. View 10, euphemistically called 'bridleway', is historically the main London approach to the mansion across the park, from the south-east from Osterley Lane and Wyke Green, and has been for centuries. The NT, it seems, made the current south drive the main approach, but this drive was later, built in the 1880s, as the railway station approach. The SE Wyke Green entrance gateway for which drawings survive in the Soane Museum (all listed). The developments will be seen in south-easterly views alongside this ensemble viewed along the exit from the mansion, as shown by the photos supplied in the TVIAs. This is perhaps most serious for this site as the drive is the most important historic approach, and it affects the listed Adam gateway/lodges.</p> <p>The views the developers have identified at Osterley are not the only ones there which will be damaged. The 1880s south drive, now used as the main</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>drive, will also 'enjoy' multiple views of the development to the east. There may be an effect on the north drive from which the tower is sporadically visible along it.</p> <p>The pleasure ground west of the mansion also needs to be checked despite apparent dense screening by trees. My colleague was unable to assess this aspect to ascertain whether the Gillette tower could be seen from the pleasure ground walk behind/west of the mansion. Views from the lake at the SE corner of the pleasure ground walk and from the Cedar Grove should also be checked. Finally, there is no consideration of views from the park north of the M4. This should also be reviewed.</p> <p>We urge your officers to require that these views are added to the TVIA so the damage can be realistically assessed. Please see attached photos below which support our opinion above.</p> <p>Turning to Syon Park, from the submitted TVIAs, representative views shown in the Syon Lane Homebase Visual Impact Assessment (SLHVIA), representative views 13, 14 and 15 all indicate that the new structures will appear in the skyline, considerably damaging the setting of Syon. Views will be affected at multiple points along the south drive and from the adjacent park, View 14 from the Syon Park South Drive being especially intrusive and damaging. The Tesco TVIA's illustrative renders show a similar picture. We disagree with the applicant's assessment that (SLHVIA view 8) this impact is 'minor to moderate adverse' and other similar comments appraising the damage to the views referred to above. We consider the strong cluster of buildings, in particular the tall Homebase, will have a considerably damaging effect on these important views. We strongly disagree with the conclusions of the Heritage Statement which says that the proposed scheme will 'on balance, preserve the setting of the heritage assets and not cause harm to their heritage significance.' Should this permanent visual intrusion into what until now has been a largely unspoilt setting on the edge of London be permitted, it will set an unwelcome precedent for further commercial development to be allowed to cause damage in similar manner. The loss of significance to these unique and irreplaceable heritage assets is in no way compensated by public benefit.</p> <p>We have seen the letter regarding this application from Dr Sarah Rutherford dated 17th November 2020 setting out the effects upon Kew and Syon in particular. To avoid duplication, we are not repeating the points she made in this correspondence but wish to have it on record that we entirely endorse her comments. We have grave concerns that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>additional views, as yet unaddressed, are likely to be harmed, especially from the riverside by the Royal Botanic Garden, Kew. We urge your officers to ask the applicant to provide further views analysis in order to obtain a full and objective understanding of the effects on these landscapes. The Gardens Trust strongly objects to the above applications.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</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. HOMEBASE LTD, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5QE. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2020</b> As per E20/0868 above</p>
Grosvenor Square	Greater London	E20/1171	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Display of public art installation for a temporary period, until 1st July 2021. Grosvenor Square Gardens, Grosvenor Square, London, W1K 6LD. SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have looked at the online documentation for this art installation and have some concerns that this very large and brightly coloured sculpture may be mistaken for play equipment and not be sufficiently sturdy to withstand children climbing on it. Were this application for actual play equipment as large and brightly coloured as this installation, within the grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Grosvenor Square Gardens, we would object, as its visual prominence would in our opinion, negatively effect the setting of a Grade II registered park and garden. We hope that</p>

					<p>this temporary structure does not set a precedent for similar installations of this great size and dominance within the RPG in future.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
<p>Stockley Park:  Business park  Phases I and II,  and country park  and golf course</p>	<p>Greater  London</p>	<p>E20/1199</p>	<p>II</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Demolition of existing buildings and use of site as bus depot with new office/welfare building, bus wash and fueling facilities with access from Dawley Road. THE COTTAGE IN THE WALL, DAWLEY ROAD HAYES.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2020</b></p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk">www.londongardensonline.org.uk</a> Stockley Park entry pending) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). For further information, we refer you to the list entry for Stockley Park (<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1466074">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1466074</a>). The site which is subject to these proposals is surrounded by the landscape listing but was not included. For this reason, we are more concerned with the impact of the proposed changes on the character, appearance, and enjoyment of the listed landscape. The design &amp; access document includes details of the wall which may be a remnant of the original farm but carries no assessment of the impact of the new use and new boundary treatments on the wider landscape. For example, how visible is the site from the business park and golf course? Will the noise and spray from the high-pressure wash be audible and visible across the park? Will any noise, water spray and increased vehicle movements impact on the wildlife surrounding the site and wider enjoyment of views and the walkers/workers experience of the landscape? These issues need to be carefully considered to ensure developments do not damage the character of the listed landscape and this includes 'remedial' measures such as tall acoustic fences.</p> <p>Stockley Park is a nationally important designed landscape newly Registered grade II, with 'survival' among the principal reasons for designation – the listing states:</p>

					<p>* carefully established and consistent design parameters have made for a unified and consistent landscape and, despite the redevelopment of some buildings and modifications to their immediate landscape context, overall, the original design is well-preserved and maintained.</p> <p>It is impossible to judge from the application documents submitted what the impact of the proposals will be on the wider landscape.</p> <p>We would hope that any identified issues can be dealt with and for this reason we do not formally object at this time, but the LGT considers the information included in this planning application to be insufficient to determine the impact of the proposals on the listed landscape on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no assessment, including plans, photos, and sections, showing the site within the wider designated landscape.</li> <li>• The noise, water spray and run off from the new cleaning facility could have a significant harmful impact on the character of the designated park and surrounding trees and wildlife. The acoustic fence to the north could increase the noise directed towards the open parkland.</li> <li>• Tree groups G1 and G2 just outside the site boundary are presumably key to minimising the impact of the works on the surrounding parkland, yet the levels next to them are proposed to change by approx. 0.5m within the root zone. In addition, the existing fence line is stated as 1m from the trunks of the trees which mean the demolition of existing boundaries and replacement with new could put this important tree screen at risk. How are important surrounding trees to be protected?</li> <li>• New 3m high boundary treatments could harm key views and be detrimental to the quality and coherence of the rest of the listed park.</li> </ul> <p>We would be grateful to be advised when further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely,  Rose Wakelin  Planning Conservation Project Officer  For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group  planning@londongardenstrust.org  c.c. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust</p>
Harrow Park (Formerly Flambards)	Greater London	E20/1216	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Hard surfacing to create footpath between athletic track and golf course. 5 Land south of football	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2020</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the</p>

				<p>Lane Harrow HA1 3HP. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY OUTCOME 02.12.2020 Granted</p>	<p>Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Harrow Park (Harrow School) * (londogardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>For further information, we refer you to the list entry for Harrow Park – HARROW PARK (FORMERLY FLAMBARDS), Non Civil Parish - 1001424   Historic England</p> <p>It is with some consternation that I see a decision notice granting approval for this application was issued yesterday 2 December 2020. This is something of a surprise given we did not receive notification of the application until 25 November 2020. I see this was because a hard copy of the original notification was sent out to our offices which are, not unexpectedly, shut due to Covid restrictions.</p> <p>The fact that there have been no external consultation responses to this application thus far would suggest to me that we are not the only organisation which received the notification too late to respond.</p> <p>The London Gardens Trust objects to this application for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Over design of a simple temporary access path</li> <li>2. Lighting is not required, since they do not play golf in the dark</li> <li>3. Lighting and the light fittings will impact detrimentally on the quiet historic character of the listed park</li> </ol> <p>Harrow Park is a significant park under growing development pressure and incremental changes such as those included in this application have cumulative detrimental impact on the historic character protected via the designation.</p> <p>Your report does not acknowledge that lighting across the park has been rejected before for very similar reasons outlined above, see P/0903/12.</p> <p>Could you please send me instructions for how to have this recorded as a formal complaint into the handling of the public consultation for this application. This application was approved in error and should not be seen as a precedent for future applications for intrusive lighting and urbanisation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>Yours Sincerely,  Rose Wakelin  Planning Conservation Project Officer  For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group  planning@londongardenstrust.org  c.c. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer, The Gardens Trust  c.c. Alison Allighan, Conservation Casework Manager, The Gardens Trust  c.c. Mrs Burke, Harrow Planning Department, Access Harrow</p> <p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.12.2020</b>  We notified your department about the difficulties of receiving very late planning notifications, as you inexplicably still seem to notify us by post at our office which is now unmanned due to Covid, and post is only forwarded approximately once a month. We were assured by Mrs Burke that we are now email consultees, and my colleague Alison Allighan also emailed you about the extremely late notification of the above application by post but to date you have not responded. It is therefore disappointing and extremely surprising that the above application should have been decided on 2nd December, the day before our colleagues in the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust had the opportunity to respond. We concur entirely with all the comments made in Rose Wakelin's letter to you and share her concerns that the application was approved without the usual opportunity for your officers to take into consideration comments of statutory consultees. We object to the application for the same reasons that Ms Wakelin outlined in her letter.  We will be making an official complaint about what we perceive to be procedural errors and I am also contacting other statutory consultees to see whether they also had the same problems that we did.  We would be grateful if you were able to acknowledge this letter and that of Alison Allighan, to assure us that this will not happen again.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer  cc The Georgian Group; Historic England; London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust</p>
Westminster City Plan	Greater London	E20/1366	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Main Modifications consultation	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2020</b>  Main Modification MM39 Policy 40  The London Gardens Trust finds itself in the unfortunate position of strongly objecting to the proposed modification of Policy 40 (previously</p>

				<p>numbered Policy 38). We refer to the main modifications <a href="https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/core_028_main_modifications_typo.pdf">https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/core_028_main_modifications_typo.pdf</a></p> <p>We have participated in the development of the Local Plan in good faith since 2017 and have been supportive in our contributions. In response to the Reg 19 consultation we:</p> <p>“Welcome comprehensive approach taken in Policy 40 &amp; in particular the rewording of Policy 40Q;”</p> <p>The Main Modification proposes one major change and some minor editing.</p> <p>Insertions in italics</p> <p>Amend clause Q to read: REGISTERED HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS</p> <p>Q. Proposals affecting Westminster’s registered historic parks, gardens and open spaces will safeguard their special historic interest, integrity, character and appearance, and protect their settings and significant views from and towards these spaces.</p> <p>Grounds for our objection and conclusion that the plan is unsound</p> <p>1 The proposed modification has totally undermined our contributions to the consultations and development of policy since 2017. The addition of the one word “Registered” has completely altered the meaning and application of the policy.</p> <p>In effect, the policy which we have supported all along has been deleted. Heritage assets of valued parks, gardens and open spaces no longer have the protection that was intended, supported by specific criteria.</p> <p>2 We were unaware there were objectors to this policy. Previous rounds of consultation involved supporters of the policy and minor improvements were made.</p> <p>The wider community will be unaware of the deletion of the policy.</p> <p>3 The deletion of the original Policy 40 (previously Policy 38) leaves the open landscape category of heritage asset without the protection and guidance which the previous drafts of the local plan indicated would be the policy position. Consultees have not been given the chance to consider the effect of the Local Plan without this policy.</p> <p>4 The policy now duplicates National Planning policy.</p> <p>5 The modified policy is a new policy which has not been through the appropriate consultation channels.</p> <p>6 We cannot trace where the insertion of “Registered” has come from. It must be a misunderstanding of the intent of the policy.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Planning and Conservation Working Group  London Gardens Trust  Duck Island Cottage  St James's Park  London SW1A 2BJ  planningresponses@londongardenstrust.org</p>
<p>Leigh Park  (Staunton Country Park)</p>	<p>Hampshire</p>	<p>E20/1151</p>	<p>II*</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid application seeking: 1) Full Planning permission for Development of a reservoir for raw water storage, A pumped storage reservoir, with the minimum required total storage capacity of 8,700 million litres (MI), to support the planned bulk supply transfer of at least 21MI/d in extreme (currently defined as 1:200 year) drought conditions; Construction of an earth embankment adjacent to Staunton Country Park ; Construction of an overflow discharge/spillway at the south-western side of the reservoir and associated works; Construction of a new junction on the B2149 Manor Lodge Road and a new junction on Swanmore Road. Provision of viewing areas on the southern embankment and western edge of the reservoir. 2) Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) control house partially incorporated within landscaped earth mounding</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b>  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. It is very unfortunate that the new reservoir will destroy part of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Leigh Park and truncate the avenue. However, we appreciate that there is very little option for alternative suitable locations for the reservoir. We very much regret the loss of ancient woodland but have to accept that the public benefit outweighs the substantial damage to the RPG, and the new reservoir, if permitted, will stop water extraction from important chalk streams. We would suggest that suitable discreet interpretation be sited on the viewing area to enable visitors to understand the lost landscape.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>

				<p>adjacent to the south west embankment; together with provision of other earth embankments. Construction of a visitor centre / cafe, with storage areas and welfare facilities to the northwest of the reservoir to be used for recreational and education purposes; Provision of picnic area(s) and children's play area(s). Access routes from both junctions to the visitor car park; visitor car park comprising 193 car parking spaces and between 70 and 75 overflow spaces plus spaces for staff, coach/minibus and disabled drivers sited to the north west of the reservoir. Creation of a permanent wetland on the northern side of the reservoir and construction of bird watching hide/screen(s); recreational facilities for public amenity. Provision of perimeter tracks and a network of bridleways, cycle paths and footpaths; Construction of a slipway on the western bank of the reservoir for operational use only and a small section of the proposed pipeline (210m). Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Middle Park Way, Havant.</p> <p>HYBRID</p>	
Central Parks	Hampshire	E20/1162	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of the former Bargate Shopping Centre and</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

				<p>multi-storey car park, 77-101 Queensway, 25 East Street, 30-32 Hanover Buildings, 1-16 East Bargate and 1-4 High Street, excluding frontage) for mixed use development comprising 519 new homes (use class C3) and commercial uses (use class E) and drinking establishment/bar uses (Sui Generis), in new buildings ranging in height from 4-storeys to 13-storeys, with associated parking and servicing, landscaping and public realm (Environmental Impact Assessment Development affects a public right of way and the setting of the listed Town Walls). Bargate Shopping Centre and adjoining land In Queensway, East Street, Hanover Buildings and High Street Southampton SO14 1HF. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The GT objected to application 18/01515 which this new application supercedes. In September 2018 we said :’ 18/01515/FUL seeks changes to consented application 16/01303 Bargate Centre redevelopment, replacing some student accommodation with normal housing and to increase the height of new development at the eastern end of the site. ...The new application proposes a height of 12 storeys as opposed to the previous 9 on Block E which overlooks Houndwell Park. We are concerned that what has already been permitted will mean another building visible from within the Park. Adding the extra floors increases that visual intrusion. Surrounding buildings should be of a height which gives enclosure without interfering with views from inside the Parks. This application seeks to add yet another intrusive building and should be amended to avoid this effect. The GT objects to the increased height as it will further detract from the significance of Houndwell Park and have a detrimental visual impact upon the Grade II* Central Parks.’</p> <p>In our opinion, the revised application compounds an application which already adversely affected the Grade II* Central Parks, by adding yet more height to the blocks, further increasing visual intrusion, especially from Houndwell Park and further afield from Palmerston and Hoglands Parks. The tall buildings which already obtrude above the tree-line from within the parks will be further compounded by this revised application.</p> <p>The GT OBJECTS to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Witley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E20/1082	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Four portacabins within service yard to provide temporary staff welfare facilities. Retrospective permission for chemical store. Witley Court Worcester Road Great Witley WR6 6JT. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hereford &amp; Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&amp;WGT) and please consider this a joint response.</p> <p>We appreciate the problems which have delayed Historic England finding a more permanent solution to providing staff facilities at Witley Court. Once the long-term proposals have been finalised we look forward to commenting on them. Although the service yard does not visually connect</p>

					<p>with the RPG it is part of the Witley story and retains various historic elements, so it is hoped that ultimately a solution can be found which does not compromise the setting or significance of the Registered Park &amp; Garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Garnons	Hereford and Worcester	E20/1282	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters, save access, reserved for the erection of three detached two storey family houses. Land at Byford Grain Store, Byford Common, Byford, Herefordshire. HR4 7JZ. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2020</b></p> <p><i>This development is just across the main road from the Garnons Registered landscape park. We appreciate that Byford is an estate village but this development is on the fringe of the historic parkland designed by Humphry Repton. He intended the view across the new road (now the main road), which was removed from just below the mansion, to be hidden from view in a sunken position. This made it appear that the parkland continued across the road. Even today this area is dotted with mature trees to give an illusion, from the house, that the park continued [See Jane Bradney in 'In the Enemy's Quarters' – Hereford Art Gallery, Repton Exhibition Catalogue (2018), pp. 34-5]. This development is thus an intrusive element in the Repton landscape. It flanks a rather sweet cottage built as a cottage orne in the mid 19thc but now extended. If the development had been integrated into the village of Byford, it might have been acceptable but here it impinges upon a grade 11* landscape park. Permission should be refused.</i></p> <p>Best wishes, David Whitehead for the HWGT</p>
Stansted Bury Briggens	Hertfords hire	E19/0398	II II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning with all matters reserved apart from external vehicular access for the redevelopment of the site through the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a residential led mixed use development comprising up to 8,500 residential homes including market and affordable homes; retirement homes and extra care facilities; a range of community uses including primary and secondary schools, health centres and nursery facilities; retail and related uses; leisure facilities; business and commercial uses; open space and public realm; sustainable urban drainage systems; utility and energy</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2020</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, has authorised HGT to respond to planning issues on its behalf.</p> <p>We remain deeply concerned that this outline application fails to take due care to protect the historic environment from harm. Historic England has outlined the matters affecting designated heritage assets and their settings with which we concur. However, there are undesignated or unrecorded heritage assets, particularly in the area of Village 7 which is the site of Henry VII's renaissance park which has been designated in part of the Ponds but has other features not yet evaluated</p> <p>New details in this application, such as more floodlit playing provision and car parking, which further harm the setting of these assets and the assets themselves. Our comments of 2 July 2020 by the GT Conservation officer, have not been addressed and our objection to this proposal thus stands.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

				facilities and infrastructure; waste management facilities; vehicular bridge links; creation of new vehicular and pedestrian accesses into the site, and creation of a new vehicular, pedestrian and cycle network within the site; improvements to the existing highway and local road network; undergrounding and diversion of power lines; lighting; engineering works, infrastructure and associated facilities; together with temporary works or structures required by the development. Land North of the Stort Valley and the A414, Gilston, Hertfordshire. MAJOR HYBRID	
52 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1251	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Atlas Cedar (T1) - Fell. Fell Atlas Cedar (T1 on diagram) due to excessive shading, overhang of surrounding buildings causing damage and low amenity value. Photo shows the position on the boundary between 52 parkway, 50 parkway & garages to the rear. This tree has now grown out of control and caused significant damage to the garage rooves over the summer. Linked to 6/2020/3012/TC 52 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HH. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. No supporting information is given as to the damage the application form states is being caused by this tree and no advice has been sought from the council. We cannot, therefore, comment but trust that WHBC will be in possession of this information and arboricultural advice and take this into account. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street	Hertfords hire	E20/1265	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of single storey extension to link with converted garage. Green	<b>CGT WIRTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have researched Ponsbourne Park from its earliest recorded date as Gracelyns Park through to the present day. Green Lodge is one of the few

				Lodge, Ponsbourne Park, Newgate Street, Hertford SG13 8NH. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>identifiable 18th century park buildings remaining largely unaltered.</p> <p>However, we consider the plans to be sensitive to the historic building. If it is necessary, as stated in the Design and Access Statement, to provide the extension due to special circumstances, then we would have no objections to the plans as proposed in this application.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1304	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>1 x Oak to reduce lateral growth towards No.17 by 3m extending full height of the tree</p> <p>1 x Oak to reduce lateral growth towards No.16 by 3m extending full height of the tree</p> <p>1 x Hornbeam opposite No. 17 to reduce by 3m in height and 2m width.</p> <p>1 x Hornbeam by garage of 16 to reduce lateral growth by 2.5m. Reduce over extending limb to right hand side by 3.5m. Reduce over extended limb to left by 3m.</p> <p>1 x Hornbeam opposite No.15 to reduce lateral growth by 2.5m</p> <p>1 x Oak to reduce lateral growth towards No.14. Reduce lowest large limb by around 4m. Reduce remaining by 3m extending full height of the tree. Remove major deadwood from throughout crown</p> <p>1 x Hornbeam on corner of road to reduce by 2.5m in height and width. To clear parking bay. Check ratchet strap supporting limb for security.</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 15.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The very limited amount of information available on the website about the extensive works proposed for mature trees, part of historic Sherrardswood Park, and their condition, does not enable us to comment. We trust that the WHBC has further information and will take the heritage values of the trees into consideration, alongside amenity and other concerns.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>



				<p>1 x Hornbeam on entrance road to remove major deadwood from throughout crown.</p> <p>1 x Oak on front corner of entrance to clear phone wire by 1m where possible, prune back limbs over parking area by 2m.</p> <p>Remove major deadwood from throughout crown.</p> <p>19 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JQ. TREES</p>	
13 Willow Grove, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire		N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 3 x Oaks to reduce by 1.5m height &amp; width. 13 Willow Grove, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NA. TREES</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. The trees noted in this application are part of the historic Sherrardswood Park. There is no information as to the reasons for the pruning of these oaks, nor has advice been sought from WHBC. We cannot, therefore, make any comment.</p> <p>We trust that WHBC will have this information and the arboricultural advice of their Tree Officer.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E20/1352	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 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>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The property sits within the Registered Park of Brocket Hall but is screened by woodland from the historic views. Our comments on 6/2020/3015/LAWP of 25 November 2020, that as long as adequate screening remains in place, we had no objections on heritage grounds, still pertain to this current application.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
52 & 54 Bridge Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1360	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of two, two-storey detached houses with accommodation in the roof space and associated parking and access on the land to the rear of 52 &amp; 54 Bridge Road. 52 &amp; 54</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.12.2020</b></p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The cottages at 52/54 Bridge Road are a pair of estate cottages built by Earl Cowper in 1876 on the edge of Sherrards Park Wood, which has been in existence since at least 1599. Bridge Road itself is the southern boundary of these historic woodlands and has been for centuries. These cottages are noted in the WGC CA Appraisal.</p>

				Bridge Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UR. BUILDING ALTERATION	Development to the rear of these cottages would severely harm the setting of the cottages, which pre-date the Garden City, both in the approach to it via the proposed drive and the destruction of the rear woodland aspect. It would , in addition, be an intrusion into an area which has formed part of the historic woodland for years and introduce a built element close to the line of the old railway, currently a green walk for the residents of the Garden City. We consider this development inappropriate and harmful in the location. Kate Harwood
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E20/1366		PLANNING APPLICATION. Erection of three agricultural barns at Goldings rare Breed Farm, Bramfield Road, Hertford SG14 2HZ	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 14.12.20</b> The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks & gardens, has authorised HGT to respond to planning matters in Hertfordshire on its behalf. Goldings Park is Grade II on the Historic England Register and the site in this application lies at the head of Goldings canal, a designed focus for views from the house and across the parkland. We note that this is the third application for barns in 2 years, the previous ones being refused. We are concerned that the applicant has provided no supporting documents for the statements in the application, nor supplied a Heritage Impact Statement, on both the listed mansion and the registered landscape, as detailed in the NPPF, Chapter 16, let alone mentioned the designated heritage asset. Recent EHDC determinations of planning applications at Goldings, including the 2 previous barn proposals for this site, have included consideration of the historic landscape. Appendix E of PPG7, still on HMG's planning website, states that PD rights for agricultural buildings should take into account listed buildings and other heritage assets. We trust that EHDC will continue this good practice, in line with the HA8 Policy, in determining this application. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Nos 1,3 & 3A Russellcroft Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1386	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Remove existing privet hedge due to continuous die back and replace with new Photinia (Red Robin) hedge. Nos 1,3 & 3A Russellcroft	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We have no objection to the replacement of the hedge along Russellcroft Road, due to continuous dieback, However, the choice of replacement species is out of character with the surrounding vegetation and the Garden City aesthetic. Photinia would

				Road, Welwyn Garden City, Herts. TREES	introduce a discordant colour intrusion into this important 'gateway' which is part of the Arts & Crafts design of this part of the town (Russellcroft, Howardsgate and Parkway). We would suggest that the hedge be of a more traditional (green) colour to preserve the historic integrity of this area. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Bayfordbury	Hertfords hire	E20/1413	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of part of building from agriculture to storage of machinery and building materials at Home Farm, Bayford Lane, Bayford, SG13 8PR	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust. HGT has been authorised by the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, to respond to planning issues on its behalf in Hertfordshire. Home Farm lies within the Registered Grade II early 19th century parkland of Bayfordbury and in proximity to the Grade II Listed walled kitchen garden, originally screened from parkland and garden by a substantial tree belt. The application is for internal re-use of one of the buildings at Home Farm and we would have no objection to that change of use, providing that materials and machinery storage is kept within the building and does not contribute to further clutter around the buildings. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Lynsted Court	Kent	E20/1258	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Renovations to walled garden including removal of 1980s concrete tractor shed building and storage shed from within the walled garden and erection of new timber carriage barn outside walled garden to house tractors and estate equipment. Erection of replacement glass house. Installation of ceramic "passive" swimming pool. Erection of an oak timber garden pavilion with adjoining oak pergola. Renovation and conservation of heritage brick walls. Lynsted Park House, Lynsted Park, Lynsted,	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to the proposed renovations to the walled garden at Lynsted Park House, Lynsted Park, Sittingbourne. The Kent Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Kent Gardens Trust have reviewed the information provided in this application and wish to make the following comments. The documentation provided demonstrates that considerable thought has been given to this proposal to preserve and enhance this listed Grade II Walled Garden, to ensure this heritage asset is restored and conserved. The use of a Landscape Architect, together with a Restoration Specialist and consultation with Historic England during the development of this proposal, has ensured that the walled garden garden will realise its full potential as part of the restoration of Lynsted Park House and its surrounding grounds. Therefore, Kent Gardens Trust wishes to support this application.

				Sittingbourne, Kent. WALLED GARDEN	Kind regards Mike O'Brien Co Chairman Kent Gardens Trust
Bradgate Park	Leicesters hire	E20/1183	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Siting of marquee adjacent to Deer Barn Cafe between 1st October and 30th April each year. Deer Barn Cafe, Bradgate Park, Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford, LE6 0HE. MARQUEE	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Leicestershire Gardens Trust who have recently visited the site and this is a joint response informed by their local knowledge.</p> <p>The online documentation is very sparse. The application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden of Bradgate Park. We would therefore have expected to see a heritage statement or some indication of what impact the proposals would be likely to have on the RPG, even if the application is only temporary. We presume that this structure is felt necessary for social distancing reasons during Covid, but there is nothing to enable us to understand the reasoning behind this application. The existing café is in the middle of the Park along the main path which runs from Newtown Linford to Cropston. It is an attractive single storey building which is built of the local stone and sits well in the landscape. There is nothing to indicate what colour the proposed marquee will be. If it is large and white, in our opinion it will be visually intrusive when looking down from the hillside above. We would prefer it if the marquee were in an 'earthy' colour or other recessive tone.</p> <p>We feel unable to comment satisfactorily without more information and without knowing if this is planned to be an annual thing, and if so for how many years. Without any information as to how this application might affect the setting and significance of Bradgate Park we feel this application fails NPPG paras 189 and 190.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Quenby Hall	Leicesters hire	E20/1193	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Proposed redevelopment of the redundant unlisted stable block and courtyard to form a Gardener's	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have consulted with our colleagues in the</p>

				<p>Courtyard to serve the main dwelling at Quenby Hall comprising part demolition of unlisted outbuildings and adjacent structures, erection of new buildings around a courtyard to accommodate a glass house, open barn, machine store and staff facilities and the construction of associated landscape works. Proposals to include demolition and construction work in the vicinity of the Listed Garden Wall. Formation of a new service access road, alterations to existing driveways, removal of existing recently constructed wall, cattle grid and gate piers, reinstatement of original ha-ha wall, and associated landscape works., Quenby Hall, Barley Leas, Hungarton, Leicestershire. HYBRID</p>	<p>Leicestershire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and are glad to note that should this application be permitted, the current access over the HaHa will be removed and the HaHa reinstated. We can also see that the reorganisation of the horticultural facilities will be beneficial to the running of the estate. We note too that the replacement buildings will be considerably lower than the existing structures and site more discreetly within the Grade II RPG. The mature oak tree is a feature of this part of the RPG and we are pleased to see this will be retained.</p> <p>We have no further comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E20/1225	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to site 16no. mobile homes, provision of parking, erection of a visitors centre, raised timber walkways and associated works. PUTTING GREEN AND KIOSK ON FORESHORE, SOUTH PARADE, SKEGNESS, PE25 3HW. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and the plans would seem to have taken account of the existing topography to utilise this rather neglected site in a better way. The landscaping plans included indicate that the better trees will be retained, and additional infill planting is proposed to further mitigate the visual impact of the mobile homes. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) on the northern boundary of the application site has already been compromised by the buildings and tarmac on their eastern side and as long as the submitted landscaping plans are carried</p>

					<p>out, the trees and shrubs in appropriate places will mitigate any visual impact from the RPG. We would suggest that perhaps some additional planting on the western side of the garden could be incorporated as the roadway is very close to the garden and the offices do not appear to be shielded from the garden at all. As long as the quantity of mobile homes are not increased in future, and the planting is done with care, the GT/LGT have no additional comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
North Norfolk Local Plan	Norfolk	E20/1206	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN North Norfolk Local Plan: Autumn Newsletter 2020 <a href="https://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/tasks/planning-policy/local-plan-newsletters">https://www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/tasks/planning-policy/local-plan-newsletters</a></p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2020</b></p> <p>We thank you for sending the NNDC Autumn newsletter which has provided The Gardens Trust, in its role as a statutory consultee, the opportunity to review the NNDC Local Development Framework. The relevant documents have been examined by the Norfolk Gardens Trust and our comments are based on local knowledge of heritage parks and gardens in the LDF area.</p> <p>We note that the responses to the first draft local plan recommended a heritage assessment to be included in the revised draft. We look forward to receiving this document when it becomes available.</p> <p>In reviewing the plan, we have considered the nature and location of proposed residential and business developments in relation to both designated heritage sites and non-designated parks and gardens with heritage significance. In doing so, we note the National Planning Policy Framework's (NPPF, Section 16, Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, para 197) statement that the assessment of development proposals must have regard to 'the scale of any harm or loss and the significance' of a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>It follows that the effect of a development on non-designated heritage assets should be treated as a material planning consideration in development control, as it is with a local list of unlisted but significant heritage buildings.</p> <p>We wish to draw your attention to three specific sites that are identified on the LDF for development: Cromer (site code CO1) Runton Road, opposite The Marrams and Sunken Gardens.</p> <p>We note that this site is currently a parking area and that a high density, high-rise residential is proposed. The style of such a development might</p>

					<p>have a significant detrimental impact on the much-loved gardens at Cromer sea front.</p> <p>North Walsham (NW44) Paston College (The Lawns) site On the first edition OS 1:25 inch map (1841-1952), The Lawns is shown as having a small landscape garden in the heart of the town. Mature trees can be seen in what remains of the garden and we are encouraged to see that these have been specifically named for retention. We note that an associated building, which is currently a part of the school, is listed Grade II. It is important that the proposed retail, commercial and community development is sensitive to the surviving remnants of the garden and its setting.</p> <p>Briston (BRI02) Land west of Astley School We read that the proposed residential development is within 2 km from the boundary of Melton Constable Park, a Grade II* designated landscape, but does not appear to constitute a threat to the Park's setting. At the same time, we note the mention of possible further future development around this site which may have a detrimental impact and therefore wish to keep a watching brief on this.</p> <p>We ask that these three sites be identified on the local plan and that the Norfolk Gardens Trust is kept informed of development applications. Overall, we are impressed by the careful and sensitive selection of development sites to ensure that they do not negatively impact designated or non-designated parks and gardens, as at Happisburgh, Horning and Overstrand. In cases where there is such a danger, the Plan gives specific mention. For example, at Weybourne (WEY02) and Sheringham (SH06) it specifies that development must minimise the visual impact, having regard to the defined setting of Sheringham Park and the long views from within it.</p> <p>We are happy to assist with any questions you may have arising from this response, or more broadly concerning heritage parks and gardens within the NNDC area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Grice Norfolk Gardens Trust Member &amp; conservation team volunteer</p>
Capheaton	Northumb erland	E20/1201	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of redundant boathouse to holiday (glamping)	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

				<p>let. Boathouse South Of Sir Edwards Lake, Capheaton, Northumberland. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and this application seems a good and appropriate use for this modest and currently little used Edwardian building. It is well away from the Hall itself and there are few alterations to the lakeside elevations. Since the boathouse is to be used as a rather exclusive offer, we hope that there will be no future proposals for other glamping structures in the vicinity which we would have concerns about.</p> <p>We note that the Heritage Statement claims that the Lake was constructed in 1790, but it is in fact earlier, shown in 1769 for the first time on Armstrong's map of Northumberland.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make on this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</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><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for your explanatory e-mail of 14th December regarding the lack of consultation on the above which is next to the boundary of the registered H P &amp; G, within the setting.</p> <p>Although we are pleased that Henry Simpson's Barn is being repaired, we are concerned that instead of stone slates the re-roofing is being done with cement fibre profile sheet roofing panels with only a row of sandstone slates at eaves level. We would have thought that a barn that is sufficiently important to be grade II* listed and within the National Park, should be re-roofed in the stone slates for which Dales barns, houses, and many other buildings are characterised.</p> <p>In addition to the information in our letter of 8th November and the appended explanatory notes we would like to give further explanation and images which we trust will be helpful.</p> <p>We consider that if the barn repairs go ahead with the substitute materials as planned, the building will look wrong from the surrounding hills, the old track (see below), several rooms in the Hall, and the much-travelled visitor's route from the rock garden, to the small lake, particularly close to the Hall.</p> <p>The old track ie. the 'drive' to Parcevall Hall when Sir William Milner bought the property in the 1920's, came between the barn and the house,</p>



					<p>dropping down to the property from the Black Hill Road track, which is today a popular walking route. The barn would therefore have been proudly visible to travellers to the Hall for nearly 200 years. Sir William, despite building himself a completely new drive from Skyreholme, chose to retain the barn and track, planting up its banks close to the Hall to provide shelter for his main, new, garden whilst still providing excellent views of this historic structure from the new wing at first floor level, and from the Great Parlour of the Old Hall, as well as from his gardens. Fig 1 shows Sir William Milner's new wing at first floor level with windows looking towards Henry Simpson's barn</p> <p>We understand that in 1995 the estate was intent on removing the entire roof of the barn but were curtailed by the issue of a building preservation order and the barn being spot listed on the day that demolition began. By then about the half the slates of the roof had been removed. Since then, the other side has been far more exposed, especially its priceless ancient timbers and the structure has collapsed much faster due to its continuing neglect. It appears the remaining extant slates are no longer 'available' for resurrection.</p> <p>Design Features: Despite the stone walls to east and west, Sir William's garden design deliberately created many vistas through to the countryside beyond. Fig 2 showing one of these vistas. This is evident on both the top and second terraces, where the wooden gates are particularly 'see through'. Fig 3 shows Sir William's designed gate to allow views out to the countryside.</p> <p>Sir William's second, smaller gate still sits opposite a gap in the trees along the boundary. Fig 4</p> <p>From the west side of the top terrace, the main cross vista even allows a glimpse of 'heaven'; similar to Lawrence Johnston's vista through the Red Borders at Hidcote Gardens, Gloucestershire, (the first garden rather than a historic house with a garden, to be given to National Trust) that give views to pure sky flanked by iron gates.</p> <p>As we explained in the explanatory notes on 8th November, Henry Simpson's Barn is also carefully connected to the shelter belt when viewed from the lake. The planting was curved around the field edges.</p> <p>Fig 5 emphasises how deliberate the connection to the surrounding landscape was for Sir William's design. The gates' vistas show well and the photograph also shows that he laid out the garden so that Henry Simpson's barn featured in vistas from the main terraces.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We trust that the information that we have given underlines the reasons why we object to this listed building application in its present form ie the re-roofing materials. In our view it is not compliant with NPPF (February 2019) para 193 and 194.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Norton Conyers	North Yorkshire	E20/1144	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Structural repair of the clock tower on former stables building. Norton Conyers Hall, Norton Conyers, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 5EQ. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site 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>The park, pleasure grounds and garden at Norton Conyers is registered grade II. On the north-east side of the Hall (listed grade II*), a courtyard is formed by a single-storey range of former stables (17th C, 18th C, listed grade II) and an adjoining wall. The clock tower rises from the gabled south end of the range and is shown in a painting by Nicholas Dall of 1774 when the attached buildings were two- storeys in height. The clock tower with its cupola makes a statement in views of the house both close by and more distant, but is now in a bad state of repair due to rot and death watch beetle attack and is leaning severely.</p> <p>We are supportive of the clock being repaired - albeit with probable new workings - and trust that this will enable the clock tower and cupola to remain an important feature of Norton Conyers for many years to come.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1277	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Environmental Impact Assesemnt : Scoping Opinion for the development of a Business park , consisting of Use Class E , Including offices (previously B1a).</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in</p>

				<p>research and development (previously B1b). light industry (previously B1c) : start up units; Use Class B2 -General Industrial : Use Class B8-Storage and Distribution and ancillary uses including sui generis uses Drinking establishments and Sui generis hot food takeaway. Land To The South West Of Junction 47 Of The A1(M), Flaxby, North Yorkshire. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL</p>	<p>respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The land to the south west of Junction 47 of the A1M is within the wider setting of Allerton Park. Allerton Park remains on the Historic England (HE) 'Heritage at Risk' register: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/list-entry/26153">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/list-entry/26153</a> and it is likely to be negatively affected by the development of a Business Park in the proposed location.</p> <p>The Registered park includes a number of other designated heritage assets including Allerton Castle (grade I), Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), advises that the Environmental Statement should contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of heritage assets. We are concerned that the massing and scale of the proposed Business Park is likely to make it visible across a very large area, and therefore could affect the significance of the heritage assets even though the assets are across the A1M and junction to the north east.</p> <p>There is already an existing industrial complex and developing works just to the west of the proposed Business Park site, and this together with the Business Park will result in a wider negative impact on the landscape. We have noted the external consultations and fully support the various points raised by Historic England and the British Horse Society Harrogate Bridleways Association.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust would like to place on record our acute concern over the present pressures and developing potentials at this junction of the A1M and the consequent impact on the Historic Park and Garden at Allerton and its irreplaceable heritage assets.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E20/1159	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The re-organisation and upgrade of the existing Caravan Club Site to include the removal of 92 touring</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the</p>

				caravan pitches and demolition of existing site buildings, construction of replacement facilities and maintenance/housekeeping buildings with provision of static accommodation in the form of 36 Holiday Lodges. Bladon Chains Caravan Park, Bladon, Woodstock. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION	above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and please consider this a joint response. We have studied the online documentation for 20/02600/FUL, the static caravans pitch, which were in effect semi-permanent. The lodges might be more long-term structures but even they will have a shelf life and need renewal in due course. Due to the importance of the setting of the Grade I Blenheim landscape and World Heritage Site, we would suggest that the impact of the caravan club site be re-assessed, and that should your officers decide to grant permission, that it is for a temporary period of 25 years. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Badger Dingle	Shropshire	E20/1284	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a storage and fishing bait production building in association with 6No. existing fishing lakes. Proposed Storage Building NE Of Badger Hall, Badger, Wolverhampton, Shropshire. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust (SPGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. It is disappointing to have to yet again remind the applicant (see 20/03205/FUL) that a planning application within a registered park and garden (RPG) as here at Badger (Grade II) needs some kind of Heritage Impact Statement to enable your officers to ascertain what impact the proposed fishing bait production and storage shed may have on the historic designed landscape. In fact, there is no mention whatsoever of the RPG within the planning statement, and as such we are surprised that the application was validated. We would be grateful if you could ask the applicant to supply the missing application before this proposal is decided upon. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Cusworth Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/1210	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Section 73 application to remove conditions 3 (tree protection) & 4 (landscaping) of planning permission ref: 18/00361/FUL.	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Cusworth Park, a landscape park laid out 1761-5 by Richard Woods which is

				<p>Old Brewhouse, Cusworth Hall, Back Lane, Cusworth.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Cusworth Park (registered grade II) laid out by Richard Woods, was designed to provide the setting for Cusworth Hall (listed grade I) and much of his work survives. It lies within the Cusworth Conservation Area. The Old Brewhouse is situated to the west of the main building in the 'service' courtyard (listed grade II) and like the setting of the house, the parkland with its specimen trees and some shrubs, also comes up to the range of buildings that includes the Brewhouse. This range of buildings is alongside the main public approach to Cusworth Hall from the car park to the west and so is significant in the appreciation of the setting of the Hall. Cusworth Hall and Park are very significant heritage assets for the residents of Doncaster MBC and this part of Yorkshire.</p> <p>We have found the documents submitted with this application rather limited in information, particularly as we were not consulted on the original planning application. However, we have been able to access the original documents and agree with the amended landscaping which gives a much more informal layout, more sympathetic to the historic aesthetic. We support the advice of your Authority's Design and Conservation Officer and also suggest that thought is given to any extension of the informal seating area with further shrub planting if the brewhouse tap proves to be very popular. Fencing in this location would probably not be acceptable. We have no objection to this application to remove the above conditions for ref: 18/00361/FUL and hope that the enterprise is a success.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Brodsworth Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/1278	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for refurbishment of Target House. Brodsworth Hall, Brodsworth Estate Road, Brodsworth, Doncaster. REPAIR/RESOTATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Brodsworth Hall, which is registered grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such</p>

					<p>consultations.</p> <p>The Target House – listed grade II as the ‘Archery Pavilion’ – is a very attractive eyecatcher in a cottage ornee style and lies to the west of Brodsworth Hall (listed grade I, built 1861-3), in part of the gardens known as The Grove. The long open space to the south of the Target House was used as an archery range during the 1870’s and 1880’s by the Thellusson family. It is thought that the building may have 18th Century origins (perhaps connected with the now demolished earlier house.)</p> <p>After acquiring Brodsworth Hall in 1990, English Heritage began the long task of restoring and repairing the gardens including the Target House. The roof, barge boards, eaves, finials and rustic posts were replaced, replicating the surviving details. Masonry repairs were carried out, and a French drain was installed around the perimeter of the building to reduce the impact of run off from the surrounding banks. Internally, the walls were plastered, and a wooden floor and skirting boards installed.</p> <p>This planning application is for repairs to the 1990s interventions both externally and internally. To reduce deterioration of the rustic posts small padstones/flagstone will be inserted and the missing rustic posts will be reinstated. Internally proposed repairs include repairing plaster in a lime plaster and re-decoration of the walls in breathable (linseed oil) paint. The refurbishment of the windows will allow the windows to open, further enhancing significance and reconnecting the building with the garden. There will also be new interactive and family friendly interpretation of the Target House and new bespoke seating.</p> <p>The gardens at Brodsworth Hall are not only important as the setting of the Hall but are a significant example of Victorian design and horticulture and are much-visited and enjoyed by the public. We support the careful repairs/refurbishment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Keele Hall	Staffordshire	E20/1384	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Permanent installation of electrolyser and grid entry unit (as permitted under planning application 18/00456/FUL) at the sports field within the boundaries	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 22 December notifying Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust of this application. I am replying on behalf of both SGPT and The Gardens Trust in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two Trusts.</p> <p>The application site lies within the grade II listed Keele Hall Registered Park</p>

				<p>of Keele University. Keele University, Keele, Newcastle Under Lyme. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>and Garden. The historic landscape in this part of the park has been seriously degraded by previous development by the applicant such that little of its historic character remains apparent. To the south is the modern sports hall; to the north and west are modern fenced enclosures around sports courts; to the east open playing fields. The very industrial looking electrolyser plant which has been installed is a further harmful intrusion into and erosion of the significance of the historic park.</p> <p>While it is regrettable that temporary planning permission was granted for siting the apparatus here in 2018 (18/00456/FUL) that consent was for a temporary period only expiring in July 2020 after which the site was to be restored. The current application does not explain why the apparatus has not been dismantled. It is moreover singularly unfortunate that there is no statement justifying retention of the apparatus in this location nor any form of heritage appraisal as advised by paragraph 189 of the NPPF to assess the long term impact of the works on the historic park . The lack of such statements suggests a very cavalier attitude towards the heritage asset in its care by the applicant and it is unfortunate the application has been registered by your Council in their absence.</p> <p>The Trusts would wish to see the apparatus removed from this site in line with the 2018 permission and steps taken towards the enhancement of its historic character. We consider the permanent siting of the plant here would consolidate the degradation and harm to the significance of the heritage asset and are opposed to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman cc: Alison Allighan, TGT; Margie Hoffnung, TGT; Louise Wallace, NBC</p>
Babergh Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (JLP)	Suffolk	E20/1134	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN Publication stage. Representations on the Pre-Submission Joint Local Plan invited <a href="http://www.babergh.gov.uk/jointlocalplan">www.babergh.gov.uk/jointlocalplan</a> <a href="http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/jointlocalplan">www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/jointlocalplan</a> <a href="mailto:localplan@babermidsuffolk.gov.uk">localplan@babermidsuffolk.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b> Place Maps and Policies Chilton Pages 196-197 The Gardens Trust support the whitelisting of the Prolog/Caverswall site in order to avoid harm the adjacent heritage assets, in particular Chilton registered park and garden.</p>

				localplan@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E20/1368	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Planning Application. Erection of 2no dwellings (consisting of one new dwelling and a revised proposal for plot one of planning permission B/16/01406). Land South Of Chilton Grove, Waldingfield Road, Chilton, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 0PR. RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is dismayed and surprised to learn about your council's complete failure to notify us about related application B/16/01406. It is apparent from reading the online documentation accompanying DC/20/04342 that when coming to a decision about the previous application there was no consideration of heritage in the final judgement, and had you not been reminded of your statutory duty by Chilton Parish Council and Lady Hart of Chilton, the owner of the adjacent Grade II registered park and garden (RPR) directly across the road from the application site, it seems entirely possible that you would have neglected to let us know about this one either. We fail completely to understand how this can have happened as we have regularly commented upon applications affecting the RPG at Chilton over the past couple of years. We would appreciate immediate reassurance that such a breach of your statutory duty will not occur again. LPAs are required to consult The GT (formerly the Garden History Society) in relation to Grades I, II* and II registered sites and also Historic England in relation to Grades I and II* registered sites. Statutory consultation requirements have been in place since 1995 in relation to 'development likely to affect' registered parks and gardens. The requirement for consultation is currently set out in Article 18/Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Before granting planning permission for development, LPAs must consult the Gardens Trust and Historic England as explained in detail at <a href="http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk">http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk</a>. I am also attaching a copy of our planning leaflet which sets out guidance for local authorities in relation to this statutory duty.</p> <p>It is also clear from reading the online documentation that the applicant has paid scant regard to commitments made in the Design and Access (D&amp;A) statement accompanying B/16/01406 as far as protecting the hedgerow and trees which formerly screened the site. As there is neither a D&amp;A or heritage statement, let alone a visual impact assessment accompanying the current application, and there was no mention whatsoever of the RPG at Chilton in the documentation accompanying B/16/01406, the importance of the setting of the RPG, and the impact of the proposals upon the RPG at Chilton would appear to have been entirely</p>



					<p>omitted from consideration during the planning process. We, on the other hand, are not ignoring the adverse impact that the removal of all the screening vegetation has had upon the RPG, or the applicant's failure to comply with previous commitments, when responding to the current application. The most basic requirements of the NPPF relating to designated heritage assets have been ignored when submitting DC/20/04342. There is no mention of the RPG, let alone a description of its significance as required by Para 189. Due to this omission, Para 190 is also not complied with as it is necessary to submit this information in order to fully appreciate the affect these proposals may have on the setting of heritage assets, the RPG and also the Grade II* Chilton Hall. Para 192a relates to any new development needing to not just sustain but also enhance a heritage asset. Destruction of the former screening means that the main entrance to the RPG and Chilton Hall are both seriously adversely affected and this is compounded by the inappropriate urban timber boarded fencing which draws further attention to the building site. In this respect it also falls short of Para 195. Before any further decisions are made with regard to this application we would ask that your officers urgently require the applicant to protect remaining trees and their root zones as per Condition 10 in the planning permission B/16/01406 agreed with your authority to be included in a landscaping scheme, and put an immediate stop to any further unauthorised clearance of vegetation. Without the screening effect of the former hedging/trees, in our opinion the application will have an even greater adverse effect on the historic park and garden at Chilton Hall, breaching Policies CN14 and CN15 of the Local Plan 2006. For brevity we will not repeat the numerous clauses of both the NPPF and Local Plan which this application does not comply with, as these are well covered by both Lady Hart's letter and also that of Chilton Parish Council.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust strongly objects to the above application and considers that the fact that the applicant has so blatantly disregarded conditions of the earlier planning consent, does not bode well for compliance with any future orders relating to possible approval of the 2nd application. We would ask your officers to ensure that replacement hedging and semi-mature trees are planted this winter, similar to those already removed, that these are suitably maintained with a management plan for the next few years until established, and that no further trees are removed. We would also expect the applicant to provide a Heritage Statement as well as</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>a Visual Impact Assessment in order that your officers can ascertain for themselves the full affect of the loss of mitigation measures.</p> <p>The GT urges your officers to refuse DC/20/04342, but before any decision is made, the applicant should provide a heritage statement and a VIA to comply with the NPPF.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Waverley Local Plan	Surrey	E29/1248	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION ON THE PRE-SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN PART 2: SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES</p> <p><a href="http://www.waverley.gov.uk/LPP2">www.waverley.gov.uk/LPP2</a>  <a href="mailto:planningpolicy@waverley.gov.uk">planningpolicy@waverley.gov.uk</a></p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2020</b></p> <p>The following comments are submitted on behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust a member of the Gardens Trust which is the statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>Chapter 4 – Protecting Places  Policies DM 20 – 24 inclusive</p> <p>Concern is expressed that the paraphrasing of and partial (unattributed) quotations from NPPF Chapter 16, paras 189 – 202 inclusive weakens the policies and possibly leaves them non-compliant with the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy DM 24 – Historic Landscapes and Gardens is not compliant with the NPPF because Registered Parks and Gardens are designated heritage assets and thus subject to NPPF paras 193 – 196 inclusive, whereas the final sentence of DM 24 “A balanced judgement ....” relates to non-designated heritage assets. (The sentence is an unattributed quotation from NPPF para 197).</p> <p>This might be resolved by a separate policy for Registered parks and gardens, and a specific reference in DM 23 Non-Designated Heritage Assets to other parks and gardens of historic interest.</p> <p>Policy DM 22 Heritage at Risk seems oddly located in the middle of this set of policies and might be better as the last item to indicate that all heritage assets, whether designated or not and whether built or landscape, can be at risk.</p> <p>Glossary</p> <p>Non designated heritage assets – such items are not just those identified by the LPA as stated in the final sentence. As Paras 4.60 and 61 note there are many other potential sources. To these should be added the Historic Environment Record (HER) as noted in NPPF para 189. If this is acknowledged there would need to be a Glossary item for HER.</p> <p>Registered parks and gardens – it is accepted that there is no additional special statutory protection but it should be noted in the Glossary that the</p>

					designated heritage asset paragraphs of the NPPF apply. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust
Packington Hall	Warwicks hire	E20/1271	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and extension of late C18 stable building to provide flexible event and learning spaces, meeting facilities and rentable accommodation. Car park, supporting facilities and landscaping. The Stables, Packington Estate, Meriden, CV7 7HF. HYBRID	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and the proposals are well conceived and approached with a respect for the heritage value of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Packington, on which Capability Brown advised c1750. The proposed car park is to be located where there are currently miscellaneous outbuildings on existing hardstanding. The game larder is to be demolished but re-erected elsewhere on the estate. The proposed parking area is well screen by trees which are to be retained. We would suggest that there is no throughway between the house and the stable block frontages, which would further break up the large area of tarmac. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Packington Hall	Warwicks hire	E20/1272	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed ha ha and crossings. Packington Hall, Packington Park, Meriden CV7 7HF. BOUNDARY, LANDSCAPE	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and the proposals are well conceived and approached with a respect for the heritage value of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Packington, on which Capability Brown advised c1750. The proposed car park is to be located where there are currently miscellaneous outbuildings on existing hardstanding. The game larder is to be demolished but re-erected elsewhere on the estate. The proposed parking area is well screen by trees which are to be retained. We would suggest that there is no throughway between the house and the stable block frontages, which would further

					break up the large area of tarmac. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E20/1238	II	PLANNING APPLICATION DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND REPLACED WITH NEW 4 BED DWELLING. 2, WOODLANDS AVENUE, WALSALL, WS5 3LN. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have looked at the sparse online documentation for this application and were surprised to see that despite the plot of the existing house lying immediately adjacent to the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Great Barr Hall, an C18 landscape park associated with Humphry Repton, John Nash and Sir George Gilbert Scott, and possibly also William Shenstone, there is absolutely no mention of this in the planning documents. Due to current Covid restrictions a site visit has not been possible, so we must therefore rely on your officers to ascertain whether or not our comments below accurately reflect whether the application causes harm to the setting of Great Barr Hall.</p> <p>The application is not accompanied by either a Heritage Statement (HS) or a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), so does not presently comply with the NPPF para 189 which requires an applicant to ‘describe the significance of 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>Looking at the site on Google Earth and from the provided documentation, it would seem that the rear elevation is well screened by trees. However, the fenestration on the rear of the house is very prominent and the large windows may well cause light spillage into the RPG. We are glad to note</p>

					<p>though that the street frontage has been carefully considered so as not to appear too domineering and remains comparable to neighbouring dwellings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Goodwood House	West Sussex	E20/1130	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of underground heat and power service network to a range of buildings on the Goodwood Estate. Redvins Barns, Redvins Road, Halnaker, Boxgrove, West Sussex PO18 0QJ. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2020</b></p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters. The GT has also brought this application to our attention. Representatives of SGT have carefully studied the documents submitted with the application together with earlier applications (SDNP 19/02256 and SDNP/20/03380/FUL). Much of the work associated with the present application is to be undertaken within the boundary of Goodwood House, a Grade I Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>The underground heat and power network is a truly innovative project and by eliminating the plant and equipment previously proposed within the hotel grounds is a distinct visual improvement. The Heritage statement indicates the disturbance caused by installing underground equipment through areas of archaeological and landscape significance has been recognised. The simple building proposed to house the local equipment within the kitchen garden reflects the proportions of the other, original, service buildings the only significant change appears to be the use of brick instead of mainly flint walling. Provided a suitable stock brick is used the result should be acceptable - if the bricklayer executes the work in sympathy to the location.</p> <p>In terms of the impact of the power network on the landscape of the registered parkland there will be some disturbance during the installation but there should be little or none in the longer term.</p> <p>Conclusion SGT does not object to the present application and welcomes the transfer of the biomass facility to a location well away from the registered site. The re-design for the hotel extensions and gardens will possibly be a more significant consideration for SGT when the revised application is submitted in the new year.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell</p>

					On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust. CC: The Gardens Trust
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E20/1273	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of 2No two storey extensions to west and north elevations; part two and three storey extension to south elevation including 5No. dormers and two storey rear extension; additional of external facing roof lights and dormer windows facing within private enclosed courtyard to provide 25 additional ensuite nursing care bedrooms (68 total), including re-configuration and expansion of facilities; additional car parking and associated landscaping. Park Avenue Nursing Home, 8 Park Avenue, Roundhay.</p> <p>MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Roundhay Park, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Park Avenue forms a major length of the southern boundary of Roundhay Park with No 8, the site of this planning application, facing north west across Park Avenue to the most southerly end of Roundhay Park which is known as Military Field. The Park was purchased by Leeds City Council c.1871. Tree lined Princes Avenue stretches north from the southern corner of Roundhay Park. This part of north east Leeds forms the Roundhay Conservation Area and in addition to the c. 200 ha Registered Park - an important heritage asset that has not been mentioned in the submitted documents – it is known for tree-lined roads with many remaining villas constructed in the 19th Century and early 20th Century set in mature landscaped gardens.</p> <p>No 8 Park Avenue was extended and became a nursing home in the 1980's and has been subject to further extensions resulting in a large portion of the site, beyond the entrance area from Park Avenue, being built upon. This application to provide 25 additional en-suite nursing care bedrooms will further increase the massing of the building; bringing the increased mass close to major portions of three boundaries.</p> <p>It is also proposed to increase the car parking by a further 13 spaces. The Planning Heritage, Design and Access Statement at 8.3 also suggests 'further spaces could be provided if deemed necessary.' The car parking area is in front of the building facing towards the Park and although the boundary trees form some screening, we would be concerned that further hard landscaping could potentially affect water availability for the trees in the future and further erode the 'garden' area. (It should be noted that although the latest Google earth/street view images have few parked cars on Park Avenue this is not the case at busy summer weekends and when there are special events in Roundhay Park.) Overall, it is desirable that tree</p>

					<p>cover is maintained and protected to enhance the heritage of the Conservation Area and Roundhay Park, also for amenity, ecology and climate change mitigation.</p> <p>We note from the Tree Survey that 3 trees (T2, T15, G13) are to be removed and tree protection measures are to be put in place. However, we do have concerns that the proposed extensions will take up what little remaining space there is around the building, will inevitably damage proportions of the tree roots and could eventually bring about the demise of the trees.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider the enlarged building will impact on the significance of Roundhay Park but we do have concerns about the future of the trees on the site and the potential impact that their damage/loss would bring.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Prince of Wales Park	West Yorkshire	E20/1293	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION First and second floor rear extension. 1 Park Drive, Eldwick, Bingley, West Yorkshire BD16 3DF. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development potentially affecting Prince of Wales Park, Bingley, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>1 Park Drive is located immediately alongside the eastern boundary of Prince of Wales Park which was begun on the wedding day of the Prince of Wales, 10th March 1863, hence the name. Housing along the eastern boundary was begun after 1914 and before 1934 as evidenced by OS maps. 1 Park Drive is one of the principal houses of this development.</p> <p>The Prince of Wales Park is one of the earliest parks in the Bradford District only preceded by Peel Park, which opened in 1850. It was designed to be enclosed by an outer circuit of woodland that includes deciduous and coniferous trees and within which lies an area of open heathland in the north-east of the park on high ground. However, as this circuit drive was designed to pass close to the boundary, of what is today Park Drive, the tree planting between the drive and this boundary was restricted to</p>

					<p>predominantly a single line of trees, but with a just few extra near the boundary of No 1. as space allowed. There are also terraced, ornamental wooded gardens immediately north-east of the Principal Entrance which lies at the south-west corner of the park. The land rises from the Principal Entrance to the much higher entrance close to Park Drive.</p> <p>Several mature trees are still extant in the Park close to No 1 but provide little screening. Recent planting of Wild Cherry, Rowan, Hazel, Silver Birch, Blackthorn and Crab Apple will be beneficial for the Park but will also not provide any screening of these proposed extensions.</p> <p>We are concerned that the first and second floor rear extension, including a flat-roofed tower with white render, would be much more imposing on the registered park than other properties along this eastern boundary, and would harm the views and aesthetic aspects of this section of the Park along the entire length of the carriage drive near Park Drive.</p> <p>We consider that the current proposals are inappropriate.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E20/1298	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation and operation of a solar park with associated infrastructure and upgraded access. Land Off Barnsdale Road, Allerton Bywater. SOLAR</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Ledston Hall is registered grade II* with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The park has 17C origins and the walled gardens and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with the area now called The Grove originally designed by Charles Bridgeman for Lady Betty Hastings c. 1731. (The payments to Bridgeman by Lady Betty are in C. Hoare and Co., Bankers, London, Ledger K, 27 March 1731.) The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest.</p> <p>This solar park covers an area of approx. 90ha of arable farmland that was</p>



				<p>once part of Kippax Park, and lies to the south west of the registered historic park and garden and Ledston Hall. In addition to Kippax Park there may have been early settlements in this area. Barnsdale Road which is located on a ridge running north-south separates the site of the proposed solar park from Ledston and could be a Roman route.</p> <p>We have noted the 'Glint and Glare Assessment' and it may be that the solar panels will be visible in the distance from the important early terrace at the western side of Ledston Hall. The Hall and terrace are on high ground, and there are views out over the landscape to the west and south-west. See Photograph May 2013 taken from the terrace. Although there is tree cover between the Hall, the road and the solar panel site, we suggest that any possible effect on the heritage assets from glint and glare is checked.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England (e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust Attachment: Photograph looking west and south-west from the terrace at Ledston Hall, May 2013</p>
--	--	--	--	--