



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JANUARY 2021

The GT conservation team received 192 new cases for England and six cases for Wales 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, 55 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure	-	E20/1443	-	NATIONAL POLICY Consultation on proposed new permitted development right for the change of use from Commercial, Business and Service use to residential to create new homes, measures to support public service infrastructure through the planning system, and the approach to simplifying and consolidating existing permitted development rights following changes to the Use Classes Order <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure/supporting-">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure/supporting-</a>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2021 (SUSSEX)</b></p> <p>Q7.1 Do you agree that the right for schools, colleges and universities, and hospitals be amended to allow for development which is not greater than 25% of the footprint, or up to 250 square metres of the current buildings on the site at the time the legislation is brought into force, whichever is the larger?</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust disagrees with this proposal since, in the absence of developments within Registered Historic Parks and Gardens being excluded from such rights there is a concern that such developments could occur to the detriment of these heritage assets.</p> <p>While many institutions of this type do not lie in or close to historic designed landscapes, a significant number do. In Sussex alone some 15 sites have been identified that could be adversely affected by further piecemeal development. Of these, 5 include an historic park or listed building with a Grade I designation on the register maintained by Historic England and a further 7 sites include an historic park or listed building with a Grade II* designation.</p>

				<a href="#">housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure</a>	<p>Hitherto planning law and regulations have provided protections for heritage assets such as historic parks and gardens. In particular, the NPPF considers ‘substantial harm’ to or loss of Grade II registered parks or gardens should be ‘exceptional’ and, in respect of Grade I or II* registered parks or gardens, ‘wholly exceptional’.</p> <p>If implemented as described, the proposed changes would significantly erode existing protections. Sussex Gardens Trust would like to see the existing protections for parks and gardens retained, as is proposed for school playing fields. Details of the identified sites in Sussex are shown below:</p> <p>Q8 Do you have any other comments about the permitted development rights for schools, colleges, universities, hospitals and prisons?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>see answer to Q 7.1 above</p> <p>Q9.1 Do you think that the proposed amendments to the right in relation to schools, colleges and universities, and hospitals could impact on businesses, communities, or local planning authorities?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The amendments proposed would place outside the scope of planning controls a significant amount of development which could have a potential adverse impact upon heritage assets. As explained earlier at Q7.1 there are many schools, colleges and universities lying in of adjacent to a Registered Park/Garden.</p> <p>Q9.2 Do you think that the proposed amendments to the right in relation to schools, colleges and universities, and hospitals, could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The amendments proposed would place outside the scope of planning controls a significant amount of development which could have a potential adverse impact upon heritage assets. As explained earlier at Q7.1 there are many schools, colleges and universities lying in of adjacent to a Registered Park/Garden.</p> <p>Q14 Do you agree the minimum consultation / publicity period should be reduced to 14 days?</p> <p>No</p> <p>Sussex Garden Trust strongly opposes this proposed change since the purported purpose of the consultation would be negated by the restricted consultation period.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Sussex Gardens Trust is a voluntary organisation and the limited number of volunteers available have many other commitments. SGT relies on notification of cases from the Gardens Trust, as the statutory consultee, and this administrative process alone takes at least 7 days, which would leave just 7 days for SGT to pass the case to a volunteer, carry out a detailed desk-based study, organise and undertake a site visit if required, agree line to take with other colleagues, draft and submit a comment. Reducing the consultation period would make impossible for SGT to adequately scrutinise planning applications.</p> <p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.01.2021 (YORKSHIRE)</b></p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</b></p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the national amenity charity the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens particularly those on the Historic England Register. The GT is the Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens (RPG), and the YGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We always try and take a balanced view of proposed changes to the heritage asset or its setting including looking to the future and the 21st Century needs of our communities, when considering planning applications that affect RPG's. Recent examples where we have given advice and not opposed are: Ribston Hall, village of Little Ribston (Harrogate BC) for a house near RPG boundary; Mulgrave Castle (Scarborough BC and North York Moors NPA) for car park and road changes; Roundhay Park (Leeds CC) for two care homes near the boundary; Sheffield General Cemetery (Sheffield CC) for works incl. signage, new amenities, lighting, carparking; Queens Garden, Sedbergh (Yorkshire Dales NPA) for 50 new dwellings incl. affordable/social rented, affordable shared ownership nearby. We are guided by NPPF chapter 16 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment', Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and HE's Good Practice Advice in Planning eg 'The Setting of Heritage Assets'.</p> <p>We presume that this consultation dovetails with the 'Planning for the Future' White Paper last autumn.</p> <p>Yorkshire Gardens Trust's (YGT) principal interest in this paper has been to consider its impact upon the potential creation and the conservation of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>existing important designed landscapes, parks and gardens, some of which also lie in Conservation Areas. Examples of parks and gardens in Conservation Areas in Yorkshire include: Hillsborough Park, Sheffield; Museum Gardens, York; Temple Grounds, Richmond.</p> <p>The Trust is also concerned to ensure that its expert commentary on proposed development is always provided with a realistic opportunity to be heard and taken into consideration.</p> <p>The paper recognises the need to protect certain situations such as National Parks, but it is proposed that conservation area status should not be presented as justification for rejection; this we disagree with. We have concerns that listed building status may not be a defence – and in addition curtilage of listed buildings is often difficult to determine. However, the paper acknowledges that the economic impact of shops potentially being lost from urban conservation areas by converting to dwellings alone may warrant planning consideration.</p> <p>There is no mention of Registered Parks and Gardens (RPG). Green space has been shown to be vital for physical and mental health during the pandemic and lockdown and will continue to be important in the future.</p> <p>The paper presses constantly for planning applications, when still required, to take less time. In those cases where an application and associated consultations will still take place it is proposed that the statutory period for notification AND submission of comments should be reduced from the present 21 days to 14 days. As a voluntary consultee this is unworkable.</p> <p>The paper includes a very detailed set of proposals to amend the small print which currently defines and underpins permitted development rights.</p> <p>The reader needs to be a cross between a planning consultant and a computer to be able to genuinely appraise this section.</p> <p>YGT's overview:</p> <p>We sympathise with the need to inject dwellings into town centres.</p> <p>We sympathise with the need to consider alternative uses for redundant high street shops.</p> <p>We sympathise with the need to deal with the imminent arrival of numerous empty office buildings.</p> <p>We sympathise with the need to prepare for economic recovery after Coronavirus 19.</p> <p>But we are nervous that this “bulldozer” of a paper does not sufficiently protect historic/cherished settings – neither buildings nor landscapes.</p> <p>Britain is betrothed to its past. Our heritage is a great driver of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>economy, up to the recent pandemic it was an in-demand tourist attraction for those from abroad and at home, and makes very pleasant and satisfying places to live. The press has assured us during Coronavirus 19 that the public have greatly cherished the amenity of their neighbourhood park, their nearby countryside and the local historic house/park. This paper makes scant reference to the protection of these things.</p> <p>The YGT presses for legislation to formally recognise that such amenities, whether listed or just locally cherished, should continue to require consultation and subsequent permission/refusal.</p> <p>We further suggest that the legislation should ensure that any conversion from “commercial, business and service” to use as “dwelling” should be limited to cases where the building(s) in question can be adapted without external physical alteration. The legislation should prevent such building(s) from being altered (windows, doors, walls, storey height, roof height, or extensions) unless the project is submitted for planning consideration/consultation/approval/rejection.</p> <p>We note the work of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission and the final report January 30th 2020 Living with Beauty, launched by Robert Jenrick, MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government at the Garden Museum.</p> <p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2021</b></p> <p>The Gardens Trust, (GT) as the statutory consultee for almost 1700 registered historic parks and gardens in England and Wales, plays a key conservation role in the heritage sector, actively monitoring and responding to planning proposals for development, strongly objecting to those which will have a detrimental impact on the significance of these valuable and irreplaceable heritage assets. The GT supports sustainable future development and management that respects and illustrates a clear understanding of the significance of each place and embodies explicit conservation objectives and management of the unique qualities of each landscape so that they are preserved for future generations.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust’s principal interest in this consultation is to consider the impact of its measures on the preservation of historic parks and gardens. The Garden Trust, as statutory consultee, provides expert commentary in response to proposed development and its potential impact on all or part of a historic designed landscape. The extended reach of the Gardens Trust through the wide network of expert volunteers in county gardens trusts</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>ensures that its limited resource is expended with maximum efficiency to stay abreast of the consultation process while ensuring that ground root knowledge and appreciation of these heritage assets has a voice in the planning process. It is essential that the acclaimed methodology applied by the Gardens Trust is fully understood and taken into account when changes to the planning process are considered.</p> <p>In our response, two key issues are highlighted. First, the potential impact of the proposed extended rights on the substantial number of registered historic parks and gardens in which schools, colleges, hospitals and prisons are located without appropriate consultation safeguards being put in place. Secondly, the practicalities of tighter timetables given the acknowledged existing lack of resource in the planning departments and need for the Garden Trust as a statutory consultee to make appropriate site visits and undertake necessary research in order to make consultation responses, often in consultation with volunteers in the county gardens trusts. These are key factors in determining appropriate consultation timetables.</p> <p>We are delighted that, once again, a number of county gardens trusts have taken the time to respond independently to the consultation reinforcing the arguments we have made and adding their invaluable perspective to this discussion.</p> <p>Sarah Dickinson Trustee and Chair of the Conservation Committee, the Gardens Trust</p> <p>Q1 Do you agree that there should be no size limit on the buildings that could benefit from the new permitted development right to change use from Commercial, Business and Service (Class E) to residential (C3)?</p> <p>No comment as outside the statutory remit of the Gardens Trust (GT)</p> <p>Q2.1 Do you agree that the right should not apply in areas of outstanding natural beauty, the Broads, National Parks, areas specified by the Secretary of State for the purposes of section 41(3) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and World Heritage Sites?</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>No comment as outside the statutory remit of the GT.</p> <p>Q2.2 Do you agree that the right should apply in conservation areas?</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>In view of the fact that Registered Historic Parks and Gardens (discussed in more detail in response to Q7 below) do not have express statutory protection (unlike listed historic buildings), the protection conservation areas afford is keenly understood as a safeguard in the preservation of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>historic parks and gardens as heritage assets. We do not therefore agree that the right should automatically apply in conservation areas.</p> <p>Q7.1 Do you agree that the right for schools, colleges and universities, and hospitals be amended to allow for development which is not greater than 25% of the footprint, or up to 250 square metres of the current buildings on the site at the time the legislation is brought into force, whichever is the larger?</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>The GT strongly disagrees with this proposal without an express exclusion of such development within Registered Historic Parks and Gardens or the setting of such heritage assets. These cherished and essential green spaces are recognised by national designation, registered on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, which forms part of the National Heritage List for England compiled by Historic England; others are identified as significant by local planning authorities. These are all 'heritage assets' (having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of their heritage interest) to which national planning policy applies. Nationally, there are a great many prisons, schools, colleges, universities and hospitals which are in Registered Historic Parks and Gardens or in their settings and which would be harmfully impacted by permitted development which is not greater than 25% of their footprint. In recognition of the historic and aesthetic value that Registered Historic Parks and Gardens contribute to the setting of these sites, a Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment should be submitted as part of the prior approval process which would also set out options for mitigation on the Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and its setting and key views. (It is understood that sites over 5 hectares in size remain covered by the separate EIA regulations which remain in force). Hitherto planning law and regulations have provided protections for heritage assets such as historic parks and gardens. In particular, the NPPF considers 'substantial harm' to or loss of Grade II registered parks or gardens should be 'exceptional' and, in respect of Grade I or II* registered parks or gardens, 'wholly exceptional'. For full detail please refer to the GT publication: The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens. If implemented as described, the proposed changes would significantly erode existing protections. The GT would like to see the existing protections for parks and gardens retained. We note the express exclusion proposed for school playing fields and would suggest that a similar precise exclusion</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>should be set out with regard to historic parks and gardens as heritage assets.</p> <p>Q7.4 Do you agree that prisons should benefit from the same right to expand or add additional buildings?</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>It is accepted that prisons should benefit from the same right to expand or add additional buildings as schools and hospitals subject to the express exclusion of heritage assets as discussed in the response to Q7.1 above.</p> <p>Q8 Do you have any other comments about the permitted development rights for schools, colleges, universities, hospitals and prisons?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Please refer to answer to Q 7.1 above</p> <p>Q9.1 Do you think that the proposed amendments to the right in relation to schools, colleges and universities, and hospitals could impact on businesses, communities, or local planning authorities?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Where schools, hospitals, prisons and other institutions are located within historic parks and gardens or the setting of buildings which are heritage assets constructive relationships have been forged between owners, local planning authorities and the statutory consultees with a duty to protect these valuable sites, to ensure that they can be enjoyed and remain fit for purpose for those working within them, while retaining their historic integrity and value to the wider public who are often given shared access to them. Existing planning law and regulations facilitate this balance and should remain fully intact (as discussed at Q7.1).</p> <p>Q10.1 Do you think that the proposed amendment to allow prisons to benefit from the right could impact on businesses, communities, or local planning authorities?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Please refer to Q9.1 above.</p> <p>Q14 Do you agree the minimum consultation / publicity period should be reduced to 14 days?</p> <p>No</p> <p>Without a substantive change to resourcing and a corresponding period of adjustment of current established working practices (referred to at Para 58-59), the Gardens Trust strongly opposes this proposed change since the purported purpose of the consultation would be negated by the restricted consultation period. As a statutory consultee, the GT is a small charitable</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>organisation with limited resource which is used to maximum effect through the mobilisation of expertise in a national volunteer network. Reducing the consultation period would make appropriate scrutiny and response to planning applications, which potentially impact detrimentally on heritage assets of national importance, virtually impossible. The GT requires a minimum of 21 days to process consultations: typically, a week to receive notifications and circulate them inhouse/ consult the volunteers in the relevant county gardens trusts; and two weeks to consider responses within the GT or await responses from county gardens trusts and submit them. Within this 21 day period site visits and meetings are arranged and detailed consultation responses completed. The GT and some county garden trust expert volunteers engaged in responses to consultations do engage with local authorities at a pre application stage, but this is entirely dependent on the local planning authority engagement and the capacity of the volunteers. The GT Conservation Officer similarly will engage at a pre application stage when approached but the suggestion that by simply requiring that preapplication consultations should be prioritised and therefore require a shorter timetable is to misunderstand the nature of these relationships and the complexity of the materials and issues involved when the potential impact on Registered Parks and Gardens is in discussion. Until the proposed consideration of the role of statutory consultees and their resourcing has been undertaken and resolved, the consultation period should definitely remain 21 days and not be reduced to 14 days.</p> <p>Q17.2 Do you have any other suggestions on how these priority public service infrastructure projects should be prioritised within the planning system?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Our comments in response to Q14 are relevant here.</p>
Stoke Park	Avon	E17/1583	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for demolition of existing buildings/structures and comprehensive redevelopment comprising up to 268 dwellings (Use Class C3) including affordable homes, vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access from Romney Avenue and Hogarth	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.01.2021</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 Grade II Registered Park and Garden, Stoke Park. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that you have provided. The Trust welcomes the proposal to link the proposed</p>

				<p>Avenue, car parking, public open space, landscaping and other associated works. Approval sought of Access and Layout. (Major Application). Romney House, Romney Avenue, Bristol BS7 9TB. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>development to Stoke Park by means of a linear park that would run through the development. The Trust would however expect to see harm to the setting of Stoke Park minimised, by the provision of a strong landscape buffer comprising trees and shrubs at the southern boundary of the application site.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust welcomes the provision of a linear park through the development that would link to Stoke Park, but expects that harm to the setting of Stoke Park should be minimised by the provision of a strong landscape buffer comprising trees and shrubs at the southern boundary of the application site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Ashton Court	Avon	E20/0303	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site to provide residential apartments including affordable housing (social rented and shared ownership) across five buildings between 4 - 9 storeys, townhouses, flexible retail/cafe space, public realm, landscaping including ecological mitigation measures, access and associated groundworks. Former Railway Depot, Clangage Road, Bristol. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.01.2021</b></p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment further on this application, which has been amended in respect of the proposed layout and the heights of some of the proposed blocks.</p> <p>We have reviewed the additional visually verified montages (VVM) and addendum to the landscape and visual impact assessment submitted by the applicant. Whilst the LVIA VVM has been revised to show winter views, we note that the heritage VVM are still based on summer photographs, which could result in the level of impact being underestimated, particularly in views 1, 2, 5 and 7. The addendum to the landscape and visual impact assessment does not actually revise the original assessment of landscape and visual impacts, but sets out some general comments comparing the impact of the scheme now proposed to the original. There is still no mention of the impact to the Sylvia Crowe landscape except at 2.43, which mentions retaining some of the associated planting.</p> <p>The area to the west of Brunel Way is at present characterised by lower rise buildings and the open spaces of White City allotments, Ashton Meadows, the Clangage sports ground and Ashton Court itself. LVIA VVM Views 1, 2 and 3 (Figures 3,5 and 7 respectively) demonstrate the significant change in character that would result from the development. The height of Block E is particularly inappropriate, as it will mar the iconic view of the Suspension Bridge from Brunel Way when approaching from the south west, as shown in Heritage VVM Figure 15 View 5. Views from Ashton Meadows and the City Docks Conservation Area will be also significantly urbanised by the massing of Block E, as shown in Views 4 and 7</p>

					<p>(Figures 9 and 15) of the LVIA VVM.</p> <p>The Heritage briefing note downplays the issue of the visual relationship between Ashton Court and the City of Bristol. However, the contribution made by Humphry Repton in 1802 consolidated the importance of the views from the estate towards the City of Bristol.</p> <p>With the experience of a site visit, starting with the existing new buildings in Paxton Drive, which are four storeys high with a recessed top floor, it is immediately apparent that the proposed site for the development is on higher ground. Therefore blocks B; C; D; and E1 and E2 [ranging from five to eight storeys high], will, when viewed from the Summerhouse Plantation in the registered park and garden, visually form a solid line that, for the first time in centuries, appears to divide the green view from Ashton Court Park to Greville Smyth Park, consequently causing harm to the setting and bringing the urban form much closer to Ashton Court, as shown in Figure 12 View 4 of the Heritage VVM. Similarly, the Trust notes that in Figure 7 View 2 of the Heritage VVM the proposed height of the residential blocks will obstruct existing views of St Mary Redcliffe spire.</p> <p>Summary: the Avon Gardens Trust are still of the opinion, expressed by Historic England before the revised scheme, that the excessive height of the proposed buildings has the potential to cause harm to the settings of a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Ashton Court Park, and the settings of two local historic parks and gardens, Greville Smyth Park and Bower Ashton. In addition to harming the Sylvia Crowe landscape associated with Brunel Way / the Cumberland Basin, and would adversely affect the setting of Clifton Suspension Bridge.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust therefore objects to the proposed development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Frenchay Hospital	Avon	E20/0855	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 30 no. dwellings, 2 no. new highway access points, hard and soft landscaping with associated works. Land East Of Malmaison Drive, Frenchay, South Gloucestershire BS16 1PJ.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting land which is adjacent to a locally registered historic park and garden, and forms part of the former designed landscape gardens of Frenchay Manor, Grade II*. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p>

					<p>The Trust notes that former historic garden features on the application site appear to have been lost, and the visual relationship between the gardens of Frenchay Manor and the application site is largely curtailed by the existing boundary treatments and existing trees, the majority of which are proposed to be retained. Additional tree planting is also proposed along the boundary between the application site and Frenchay Manor. However, the Trust also notes from the original submitted Heritage Statement that historic garden features may have existed at the junction between the pleasure garden and the pasture beyond.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposed development but, as mentioned in our letter of 25th September 2020, supports the view of the Archaeology Officer of the Council who recommends that a condition be included in any consent granted, that a programme of archaeological work should be carried out in advance of any development, to record any remaining features.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens trust does not object to the proposed development, but supports the view of the Archaeology Officer of the Council, that a condition should be included in any consent granted, for a programme of archaeological work to be carried out in advance of any development, to record any remaining historic garden features.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Stoke Park	Avon	E20/1346	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for approval of Reserved Matters following consent granted under app.no. 18/00703/P - Outline application for demolition of existing buildings/structures and comprehensive redevelopment comprising up to 268 dwellings (Use Class C3) including affordable homes, vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access from Romney Avenue and Hogarth Avenue, car parking, public open space, landscaping and other</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.01.2021</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 Grade II Registered Park and Garden, Stoke Park. 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>Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that you have provided. The Trust welcomes the proposal to link the proposed development to Stoke Park by means of a linear park that would run through the development. The Trust would however expect to see harm to the setting of Stoke Park minimised, by the provision of a strong landscape buffer comprising trees and shrubs at the southern boundary of the application site.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust welcomes the provision of a linear park</p>

				associated works. Approval sought of Access and Layout. (Major Application) - now proposed to consider detailed layout, appearance, landscaping and scale (cross boundary application with South Gloucestershire Council). Romney House, Romney Avenue, Bristol BS7 9TB. RESIDENTIAL	through the development that would link to Stoke Park, but expects that harm to the setting of Stoke Park should be minimised by the provision of a strong landscape buffer comprising trees and shrubs at the southern boundary of the application site. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Tyntesfield	Avon	E20/1522	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a vertical, closed loop Ground Source Heat Pump and associated pipework/connections; works to include trenching to Station Lodge. Belmont House, Belmont Estate, Belmont Hill. ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2021</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Tyntesfield, and the wider association of the site within the North Somerset Green Belt. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust note that the whole ground source heating system will be discreetly installed under ground for the most part and will have little negative effect on the Registered Park and Garden, once the work and restoration of the land is complete. The carriage driveway, 'Station Drive' which extends c 800m north – north-west through an avenue of Laurels, is a very distinctive feature in this landscape and whilst benefitting from a root protection zone during the trenching, will also need particularly careful shaping of the multiple stem canopy, if the historical view is to be maintained. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust have no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Slough Spatial Strategy	Berkshire	E20/1400	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Local Plan for Slough; spatial Strategy Consultation <a href="https://slough.citizenspace.com/">https://slough.citizenspace.com/</a>	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.01.2021</b> We fully support the following principles which Slough will adhere to: prioritise providing open space in new development (13.89) and no further loss of parks and open spaces (14.5); regenerate the route to the Jubilee River (13.90); regenerate the Canal Basin (13.87); and prioritise the Upton Court Park for tree planting (13.90). These measures will go a long way to conserve and enhance Slough's valuable historic environment. We also

					<p>note the changes proposed for Bowyer Playing Fields as part of the Canal Basin regeneration (13.87) and would like to see the heritage value of the open space and canal enhanced through these measures.</p> <p>Historic environment assets</p> <p>Slough has a number of Parks and Gardens on Historic England's Register within the Borough or immediately adjacent within Buckinghamshire. Herschel Park Grade II and also the northern part of Ditton Park Grade II lie within the Borough (<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001648">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001648</a> and <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001290">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001290</a> ). Adjacent to the Borough lie Stoke Park Grade II, Huntercombe Manor Grade II, Stoke Park Grade II, Stoke Place Grade II, Stoke Poges Gardens of Remembrance Grade I, and Langley Park Grade II. The Borough also has many valuable local parks of historic interest that add to the Borough's historic environment. These include Bayliss Park, Lascelles Park, Montem Mount, Salt Hill Park, and Upton Court which are on BGT's Depository of Berkshire parks and gardens of historic interest. The Borough's details of parks and open spaces also include Godolphin Recreation Ground. Langley Marish churchyard at St Mary's Church is also of great historic interest. In each case it is not only the sites themselves but also their settings that are protected through national policy. A study of the historical value of the remaining parks and open spaces may reveal further aspects or features of historic interest.</p> <p>We therefore urge the Council to undertake an audit of the heritage value (as well as nature conservation, landscape and cultural value) of both public and private parks and open spaces, including smaller ones such as those attached to churches or listed buildings, to inform the HER records for Slough and the planning process and to contribute to the principles set out for Slough. Without this evidence it will be all the harder to resist inappropriate development. BGT would be very pleased to help out where we can as part of our Parks Awareness Project 2021 on for Berkshire. In addition to the open space itself, landscape features, trees, woodlands, water features, views, routeways, structures as well as any listed buildings or buildings of local historic interest all contribute to the historic value of a site. These sites and their features are irreplaceable and contribute to the sense of place and identity of Slough.</p> <p>Spatial Strategy Approach to historic parks and gardens</p> <p>We note that the Spatial Strategy identifies a shortage of open spaces and parkland across the Borough and also acknowledges the significant</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>importance of these spaces to the local population. Many of these parks make multiple contributions to the Borough as a result of the recreational and well-being benefits and their historic, natural and cultural value. The Local Plan Objectives Appendix B are supported in particular: To protect, maintain and enhance those elements of the built and natural environment of local or value historic. We suggest that 'protect' is replaced by 'conserve' to reflect NPPF wording.</p> <p>There is some reference to Heritage assets in the Spatial Strategy (15.22 to 15.26) but these focus on built or archaeological assets alone. Nor does the following section on parks and open spaces (15.27 to 15.31) refer to the heritage value of many of these parks and open spaces.</p> <p>We request that the number and importance of the historic parks and gardens in Slough should be clearly recognised under the Heritage Assets section and that the objective to conserve and enhance heritage assets should be extended to cover the parks and gardens and other historic landscapes in line with NPPF guidance.</p> <p>The section on Parks and Open Spaces should be amended to include reference to the historic value of both Registered and local parks and gardens of historic interest. We fully support the objectives set out in Para 15.31 but this suggest that this should include a reference to the importance of these parks in representing history of Berkshire and the history of the Borough.</p> <p>Upton Court Park is identified in Para 15.29 as having the potential for providing a wider range of recreation opportunities, being a large area and for biodiversity through creation of wildlife habitats. We request that any further development for recreation takes fully into account the historic significance of the Park and the role of the park as a setting to the listed buildings.</p> <p>Chalvey is also identified for regeneration (14.44 to 14.55). The areas identified as 2, 5 and 6 in Figure 11 Chalvey Regeneration about the historic open space at Salt Hill Park and Montem Mound. We welcome the note (14.48) that some improvements in Salt Hill Park would be included but request that the supporting text includes a requirement to ensure that the proposed redevelopment conserves and enhances the setting of these historic assets in accordance with NPPF guidance.</p> <p>Proposed Spatial Strategy sites and areas for development</p> <p>The indicative location of preferred sites and the details of proposed Green Belt sites in the Strategy appear to avoid direct impact on any of the above</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>listed parks and gardens as far as we can see. However, there are some cross boundary locations under Proposal 5 on Figure 7 Key Diagram and para 17.19 that could potentially impact on the Registered sites which border Slough and could result in direct adverse effects, or impacts on the settings of these assets.</p> <p>We note that decisions on this will depend on the emerging Buckinghamshire Local Plan (17.17) and the outcome of studies into the pressures for additional housing to meet Slough's unmet need. We are concerned that pressure for locations close to Slough could have an adverse impact on the quality of the landscape and parkland on the borders of Slough and Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>The section on Existing Residential under Para 13.77 refers to Herschel Park. It is important that any regeneration in this area fully conserves and enhances the Grade II Registered Park and its setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Bettina Kirkham Chair and Planning Advisor for the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Sunninghill Park	Berkshire	E20/1403	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land for construction of film set and use of associated land for parking and storage purposes for a 5 year period. Land Adjacent To The Drawery, Windsor Great Park, Windsor.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. The application site does not sit within a Registered Park &amp; Garden, nor on any locally listed parks. It is located within Sunninghill Park, which is Crown Estate and Green Belt where other planning policies will apply.</p> <p>There is a distinct lack of any investigation into the historic environment surrounding and including the application parcel of land. The site is set within the grounds of Sunninghill Park to the south of the now derelict house and Sunninghill Park Dairy which has an interesting history.</p> <p>We should like to see an evaluation of former uses of the area and with particular reference to the ancient woodland and Great Pond so that the impacts of the proposed film set, storage and parking can be more fully assessed. In the absence of this we are likely to object on the grounds of insufficient information. We are also concerned about sufficient tree protection for fencing of ancient woodland and the pressure to fell trees close to the tracks proposed to be used by large trucks and numerous other vehicle movements.</p>



					Yours sincerely Helen Parvin Planning Advisor of the Berkshire Gardens Trust
Wavendon House Landscape	Buckinghamshire	E20/1448	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Retrospective approval for the provision of link between dwelling and garage. Site To North West of Wavendon House Drive, Wavendon. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We appreciate that Wavendon has only been registered since the original application in 2017, but had we been notified of the original application we would have objected to the quantity of roof lights with regard to light spillage affecting the RPG during the hours of darkness. Since the already constructed link also has a rooflight we would just wish to put this comment on record as the damage is already done.</p> <p>Now that Wavendon has been registered, we would be most grateful if you would continue to consult us in future should any more applications arise which might impact on the RPG. Thank you.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E20/1412	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Works to the Show House include the replacement of the roof structure, rainwater goods, lintels and external doors, repairs to brickwork and lead flashing. Works to the Fernery include sections of the glazing being replaced and repairs to the timber roof structure, removal of render, with masonry and structural repairs. An internal maintenance access system will also be installed. TATTON PARK, KNUTSFORD DRIVE, KNUTSFORD,	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.01.2021</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. The Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) 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>For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at <a href="http://www.thegardenstrust.org">www.thegardenstrust.org</a>.</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance of Tatton Park, a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II*. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. The application also has an impact on the collection of glasshouses, most</p>

				<p>KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE WA16 6QN REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>specifically the Fernery (Palm House), listed Grade II*, the Orangery listed Grade II, and the Show House, a non- designated heritage asset.</p> <p>We write to support this application, which will repair and restore the Fernery enabling it to reopen to the public. However we do have some concerns about detail and the replacement proposal for the Show House which we consider may cause some harm to the significance of the collection of glasshouses at Tatton.</p> <p>The site is well known to us. We have visited during the past year but not recently when the Fernery and Show House have been closed to the public, or specifically regarding this application. We were not invited to pre-application discussions regarding proposed work to any of the glasshouses at Tatton.</p> <p>We agree with Purcell’s Statement of Significance for the Fernery, but would add the following points which encompass the significance of the Show House whose significance is not addressed in the Design, Access and Heritage Impact Statement:</p> <p>The Fernery, together with the earlier Orangery, are the only glasshouses at Tatton created for the display of exotic plants demanding specific environmental conditions and for use as polite social spaces by the family and their guests. In accordance with these roles, they are the only glasshouses directly adjacent to the pleasure gardens and in close proximity to the house. The Show House links these two special glasshouses together, is important to their setting, and is part of the sequence of spaces experienced by visitors. As such it is an important space and part of the setting of the listed glasshouses either side. We consider the Fernery to be the most impressive and elegant of the glasshouses at Tatton, the “jewel in the crown”, which has continued to provide a very special experience for visitors for over 150 years.</p> <p>It is to be welcomed that the poor state of repair of the two structures has been recognised and that plans are being made for their refurbishment. Also welcomed is the depth of investigation and reporting of the state of both buildings. It is important that they are reopened to the public as a significant part of the complete estate.</p> <p>Our concerns regarding the proposals and their impact on significance are as follows:</p> <p>The Fernery</p> <p>Repair of the roof is essential and the proposed replacement of the glass with more substantial panes is welcomed. However we are unsure of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>importance of “sandblasting” the laminated panes? Our understanding of sandblasting is that it introduces a degree of opacity which would alter the quality of light, limit sparkle, and obscure clear views through the foliage and elegant structure to the sky. This would have an impact on the character of the space and visitor experience. No justification is given for the proposal which, if our understanding of sandblasting is correct, will have a material impact on the significance of the Fernery.</p> <p>We appreciate and support concerns that the restored Fernery should be sustainable and safe for staff and visitors but do not consider that sufficient information has been provided concerning the proposed fall arrest system to assess its impact on the building or visitor access. The application states that ‘An internal maintenance access system will also be installed’ but no information is provided on the nature, appearance, structure and impact of this system.</p> <p>We understand the reasons for removal of the render and agree with the proposal but are concerned that this should be undertaken very carefully, perhaps removing one panel and undertaking an assessment to inform subsequent work before continuing the process.</p> <p>The Show House</p> <p>We appreciate that the present Show House structure is not original and is in need of replacement. However the significance of the building as described above has not received sufficient understanding to inform the proposal for replacement. We consider that the proposal to simply replace the superstructure with a powder coated aluminium structure, apparently of utilitarian character, will have a negative impact on the setting and visitor experience of the Fernery and Orangery, but acknowledge that in part due to limited external views of the Show House, the harm will be less than substantial. We consider that the opportunity to replace the Show House with a beautiful, simple, high quality contemporary and bespoke structure that acknowledges the supremacy of its neighbours but complements them is being lost.</p> <p>In the past someone thought that the ornamental ironwork was sufficiently important to retain and reuse it. We consider that this example should be followed and the ironwork retained on site for reuse. Operational and ornamental ironwork was integral to the design and function of Victorian glasshouses and should not be lost.</p> <p>Planning Policy</p> <p>There is national and local policy of relevance to this application. At a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>national level, we refer you specifically to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph:</p> <p>185. Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account.... (c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness</p> <p>192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of... (c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>We are concerned that the positive contribution that a new Show House could contribute to the collection of glasshouses and to the setting of the Fernery and Orangery has not been adequately explored.</p> <p>197. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>We consider that there has been insufficient understanding of the Show House, a non- designated heritage asset, to inform proposals for its replacement as part of the setting of two listed glasshouses. All these buildings are part of the collection of glasshouses that make Tatton Park special.</p> <p>These considerations are reinforced by the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy adopted 27 July 2017,</p> <p>Policy SE 7 The Historic Environment</p> <p>3. b Non-Designated Assets: i. Requiring that the impact of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be properly considered, as these are often equally valued by local communities.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>While we fully support the principle of restoration and repair of the Fernery, we would like clarification and justification regarding the choice of sandblasted laminated glass, further detail of the fall arrest system and any interventions for maintenance access, and confirmation of a method statement for works to remove render and repair the walls.</p> <p>We appreciate the necessity to replace the Show House but request that the approach is reviewed in the light of our comments and adopted planning policy.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Susan Bartlett</p> <p>Planning responses coordinator</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Eaton Hall	Cheshire	E20/1461	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of building to house biomass boiler. Gardens Compound, Eaton Hall, Belgrave Avenue, Eccleston, Chester, Cheshire CH4 9JF.</p> <p>BIOMASS</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.01.2021</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 considered the information that you have provided, discussed the case with colleagues in Cheshire Gardens Trust, and on the basis of this have no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Margie Hoffnung</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Tarn Lodge Estate	Cumbria	E20/1490	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting Of 2no. Holiday Lodges &amp; 2no. Pods Together With Landscaping, Newt Ponds, A Sealed Foul Water Drainage System, Access Track &amp; Parking (Revised Application). Land to north of Tarn Lodge Farm, Heads Nook, Brampton.</p> <p>HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to this new proposed development scheme 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 Cumbria Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The research undertaken by the applicant clearly demonstrates the significance and relationship of the Tarn Lake to Grade II registered Tarn Lodge and the Grade II Tower, both listed when the estate was not in divided ownership. There are panoramic views of Tarn Lake from the elevated viewing platform of the Tower, specifically placed to enjoy the vista over the Tarn, Pleasure Grounds, formal gardens, mature plantation (with some original trees still extant) and the parkland. Tarn Lake is also visible from Tarn Lodge. Your officers will be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, 2nd edition, December 2017. (GPA3) which states on p5 'Many heritage assets have settings that have been designed to enhance their presence and visual interest or to create experiences of drama or surprise. In these special circumstances, these designed settings may be regarded as heritage assets in their own right, for instance the designed landscape</p>

					<p>around a country house.’ This places Tarn Lake firmly within the setting of both the Grade II Tower and the Grade II Tarn Lodge, and the whole forms a layout with strong group value, little altered since its conception in 1802, as shown in map evidence submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>GPA3 p 11 states ‘Views which contribute more to understanding the significance of a heritage asset include those where the composition within the view was a fundamental aspect of the design or function of the heritage asset.’ That is demonstrably the case here : (GPA3 p3) ‘To avoid uncertainty in discussion of setting, a landscape is ‘an area, as perceived by people, the character of which is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/ or human factors.’ In our opinion, the inclusion of visible holiday lodges and pods with associated car parking around Tarn Lake, will negatively impact the historic character of the designed landscape, ie. ‘the group of qualities derived from its past uses that make it distinctive. This may include: its associations with people, now and through time; its visual aspects; and the features, materials, and spaces associated with its history, including its original configuration and subsequent losses and changes, ... ‘to which heritage assets and their settings may contribute.’ (GPA3 p7)</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and whilst there may have been planning approval for 6 lodges 27 years ago (94/0524) this permission is long since lapsed and is of no relevance here. In addition, since then, understanding of the history and significance of the heritage assets and their landscape setting is far better understood. We are pleased to note the subsequent reduction in number of holiday lodges within the site. We would strongly oppose any future increase in this number.</p> <p>It is helpful that a detailed Arboricultural Assessment has been undertaken showing that construction of the lodges and infrastructure will not impact upon the root zones of any of the trees due to the no-dig construction method proposed and that no felling is required. What we have not seen within the online documentation however, is any indication of what form of lighting is proposed. For such a wild area, where red squirrels, bats and other wildlife abound, this should be kept to the absolute minimum and be extremely discreet. We are also unclear as to what is proposed on the edge of Tarn Lake itself as obviously visitors will be drawn to the water’s edge. Should your officers be minded to approve this application we would ask you to consider making it a condition that no permanent barbeques or other domestic paraphernalia be allowed near the water’s edge or by the lodges/pods in order to maintain the wildness of the surroundings. We</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>would also ask your officers to request that the lodges/pods be stained a dark green/grey or suitably recessive colour in order to minimise their visibility within the landscape. We would also suggest that should this application be allowed, the applicant consider including some very discreet interpretation near the car parking area to educate visitors to the heritage of the site. We note the proposed fruit tree varieties and wonder whether there are any local heritage varieties which could be substituted for the widely available commercial cultivars suggested?</p> <p>Our main concern, should your officers approve this application, remains that the Lake's link to Tarn Lodge and the Tower Folly would become lost, the setting of the heritage assets would be compromised and their significance correspondingly reduced.</p> <p>The GT/CGT maintains its objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Wolfeton House	Dorset	E20/1252	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application for residential development for up to 89 dwellings, public open space, landscaping &amp; associated works with access from Westleaze (all other matters reserved). LAND SOUTH OF WESTLEAZE, CHARMINSTER, DT2 9QL. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<div data-bbox="1288 151 1429 363" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>The Dorset Gardens Trust,  Christopher Clarke, 6 Redcotts Road, Wimborne, BH21 1ET  conservation@dorsetgardenstrust.co.uk</p> <p>13 January 2021</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p><b>WD/D/20/003004 – Re-submission for residential development, Westleaze, Charminster, Dorchester.</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to this proposed development. The Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. It is authorised by the GT to respond on its behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Trust's concern about this re-submission is the same as before. It concerns Wolfeton, a grade I listed building to the south-west of the main part of the application site, and generally south of the area proposed for public open space. The Appendix to this letter sets out the Trust's statement of significance of this site, which is substantially the same as the Statement submitted to the inquiry in 2019. Nothing has changed since then.</p> <p>As before, there are other important issues that will influence the Council's decision on this application. These are –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the progress made on the new Dorset Local Plan in succession to the West Dorset Plan, and the 5-year land supply,</li> <li>* a consideration of the overall heritage landscape of the Frome Valley,</li> <li>* the significance of Wolfeton House, the various other structures close by all Grade II, and the Grade II* late 16<sup>th</sup> / early 17<sup>th</sup> century Riding House to the north of it.</li> </ul> <p>The Trust makes no specific comment on these issues other than what is necessary in relation to the implicit relationship between the listed buildings at Wolfeton and the surrounding parkland which is an essential part of the complex and which helps to provide its setting.</p>
----------------	--------	----------	---	--	---



					<p>The key element for this re-submission is the reduction of development on the site, and the incorporation of the south-west part of the site into open space. Dealing with the listed building complex first, It is notable that the letter from HER dated 18 December 2020 deals almost exclusively with the issue of the overlooking of Wolfeton from the proposed development. The Trust believes that there remains an issue here on the significance of the site in itself. The Trust sets this out in the Appendix to this letter. This appendix is a shortened form of the statement made to the public inquiry in 2019, and excludes the images that formed part of it. These can be retrieved from the appeal submission if it is felt necessary. The Trust therefore requests that the planning authority considers this issue in its determination.</p> <p>This Trust's remit concerns the park and garden surrounding the house, although inevitably this is closely connected to the House itself. It is clear that this becomes a key issue here. First, the appeal decision (put simply) concluded that the planning balance had not been met in favour of the development as then submitted. The fact that the Heritage Report for this re-submission deals with the significance of the House complex at a forensic level over about 9 pages tells its own story.</p> <p>The HE letter sets out a cogent argument concerning the location of Wolfeton - and by association its gardens - within the open and rural landscape of the Frome valley. The Trust is in full agreement with this sentiment. Their letter also identifies various lost elements of the landscape that could be re-instated, but this would require major investment.</p> <p>The key issue therefore becomes the extent to which Wolfeton, which inevitably includes the building complex and its integral parkland, is compromised by the proposed development. The Trust acknowledges the significant change to the indicative layout now proposed over the original. However, taking the HE's and Trust's starting point, which is that the house complex and parkland should not be overlooked in order to preserve its rural setting, the information submitted is not consistent.</p> <p>The Documents from Tyler Grange include a series of visual photomontages that show the existing view and proposed visualisations of the development. These show that there will be an element of inter-visibility. These are based presumably on the indicative layout and background information submitted by Clifton Emery. The pre-application advice letter from HE dated 21 October 2020 (Appendix 2 in the Heritage Report) includes a very different photomontage of the site from the Wolfeton parkland. The Trust is in no position to compare these two representations, and pandemic rules mean that it is not possible to visit the area.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>One particular element may give rise to this difference. The Trust notes that elements of the new housing within Clifton Emery's indicative layout are to be designed to emulate agricultural buildings, but these appear still to be two-storey. While there is nothing wrong with that, it is perhaps the height rather than the design ethic that is the issue. A re-consideration of the southern fringe of Area 5 to a single-storey but still potentially agricultural style of housing might assist.</p> <p>The Trust accepts that the applicants have made significant improvements to the proposals, and acknowledge the importance of the Wolfeton complex and parkland. However, if the objective is to limit the mutual inter-visibility between the two, then some further alteration to the indicative layout is needed. The Council will also need to be satisfied that the draft Heads of Terms for the offered s106 agreement is sufficient to tie any development to this layout.</p> <p>Until these discussions with the applicants take place, the Trust objects to the application. If amendments are made to this application, the Trust would appreciate being informed please.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Christopher Clarke For the Dorset Gardens Trust</p>
Lulworth Castle	Dorset	E20/1460	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a 25m Telecommunications Mast together with 4 cabinets, compound fence, 2 transmission dishes and ancillary development. Binford Range, Lulworth Camp, West Lulworth, Wareham, BH20 5QS. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</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 Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have been unable to undertake a site visit due to Covid restrictions and our response is therefore necessarily a desk based assessment. The Planning Statement for the submission notes a number of heritage assets, including listed buildings, SSSIs and SACs in the vicinity, but states "...there are no designated heritage assets within or immediately abutting the application site." This is not correct. The proposed site of this mast is very close to the boundaries of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Lulworth Castle on its north and east sides.</p> <p>The Planning Statement, whilst invoking Local Policy LLH, also states "The main issues arising from this application are whether the proposed mast and cabinets due to their scale and siting would be a visually obtrusive feature which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of</p>

					<p>the area, including designated heritage assets in the wider surrounds, and whether any perceived harm would outweigh the significant social, economic and public benefits associated with the increased service provision attributed to the proposal and other valid material considerations as outlined within NPPF and the Local Plan.”</p> <p>In its final Summary, the Planning Statement also concludes that “....the proposed site has been carefully sited in a location that benefits from a good degree of tree screening that will provide camouflage to the mast, particularly from medium distance views from the wider surrounds.” This is an extremely important consideration given the numerous designated heritage assets in the wider surrounds, notably at Lulworth Estate. The applicant concludes that there would be no harm caused to these assets by virtue of the distance and intervening tree/foliage cover between the site and the estate. There have been many statements highlighting the benefits and need for improved 3-5G coverage in their area.</p> <p>The GT/DGT therefore conclude that –</p> <p>a) There is a wealth of detail and justification for the provision of 3-5G coverage in the Lulworth area,</p> <p>b) There is a designated national heritage asset which has not been identified as a material consideration.</p> <p>c) There is a conclusion that heritage assets have not been harmed, but no justification from this statement, other than the single sentence “there would be no harm caused to these assets by virtue of the distance between the site and Lulworth Estate and the intervening tree and foliage between the site and the estate.”</p> <p>The GT/DGT believe that this application is deficient in its reasoning. There is no doubting the government’s clear objective to provide improved internet coverage in rural areas, but this does not mean that heritage assets can be subject to only cursory examination.</p> <p>The GT/DGT ask that the heritage issue be considered fully and with greater rigour before the application is determined.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Belhus Park	Essex	E20/1325	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Remediation and restoration, with associated works, of former landfill site to create a new public	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.01.2021</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>

				open space including community woodland. Land Adjacent And East Of M25 And North Of Stifford Road, Aveley, Essex. LANDSCAPE	above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation accompanying this application. The former landfill site lies immediately to the south of the eastern extremity of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Belhus Park which is bisected by the M25. The GT/EGT are pleased to see that the former landfill site is to be restored and are supportive of this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/1445	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of five dwellings (C3) on land to the rear of the existing public house (Sui Generis) utilising existing access off Cambridge Road, reconfiguration of public house car park, with associated hard and soft landscaping. Coach And Horses Inn, Cambridge Road, Newport. RESIDENTIAL	<b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The GT/EGT objected to the previous planning application (UTT/20/0803/FUL) which was refused by your officers last year. Whilst the layout of the new application is an improvement on the previous arrangement, and the scale of the development more suited to a backland site, we would however like to reiterate the points we made previously and maintain our objection. It is clear that Newport is under a great deal of development pressure and this proposal for five new dwellings immediately adjacent to the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Shortgrove will be a further incremental erosion of the setting of the RPG. Should this application or the appeal be successful, we would request a condition requiring a tree management plan to ensure screening of the site. Even with such a plan in place, the additional development will result in a more prominent, urbanising, physical form at the edge of the RPG even if filtered to some degree. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Lilystone Hall	Essex	E20/1483	-	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of Stable Building with Associated Ancillary Facilities and Storage for Hay and Feed. Land At Junction Of Honeypot Lane And	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</b> Thank you for referring this application to the Essex Gardens Trust, which represents The Gardens Trust, the statutory consultee on applications the might affect historic and registered landscapes, in this case the land associated with Lilystone Hall, which is included in the EGT's inventory of

				Ingatestone Road, Stock, Ingatestone, Essex. EQUESTRIAN	historic gardens in the City of Chelmsford. We have no objection to this application, but would recommend that there is a condition to ensure that the access road has a surface suitable to this rural setting, and possibly some planting to soften the impact of it and the stable. David Andrews FSA, IHBC
Trent Park	Greater London	E20/1370	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Replacement timber fence and hardstanding at front. Front Lodge, Trent Park, Cockfosters Road, Barnet. BOUNDARY	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.01.2021</b></p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Trent Park and Trent Country Park * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>The park is designated a Registered Park &amp; Garden Grade II -TRENT PARK, Enfield - 1000484   Historic England</p> <p>The application is incomplete since it does not include the list entries for the Lodge House, the Gate and the wider park which the lodge house and gate originally served. Reference to the list entries would be the the minimum required by the NPPF and HE guidance. The application gives scant regard to the listing of the property, but none at all to the impact of boundary treatments on the registered landscape and gate.</p> <p>The height of the fence is said to increase, but not the proposed height is not stated. Any fence which severs views of the house from the front as entering the park will undermine its historic use as a gate house, its setting within the park and with the gates itself. The HE listing states:</p> <p>‘ENTRANCES AND APPROACHES The approach to Trent Park house is from Cockfosters Road to the west (1km south-west of the house), through the late C19 west entrance gateway (listed grade II), with semi-circular red-brick and stone quadrant walls, with returned ends, flanking two large piers, with finials of urns and garlands, supporting panelled wood gates. On either side of the entrance are seven stone bollards with ogee domed tops (listed grade II). The entrance masks the halftimbered Victorian lodge. ‘</p>

					<p>The Lodge is entirely within the registered park and high fences to its boundaries will undermine all three designated heritage assets, individually and jointly.</p> <p>The LPGT OBJECTS to this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no information online to show the proposed fence height, or a plan with legend showing exactly what type of fence will be used and where;</li> <li>• There is no information online which clearly shows the present area of hard standing and the proposed area of hard standing.</li> <li>• There is no assessment on the impact of the new fence on the character of the wider registered landscape</li> <li>• The boundary will impact directly not only on the listed house Front Lodge at Trent Park , Enfield - 1387178   Historic England, but the separately listed gate West entrance gateway to Trent Park at Front Lodge, Enfield - 1358676   Historic England.</li> <li>• The gate lodge and gate are historically linked and to erect any structure which destroys this link also undermines the context for each and their meaning in the wider landscape. Such fragmentation is detrimental to the quality of the registered landscape, listed lodge and listed gates.</li> </ul> <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</p>
Beddington Park	Greater London	E20/1436	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two semi-detached, two storey dwellings with private amenity space, car parking, cycle and bin storage. Grange Lodge, London Road, Wallington SM6 7BT.</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.01.2021</b></p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see</p>

					<p>Beddington Park and The Grange, including Carew Manor (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Contrary to claims in the D&amp;A the site lies entirely within the historic park, Beddington Park and the Grange, Beddington Park Conservation Area and the Wandle Valley Regional Park. The existing lodge building character positively contributes to the historic character of the park, and to the setting of several other designated and nondesignated heritage assets surrounding.</p> <p>The Park recently completed improvement works, partly fund by £3million from the Heritage Lottery Fund to improve signage and interpretation of the history of the park. To permit the demolition of an attractive lodge building would seem a particularly damaging action. To allow such poorly designed and incongruous replacement buildings, would compound the damage to the park and conservation area.</p> <p>The LPGT OBJECTS to this planning application on the following grounds: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is wholly within the Beddington Park Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset, and as such the existing lodge is protected as a positive contributor to the protected historic character.</li> <li>• The site is additionally positioned within an historic park and garden, and the Wandle Valley Regional Park. The loss of the original lodge would be detrimental to their character and interest.</li> <li>• The existing lodge is of considerable age and has architectural merit in its own right. It is clearly a non-designated heritage asset as described by the NPPF and wholly within a conservation area and should be afforded the commensurate protection from demolition and/or detrimental alteration.</li> <li>• The existing lodge is in keeping with the other existing Lodge on London Road and should be seen as part of an historic sequence and intrinsic part of the character and evolution of the historic park and gardens.</li> <li>• The replacement buildings proposed are lacking in any architectural quality and have no relevance to the protected garden and conservation area. They are poor reflections of the surrounding 1930s residential developments and add nothing positive to the character of the conservation area and would be damaging to the quality and coherence of the conservation area and historic gardens.</li> <li>• The building is within a park which has recently been awarded Heritage</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Lottery Fund support for a £3.7m improvement plan. To then allow the loss of original and attractive architecture, which positively contributes to the high quality of the surrounding conservation area and setting of listed buildings, would be contrary to all heritage conservation policy and guidance.</p> <p>Please inform us of your decision once available. In addition, could you please improve the information available via the council website on the conservation area and park. Only the boundary outline of the conservation area is shown on the policy map and without character assessments, management plans or designation reports. I found a committee meeting from October 2020 giving permission for a public consultation on the Beddington Park Management Plan and I request you notify the Gardens Trust when this consultation begins.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Bromley Open Spaces Strategy	Greater London	E20/1481	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Consultation on Open Spaces Strategy	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</b></p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Inventory (<a href="http://londongardenstrust.org">londongardenstrust.org</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Unfortunately, although we are statutory consultee, we did not receive notification of the above consultation in time to meet the deadline. A member of the public contacted us 5th January and the closing date was 7th January. It is disappointing that we were not contacted earlier and I hope our comments enclosed are still recorded as part of the consultation.</p> <p>1. We are concerned about a document that uses words like "re-assign" or "redevelop". We would prefer such a document to be about getting "sufficient" space of "sufficient" quality in the right place, with an assessment of facilities: cafes, football pitches etc. across the borough. If a</p>



					<p>space is of poor quality /location then where / how to could it be improved or swapped for other better spaces?</p> <p>2. It does no seem necessary for the SPD to directly reference with the NPPF so we see no need to refer to housing. It could prejudice decisions.</p> <p>3. What do you mean by the reference to 'Green towns'? Could you please refer us to the source of this term.</p> <p>4. It would seem more helpful for the document to define what is appropriate for each space i.e. natural might be right for one place and wrong for another. Allowing tree planting to go 'natural' does not mean no maintenance in any case. We have all seen the benefit of a range of open space provision in the last year and that should surely be the aim? The sphere of travel to open space must have shifted dramatically in recent months. Just a slightly different climbing frame for example is enough to justify walking 0.5 miles for many families.</p> <p>5. Short term contractors rarely have horticultural skills in house and little incentive or interest in getting them. This is the main problems with planting choices; and the section on natural planting is disappointing. All planting should be site specific and related to the character assessments of each space ideally.</p> <p>6. Little mention is made of historic designed landscapes and enhancing local character.</p> <p>Could you please acknowledge receipt of this response and ensure that in future the London Gardens Trust (<a href="mailto:planning@longongardenstrust.org">planning@longongardenstrust.org</a>) is notified of all consultations on policies and strategies affecting parks &amp; gardens in Bromley, and the outcome of this recent consultation on the Open Spaces Strategy.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Public London Charter	Greater London	E20/1515	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Public London Charter consultation draft	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.01.2021</b></p> <p>It would help us to know what type of user of public space you are? (select as many responses as appropriate)</p> <p>other</p> <p>Would the Charter make you feel more confident about what your rights and responsibilities are when you are in a public space?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Would the Charter make you feel more confident about what the</p>

					<p>responsibilities of the manager/owner of a public space are towards you in said space?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Principles in the Charter?</p> <p>Public Welcome Strongly agree</p> <p>Openness Strongly agree</p> <p>Unrestricted Use Somewhat agree</p> <p>Community Focus Somewhat agree</p> <p>Free of Charge Strongly agree</p> <p>Privacy and Data Strongly agree</p> <p>Transparency Strongly agree</p> <p>Good Stewardship Somewhat agree</p> <p>If you think the principle of Public Welcome in the Charter needs changing, can you tell us how and why?</p> <p>It is not clear how the public/Local Authorities will be able to secure remedy if the Charter is ignored</p> <p>Are there any changes you would make to the guidance for the principle of Public Welcome?</p> <p>Yes - whilst it is noted that the document refers to Public Realm - insufficient emphasis is given to environmental factors and no weight is given to encouraging climate mitigation measures and green space; or to respecting existing heritage. Whilst these are covered elsewhere in policies within the London Plan there is insufficient tie-in here.</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes them align with this principle?</p> <p>The Trust holds an inventory of over 2,500 historic landscapes that exist across London - many of which comply with the charter by making them freely accessible. The Trust works with many landowners of sites that are less open to the public, such as rooftop gardens in the City of London, and Historic Squares which it seeks to open up for greater public access through its annual event that ran for 21 years prior to the Pandemic.</p> <p>If you think the principle of Openness in the Charter needs changing, can you tell us how and why?</p> <p>It omits any reference to greenery. It does not seek to open up rooftops and other areas.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Are there any changes you would make to the guidance for the principle of Openness?</p> <p>Add final sentence: It should seek to enhance biodiversity and offer water run off and natural landscape wherever possible. Commercially managed garden rooftops and other spaces that have restricted access should be open up as frequently as possible to the general public.</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes them align with this principle?</p> <p>See <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a> Select "Private Open Space" Several examples including Coram's Fields</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes they align with this principle?</p> <p>See Inventory as before.</p> <p>If you think the principle of Community Focus in the Charter needs changing, can you tell us how and why?</p> <p>The emphasis on public art and cultural activity is inappropriate for many spaces. People enjoy some areas of tranquility.</p> <p>Are there any changes you would make to the guidance for the principle of Community Focus?</p> <p>Public space should be managed to enable users to meet, associate, spend time with others, [insert - relax, enjoy the environment] and celebrate their community. It should make provision for community-led and cultural activities that reflect the diversity of London's communities, [delete - as well as public art] and other ways of celebrating diversity in the public realm.</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes them align with this principle?</p> <p>Public Parks - see inventory</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes them align with this principle?</p> <p>Every local authority run park! But it is not a statutory service and so, despite extra costs incurred as a result of social distancing measures such as fencing off outdoor gyms and potential covid hotspots the parks departments are likely to see further budget cuts. This makes maintenance a greater challenge and leads to loss of amenity value as spaces degrade.</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>No</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes them align with this principle?</p> <p>Most entrances to parks give outline statements about not vandalising the space and governance through bylaws. The issue is a lack of enforcement - what is the status of the Charter and how/who will pay for enforcement?</p> <p>If you think the principle of Good Stewardship in the Charter needs changing, can you tell us how and why?</p> <p>Nothing about investing in the landscape and maintenance.</p> <p>Are there any changes you would make to the guidance for the principle of Good Stewardship?</p> <p>Add "It is vital that landlords maintain the space for the benefit of nature on a regular basis and regularly monitor wellbeing scores and environmental impacts to demonstrate that standards are appropriate."</p> <p>Do you know of any examples of existing public space in London where you think this principle is already being applied?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If you answered yes, can you tell us which space(s) these are and what you feel makes them align with this principle?</p> <p>Public Parks are doing the best they can.</p> <p>Do you have any comments on how we propose to implement the Charter?</p> <p>Please refer to Section 3.</p> <p>It is unclear how the enforcement and monitoring will take place, what the legal status of a s106 agreement will be to a 3rd party that purchases of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the original landlord; how service level agreements will be set up etc.</p> <p>Do you have any further comments to make on the Public London Charter? The Trust warmly welcomes the principle of setting standards for public realm. The Trust is concerned that there are no measures in place to respect the historic environment, and to maximise opportunity for green space. The Trust would like to see greater emphasis on encouraging more landscapes to be opened up on a regular basis - the opening text refers to roof gardens but these are not public realm - in practice almost none (with the exception of perhaps Brown Hart Gardens in Westminster; and the raised areas around the Southbank) are freely accessible to the public - this is a missed opportunity to embed the principle of Corporate Social Responsibility with landowners being required to actively hold open days - many do (such as Nomura Bank and Cannon Bridge Station in the City for Open Garden Squares Weekend); but plenty do not (eg. roof gardens in the Vauxhall/Wandsworth Area; and on top of buildings at King's Cross; which are kept for exclusive residential/commercial users at all times of year or Sky Gardens in the City which is a paid for attraction).</p> <p>Helen Monger</p>
South Stoneham House	Hampshire	E20/1326	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building consent</p> <p>Demolition of the South Stoneham Tower block hall of residence, the building known as the Junior Common Room annexe including the glazed link, the dining room, kitchen area and linking building to South Stoneham House, the Wardens Lodge, the store structures, part of boundary walls and ancillary structures within grounds of South Stoneham House.</p> <p>(Submitted in conjunction with 20/01625/LBC). South Stoneham Site, Wessex Lane, Southampton.</p> <p>DEMOLITION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.01.2021</b></p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Hampshire Garden Trust concerning the above planning application. We are very concerned that the University does not appear to be taking into account the importance of South Stoneham House and its grounds as a Capability Brown landscape. The unsympathetic changes in the 60's and the house being in separate ownership from the rest of the grounds which run down to the Itchen caused a lot of damage to the design but a number of features survive and any redevelopment should seek to reunite the house visually with these surviving features.</p> <p>Any planning approval should be dependant on much greater recognition of the historical importance of the historic landscape and require co-operation in reinstating the important vistas harmed in the 60's that are capable of being restored if the tower block is demolished..</p> <p>I attach a copy of the historical research carried out by the Trust for ease of reference and a copy of our comments to the University when they carried out their consultation. I can see no evidence that they have taken the importance of the landscape into account.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Mrs J Adams</p>

					LVO OBE FIHort Conservation and Development Team
Hackwood Park	Hampshire	E20/1406	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed erection of post and wire fencing to match and adjoin to existing at either end including 3 timber gates. Sawmill Yard, Hackwood Park, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG25 2JZ. BOUNDARY	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.01.2021</p> <p>The above applications relating to Sawmill Yard at Hackwood Park have been brought to the Gardens Trust's (GT) attention. As you are aware, we are statutory consultees 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, and we are surprised and disappointed that you failed to consult us, despite having engaged with us on several previous Hackwood applications. We are grateful that you have allowed us an extension of time to respond to both applications which we are responding to together as they are inextricably linked.</p> <p>The documentation accompanying both applications is woefully inadequate as there is no mention whatsoever that the application site lies within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Hackwood Park. As your officers are aware, Hackwood is one of the most important designed landscapes in the country. The RPG is a highly selective designation, with only 145 of the 1658 designated parks and gardens in England being included at Grade I. This puts Hackwood on a par with places such as Blenheim and Stourhead, so it is incumbent on Basingstoke and Deane BC to strongly uphold the NPPF which makes it very clear that harm to such heritage assets or their settings should be wholly exceptional and any adverse impact to their setting should be very strongly resisted. Hackwood is one of only two intact Baroque landscapes in England, and the only example of a relatively intact Bridgeman design ornamented by a host of garden buildings by James Gibbs, making it an astonishingly rare survival. Even the briefest reading of the Register entry shows that over the course of its history, Hackwood has been associated with many of the most illustrious names in English landscape gardening, as well as associations with other notable figures such as John Gay, reflected in the naming of features within the park.</p> <p>The planning applications seek to erect a new fence, a substantial part of which would run alongside the original principal historic drive into Hackwood Park shortly after passing the entrance lodge. A visitor's first impression of the landscape, which has until now always been unfenced in this part of the RPG, would be immediately altered by this intrusive and alien addition. We note that in the Application Officers' Report for the original consent for the conversion of the Sawmill Yard (15/01280/FUL &amp;</p>

					<p>15/0281/LBC) it was stated that ‘it would be expedient to remove most PD Rights enjoyed by dwellings to avoid any possible further erosion of the existing agricultural character through domestication.’ This is extremely relevant in this instance. The most southerly point of the area to be fenced is only about 150m from the edge of Spring Wood, which although only part of the registered landscape, is the most sensitive part of the RPG at Hackwood in garden design terms. Within Spring Wood, the Rotunda stands at the head of The Amphitheatre and there are clear views down from the Amphitheatre, and the outer Walk in that area to the open parkland, the old bridge and the area subject to the Lawful Development Application. Amphitheatres were a distinctive feature of several designs by Bridgeman. Spring Wood is the only site in which the amphitheatre can be seen in the context of his overall design, and at Hackwood that design remains largely intact. All other Landscapes designed by Bridgeman were subsequently the subject of substantial alteration - eg Stowe, Rousham, Claremont and Eastbury, which adds to the importance and significance of this survival at Hackwood. A marked up copy of a Google Earth image which gives an up-to-date indication of how the introduction of a residential curtilage would impact on Bridgeman’s design has been attached to the end of this letter.</p> <p>In our opinion, any change in the status of the land outside the curtilage permitted in 2015 would represent a significant threat to the integrity of the RPG, and all the conditions imposed back in 2015 stress that these were put in place to preserve the special historic interest and setting of the heritage assets. The area now to be enclosed is much larger than the original area permitted for change of use outlined in red (see Dwg 2040/01 dated March 2015).</p> <p>Basingstoke &amp; Dean’s adopted Local Plan 2011-29 (policy EM12 Historic Environment) requires applicants to (Para 127a) ‘Demonstrate a thorough understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, how this has informed the proposed development, and how the proposal would impact upon the asset’s significance.’ In addition Para 6.92 requires an applicant to demonstrate their understanding of significance through ‘the pre-application discussion and process.’ From the submitted documentation it does not appear that there was any pre-application consultation and without any form of heritage statement or visual impact assessment, it is apparent that the applicant does not fully appreciate either the significance or the impact their proposals will have upon the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>setting of the RPG. Therefore, this application fails to comply with your adopted local plan as well as Paras 189, 190, 193 &amp; 194 of the NPPF. Your officers will also be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (GPA3). We suggest that these applications do not follow this advice in several instances : (page 2) - A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it. There is no higher designation for an RPG than Grade I and this seems to have been entirely ignored. Should the new fencing be permitted, it would set a precedent encouraging others to also fence in their property, further detracting from the original open aspect of the landscape, and it is therefore incumbent on local planning authorities ... to consider the implications of cumulative change. (GPA3 p2).</p> <p>Should your officers approve this application for fencing and change of use of the area to residential garden, the only reason for granting it would be if a specific change of use was intended. There is nothing to suggest that the applicants propose either a forestry or agricultural usage of the land within their ownership and the sole purpose of the fencing is to enclose it as a domestic garden. This would be contrary to the Application Officers' Report quoted above, and in our opinion any change from the current open parkland layout would have an adverse impact on the RPG and make it more difficult to read its original purpose and design rationale.</p> <p>Should the applicants require a secure garden area, they might consider for example, fencing hidden set slightly back within the existing woodland, which would provide the necessary security without impinging adversely on the setting and significance of this nationally imporThe Gardens Trust OBJECTS to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Croome Court	Hereford and Worcester	E20/1350	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed waste wood recycling and expansion of existing composting facility. Croome Farm, Croome D'Abitot, Severn	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.01.2021</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;</p>



				Stoke, Worcestershire MISCELLANEOUS	<p>Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&amp;WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We responded to the earlier incarnation of this application 19/00004/CM on 12th February 2020. Our comments remain unchanged.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Witley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E20/1545	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of Stables to provide DIY Livery facilities. Witley Park Farm, Worcester Road, Great Witley. EQUESTRIAN	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2021</b></p> <p>The above retrospective application has been brought to our attention by a member of the public. We are disappointed that your council failed to notify us of this application, as you will be aware that the Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee for any proposed development affecting all grades of registered parks and gardens (RPGs) listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The above application lies within the Grade II* Witley Court RPG and as such we should automatically have been consulted. I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet which sets out guidance for Local Authority in this regard. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hereford &amp; Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&amp;WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation for this retrospective application. The application site appears to lie in part of the farm which contains some existing large barns. However, the information submitted is inadequate for an understanding of the exact development location within the RPG. Since we have been unable to visit the site due to Covid restrictions, we would ask that your officers request a Heritage Impact Assessment as it is not possible either for them or for us to understand and analyse the impacts which cumulative development has had upon the setting and significance of the RPG without such a document. This information is required before an informed consultation comment can be made.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Welwyn Hatfield Climate Change Strategy	Hertfords hire	E20/1253	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Draft Climate Change Strategy public consultation <a href="https://www.welhat.gov.uk/strategies/climate-change/preface">https://www.welhat.gov.uk/strategies/climate-change/preface</a>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic designed parks and gardens. This response is on behalf of both organizations.</p> <p>We support policies to encourage waste water recycling, SUDS, and green</p>

					<p>infrastructure to help mitigate the effects of climates change.</p> <p>We have the following concerns about the effect these policies might have on the many historic parks and gardens, both designated and undesignated which lie within the borough. There is no specific mention, apart from one brief 'heritage' , of the effects, both of climate change and of any mitigation measures which may be undertaken.</p> <p>Many of our historic parks and gardens contain lakes, often formed from dammed rivers as at Tewin Water Hatfield House, and Brocket Park, spring fed as at Digswell Water or features as at Woolmers Park or early industrial water ways as at Mill Green. These are sensitive to changes in water supply and mitigation measures, either by narrowing the watercourse or widening it to contain floodwaters would cause substantial harm to these designed features. Similarly these designed landscapes contain much tree planting which is a key element in climate change mitigation. The species of trees and the disposition in these landscapes contributes in a major way to their significance and their character. We recognise that species may need to change due to pests, diseases or climatic conditions, but these should always be carefully considered site by site so as to preserve its historic integrity . Likewise, mass planting of trees in historic parks and gardens to increase tree cover in the borough should not be permitted if it alters the design intent of the parkland.</p> <p>None of this is mentioned and Historic Designed Landscapes are not even noted as an issue to be considered in any policy or strategy. The NPPF requires that heritage assets be conserved and where possible enhanced. This should also apply to this Climate Change Strategy.</p> <p>We also note that you mention a Green Corridor which is illustrated in Figure 8. This Green Corridor has been much debated during the Local Plan Examination Hearings and the optimum criteria for a Green Corridor, supported by research documentation, has been set out by The Central Herts Green Corridor Group. The Green Corridor as illustrated in Figure 8 is inadequate and would not function as a Green Corridor. A section of the Green Corridor has been included in Document EX227, Diagram P3 on SDS2(WGC5) Birchall Garden Suburb Section in The Local Plan Examination Document. This diagram demonstrates that the council does not understand the requirements and function of a Green Corridor. Although HGT and GT support the idea of a Green Corridor not least to prevent coalescence, or destruction, of the settings of heritage assets, a robust , fit-for-purpose corridor should be planned.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust The Gardens Trust
15 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1544	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce the crown of 1 x Hornbeam tree 3-4m. 15 Scholars Mews, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JQ. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30/01/21</b> Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. No information as to the reason for reducing the crown of this tree is included in this application. We would not object to this application if the WHBC considers that the pruning is necessary for the health of the tree
53 Oakdale, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1560	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a detached garden room. 53 Oakdale Welwyn Garden City AL8 7QP. GARDEN BUILDING	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.01.2021</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. The rear of this property is within the views across the landscape which was formerly part of the Capability Brown design for Digswell. From the plans included, which show that the proposed Garden Room is very largely screened by the existing beech hedge, we do not consider that the room would have a harmful impact on the historic landscape, providing the hedge is not reduced in height. We therefor have no objections to this proposal as described.
79 Digswell Park Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1528	N	PLANNING APPLICATION 1 x Silver birch to reduce by 2m height, 1.5m width and to sever ivy at base. 1 x White willow to fell to around 1.5m above ground level. 1 x White Willow to reduce laterals by 2.5m 1 x Sycamore to reduce lateral growth by 1.5m 1 x Beech to reduce 2 over extended limbs by around 1 - 1.5m 1 x Eucalyptus to reduce by around 4m in height 79 Digswell Park Road, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NW. TREES	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21/01/21</b> Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. There is no justification submitted with this application for these extensive works. We would have no objection to the drastic pruning as proposed if the WHBC is satisfied that they are necessary .
Hatfield House	Hertfords hire	E20/1395	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 289	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.21</b> Object Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.

				residential units (Use Class C3) and community hub (Use Class E/F.2), with public realm and open space, landscaping, access, associated car and cycle parking, refuse and recycling storage and supporting infrastructure. Biopark, Broadwater Road, Welwyn Garden City AL7 3AX. MAJOR HYBRID	The Biopark lies within the setting of the WGC Conservation Area and listed buildings to the north at Roche and Shredded Wheat sites. It is also part of the wider setting of Hatfield House and Park, both Grade 1. The height and massing of the proposed blocks would cause harm to the setting, and therefore the significance of these designated heritage assets. Further redevelopment of this area as proposed will adversely affect the relatively low-rise residential properties in the immediate vicinity. Although this area has historically been the Industrial Zone of the Howard vision for the town, we have no objections to a more modest residential scheme though we do regret that the industrial heritage of the town has not been valued as much as the residential heritage, both now and in the past. We object to this scheme due to the harm to the significance of designated heritage assets as above
Northaw Place, Northaw	Hertfords hire	E20/1402	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of an outbuilding. 8 Northaw Place, Coopers Lane, Northaw, Potters Bar EN6 4NQ. MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09/01/21 Object Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The garden ground to the south of the houses at Northaw Place has always been pleasure grounds and contained no substantial buildings. We are concerned that the introduction of such a large building so close to the Listed Garden Walls and in view of the Listed Mansion would harm the setting and significance of both heritage assets. The proposed building appears to have no further screening than the existing hedges and walls which are lower than the roofline; the views of the garden walls, both from the houses and from the entrance drive to the south would be harmed by the proximity of the building and lack of screening; and the open aspect, of the garden ground would be compromised. We note that this lies within an historic garden of Local Importance on the WHBC list and within the Green Belt. In view of harm to setting of heritage assets, and inappropriate building in the GB, we object to this proposal.
Grove Gardens, Adgerton	Isle of Wight	E20/1409	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of conservatory; proposed side and rear single storey extensions; alterations. Grove Gardens, Upper Road, Adgestone, Sandown Isle Of	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.01.2021</b> The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust (IWGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works to protect and conserve historic parks and gardens. The comment on this development from the Archaeology and Historic Environment Service states: the development site lies within a non-designated heritage asset recorded

				Wight PO36 OET BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>in the Isle of Wight Historic Environment Record (IWHER 9153 Productive Walled Garden) and adjoins IWHER 13591 (Cottage, Grove Gardens). The walled garden predates 1793 and is associated with the farmstead at Grove (IWHER 8859) of which non-designated and designated buildings survive. The walled garden and earliest buildings at Grove Farm may be associated with an earlier Manor House.</p> <p>In 2014, the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust carried out a survey of local walled kitchen gardens and produced a publication with gazetteer available on our website at Projects (iowgardenstrust.co.uk). The walled garden at Grove is included in the gazetteer. It is one of a minority of walled kitchen gardens on the Island that predate 1800. At present, it is not on the Isle of Wight Council's Local List but we feel that the list requires updating following the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust publication. Walled kitchen gardens are not currently represented on the list as stand-alone features although historic parks and gardens are included. As an early local example of a walled kitchen garden, Grove Garden should be considered for inclusion and we hope that the Local List Panel will reconvene in 2021.</p> <p>We note that the present application proposes a relatively small extension to the modern house that already exists in the garden and that it also includes the removal of a modern conservatory. We therefore do not object to this proposal. The purpose of our comment is to emphasise the local heritage value of the site to the Isle of Wight Council and to the owner.</p> <p>John Brownscombe Chairman Isle of Wight Gardens Trust</p>
Woodlands Vale Estate	Isle of Wight	E20/1540	II	PLANNIG APPLICATION Outline for up to 50 residential dwellings (with details of access), creation of a new access off Puckpool Hill, and provision of public open space, landscaping and associated works (additional information available to view online - ecology report and revised road widening and access plan) (readvertised application). Land North Of Woodland Close	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.01.2021</b></p> <p>The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust (IWGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works to protect and conserve historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>The site of this application is adjacent to the Woodlands Vale Estate which is shown on the National Heritage List as a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. However, there is no known documentary evidence that this site has ever been part of the historic Woodlands Vale Estate. It is located just north of the former walled kitchen garden of Woodlands Vale which has subsequently been built over and to the west of Cedar Lodge which itself has an interesting garden but is not on the national or local list for its parks and gardens interest.</p>

				<p>And Adjacent Cedar Lodge And Thornton Cottage Puckpool Hill Seaview Isle Of Wight</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>We restrict our comments to those relating to the potential impact of the development of this site on the adjacent registered area. Having looked at the submitted information we have made the following conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The substantial existing tree belt between the area and Woodlands Vale provides significant visual screening between this site and the registered park. This is already protected under a Tree Preservation Order. This helps to reinforce the separation between the two areas.</li> <li>• The local topography and the level of existing mature trees and shrubs on site boundaries mean that the site is well contained and benefits from existing screening.</li> <li>• This latest iteration of the layout of the site includes a greater separation than originally shown with the closest proposed property being set back approximately 40 metres from an open area which is included as an attenuation basin.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, we do not believe there to be any adverse impact on the registered park and garden from the proposed development.</p> <p>This site and the setting of the adjacent Woodlands Vale Registered Park and Garden could be further enhanced through some additional planting of evergreen parkland trees in the south-eastern corner of the site. We would ask the applicant to consider this as part of their proposals and recommend Cedrus libani, Pinus sylvestris and Taxus bacata as appropriate for this purpose.</p> <p>Yours faithfully John Brownscombe Chairman Isle of Wight Gardens Trust</p>
Stoke Rochford Hall	Lincolnshire	E20/1421	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Display of digital 48-Sheet free-standing advertisement. Stoke Rochford Golf Course, Great North Road, Stoke Rochford, NG33 5EW.</p> <p>ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2021</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. We note that conditional approval for the advertising boards was granted in August 2009, but would like to highlight the fact that the online documentation totally fails to mention the fact that the site lies within the Grade II* Stoke Rochford registered park and garden (RPG). As such we would have expected a planning application to be supported by a Heritage Statement at the very least and a Design and Access statement. It is</p>

					<p>disappointing that the applicant appears to have little understanding or appreciation of the importance or sensitivities of their site, or how their advertisement might affect the setting or significance of the RPG. Failure to provide this information means that the application fails to comply with the NPPF Paras 189 and 190.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stanley Park, Liverpool	Merseyside	E20/1311	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To extend the Anfield Road Stand, following partial demolition, to provide up to 7,000 additional seats and internal facilities including general admission concourses, hospitality lounges, a family fan zone, club offices, staff facilities and plant and equipment; with associated public realm; lighting; landscaping and associated infrastructure; and, To use the stadium for other team sporting events and to host up to 12 concerts and / or major events per annum. Anfield Stadium, Anfield Road, Liverpool, L4 0TH. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.01.2021</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 in connection with the above. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have reviewed the application documents, and also visited the site last year as part of the assessment of the earlier Scoping Report. The Anfield Road Stand lies immediately adjacent to Stanley Park, a very important Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, together with a number of Grade II listed structures and buildings, recently benefitting from considerable investment and upgrading.</p> <p>We commented on the Scoping Report by letter dated 21 January 2020, making reference to those areas and features of Stanley Park affected by the proposals. Although we accept that there were a considerable number of respondents to the Scoping Report consultation, we can see no reference or acknowledgement of our comments made in the process. Of greater concern, the proposals do not appear to be obviously different from the details originally submitted. Our concerns and objections therefore remain. We therefore reiterate our concerns as outlined below.</p> <p>Whilst we support the underlying project in the continued development of Liverpool Football Club, we object to the inclusion of part of the Registered Park and Garden within the application boundary. This area forms the south side of the Dahlia Walk, one of the major entrances to Stanley Park from Utting Avenue which is laid out as a formal designed avenue. The boundary intrudes into the Park in this location. We acknowledge that the tree retention and removal plan indicates that removals are limited.</p> <p>Our primary concern is that the boundary and components of the</p>

					<p>Registered Park and Garden should not be affected in any way. The avenue has symmetry and grandeur: it is an essential element in the overall design and should have a parallel row of trees framing it. Therefore the retained trees immediately adjacent to the boundary of the Park must be secured and protected during all construction operations.</p> <p>The development of land immediately adjacent to the Registered Park and Garden will have significant adverse visual effects on the setting and character of the Park, and this is recognised in the Environmental Statement. In our earlier response we asked for a comprehensive and effective mitigation scheme, but these required proposals have not been clarified.</p> <p>A further area indicated by a green outline lies within Stanley Park, north of the Dahlia Walk. This is indicated for Site Welfare and Office Accommodation. We continue our objection to the siting of this facility within the Park as this will adversely affect the RPG and will add to the interference to Park users, as will the requirements for servicing, access etc., particularly to the Dahlia Walk. There are a number of alternatives to this location, and the large area of fenced unused land with concrete bases at the rear of 45 Anfield Road appears more suitable, minimising conflict with Park users. We suggest that alternative locations must be identified and pursued in preference to use of greenspace within the Park.</p> <p>In summary, the character and setting of the Registered Park and Garden must be protected and maintained at all times, including safe access for the public.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter, please contact me by email <a href="mailto:conservation@lancsgt.org.uk">conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</a>.</p> <p>Yours faithfully S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation &amp; Planning Group</p>
Norwich City (Earlham Road) Cemetery	Norfolk	E20/1425	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of a radio based station comprising of a 15m monopole supporting 3 No. shrouded antennas, 2 No. equipment cabinets, 1 No. meter cabinet and ancillary development. Proposed Telecom</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2021</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 Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The GT &amp; NGT object to the siting of the proposed radio base station, which would include a 15m monopole. The site is adjacent to the boundary</p>



				Base Station On Pavement Adjacent To North Bound Lane Farrow Road Norwich. COMMUNICATIONS/CCTV	<p>of the western section of Earlham Cemetery, a registered Grade II Historic Park and Garden and lies within the setting of the cemetery which makes an important contribution to the cemetery's significance. The two sections of the cemetery are separated by part of the Norwich ring road. Nevertheless, there are views between the two sections across the road. The proposal would encroach into a long stretch of grass verge which borders the cemetery's boundary fence and is free of development. There are lampposts in the ring road central reservation. The proposed monopole would introduce a prominent, tall and intrusive feature into the setting of the cemetery. In addition, the base station cabinets would be close to the cemetery's ornamental boundary railings, partly obscuring views of them. While the harm to the significance of the cemetery would be less than substantial, the evidence provided does not show that it would be outweighed by public benefits. It is not clear that no other site could accommodate this development. In addition, the supporting information suggests that to operate successfully the mast should extend above nearby trees, and the proposed monopole would not achieve this. There are important trees close to the proposed site, including trees within Earlham Cemetery. Should the Council decide to grant planning permission, those trees should be protected by effective planning conditions.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Gilling Castle	North Yorkshire	E20/0904	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of wasteland and replacement with stone chippings to provide parking area (retrospective). APPLICATION AMENDED Land Off Pottergate, Gilling East, Helmsley. PARKING	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for re- consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) on this retrospective planning application. As you know we objected to this retrospective planning application within Gilling Castle's Registered Historic Park and Garden (HP&amp;G). However, in our letter of 18th November 2020, we agreed with the suggestion from your authority's Tree and Landscape Officer that some mitigation might be helpful and we note the recent letter from the Howardian Hills AONB Officer regarding a landscaping plan and the letter from the Ampleforth College Golf Club Manager also with details of landscaping. We understand the objection from your authority's Conservation officer, as the additional parking proposed within the Registered HP&amp;G will cause some harm. However, on balance and assuming that the additional parking will relieve the situation on Pottergate, and that rainwater run-off will be prevented, we consider that the proposed landscaping will go some way to</p>

					<p>mitigating the harm.</p> <p>We agree with the landscaping proposals from the Howardian Hills AONB Officer, Paul Jackson, and suggest that some of the planting includes evergreens such as holly, a native species and one historically used in designed landscapes.</p> <p>If this compromise is achieved, we would withdraw our objection.</p> <p>However, we wish to underline that designated heritage assets, as here at Gilling Castle, are an irreplaceable resource and should be carefully conserved. In addition, this site is within the Howardian Hills AONB. It is incumbent on owners and tenants to take expert advice from their local planning authority before embarking on any changes to a heritage asset and it is even more important if those assets are within a specially designated landscape.</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	E20/1174	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Consultation on Application for the approval of details reserved by condition No's 20, 21 &amp; 23 of Planning Permission Ref. C6/19/00988/CMA which relates to a a Landscaping Scheme &amp; After-care Management Plan, a Restoration Environmental Management Plan and a Bird Hazard Management Plan on land at Allerton Park Landfill, Moor Lane (Off A168), Knaresborough, HG5 0SD. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRTITTEN RESONSE 09.12.2020</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 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>Allerton Park remains on the Historic England (HE) 'Heritage at Risk' register and we would like to point out the significance of the gardens and pleasure grounds to the north of the house; the 'setting' for the Landscaping Scheme, Aftercare Management Plan etc for the land at Allerton Park Landfill. The complex of listed buildings that make up Allerton Park includes three listed buildings towards the southern boundary of this application: Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). These have already had extensive restoration work and are significant structures.</p> <p>We note that the application form states it is a variation of Conditions 1, 2 and 20 which we commented on in our letter of 3rd April 2019 with a follow-up letter of 12th July 2019.</p>

					<p>And we refer you to our comments where we noted that the Landfill landscape design needs to be sympathetic to and integrated with the registered designed landscape to the south and with which it should be aesthetically linked. The planting should enhance the reciprocal views of Allerton Park and its listed buildings and the species used should reference the historic designed landscape and in their planting arrangement. The current submission is notated as at the top of our letter here, ie Conditions 20, 21 and 23.</p> <p>The south eastern section of the application site lies within the Registered Park and Garden (RPG). This is proposed to become a recreated 'parkland landscape' (para 2.5 Planning Condition 20 Landscape Scheme and Aftercare Management Plan). This seems a good way forward, however as we have not visited the site, we ask whether the proposed tree locations and landform have been considered in the wider context of the historic designed landscape. It is important for the future of the whole designed landscape that this aspect is addressed. We are encouraged by the proposals for tree planting but we understand that in earlier consultations with the landscape management of Allerton Park that beech, pedunculate oak, sweet chestnut, Scots pine and field maple were specified for the parkland to the south, all key species in the historic park. We are pleased to see the use of small-leaved lime but we consider that a couple more species in the 'parkland landscape' would future proof it.</p> <p>Turning to the Proposed Landform, the dome will have an impact on the RPG and we are disappointed not to have any cross sections showing the dome and the anticipated impact of the new trees at year 1, 10 etc. Have higher canopy trees been considered for this area? Again, we understand that beech, pedunculate oak, sweet chestnut and Scots pine had been suggested. These would link the proposed landform with the RPG to the south.</p> <p>We have noted Section 4 of Planning Condition 20 Landscape Scheme and Aftercare Management Plan.</p> <p>At General 4.1 Areas to be planted or seeded are to receive multipurpose subsoil in accordance with Table 1 of BS8601:2013. This subsoil shall be spread to a depth of 1.8m in areas where tree planting is proposed, and to a depth of 1.2m in other areas. 4.2 Soil shall either be imported, or manufactured on site, and shall accord with the requirements of BS8601:2013. Ground preparation and soil spreading shall also accord with BS8601:2013. 4.3 It is not the current practice of the Operator to use</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>topsoil in site restoration. As such, topsoil shall not be spread unless otherwise stated.</p> <p>We have not seen the detailed documents but would emphasise that in order to have successful tree planting some good topsoil is necessary in those areas, otherwise there are likely to be failures which would be costly in terms of improving the soil, planting new trees and the time and labour involved.</p> <p>We have not seen the drawing but trust that the following will be successful:</p> <p>Specimen Trees 4.11 All tree pits shall be constructed to the dimensions shown on Drawing 2259-01-09, and shall be made available for inspection by the Operator's Landscape Architect prior to backfilling. All pits shall be backfilled with approved imported topsoil (BS3882).</p> <p>At 4.14 Each tree shall be guarded against damage by deer.</p> <p>We agree that this is important and similarly the guarding should prevent damage by rabbits.</p> <p>We also query whether drainage has been carefully considered; will there be much run-off from the higher ground that could potentially affect the planting and Allerton's northern park? We note that there is a drain on the southern boundary and this will need to be maintained.</p> <p>Our other points on the Landscape Scheme and Aftercare Management Plan concern the watering of the specimen trees (para 6.15). We are experiencing more extreme weather conditions and Spring 2020 was notable for two months without rain in North Yorkshire, so we emphasise the importance of watering the young trees in their first few years and ensuring that they are not competing with weeds. We are also unclear as to the management of the landscape after Year 5. We trust that great care will be taken and that there will be regular monitoring so that any losses can be rectified, soil conditions modified and the tree planting is a success. We have no comments to make on Condition 23 Bird Hazard.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p> <p>cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1330	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed Agricultural Building.</p> <p>Allerton Grange Farm, Braimber Lane To Allerton Park</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2021</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,</p>

			Interchange, Allerton Park HG5 OSE. AGRICULTURE	<p>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>These four planning applications, each one for a large agricultural building, are on land between A1M and A168 immediately north of Junction 47 of the A1M. Although they are beyond the Registered boundary, they are within the wider setting of Allerton Park. At the moment most of the area between the A1M and A168 is being used as a compound for re-doing the roundabout where the A59 Harrogate road crosses the A1M. The plans for these four agricultural buildings indicate that they are proposed immediately north of the newly constructed adjoined buildings/sheds that we assume are being used by the motorway contractor and for which we can't recall having received any planning application. We trust that the adjoined buildings/sheds are temporary and will be removed on completion of the road works.</p> <p>As you will know 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 further development in its setting.</p> <p>The Registered park includes a number of designated heritage assets including Allerton Castle (grade I), Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). Both Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are sufficiently elevated to be further harmed by massing of the four proposed agricultural buildings which each measures 463sqm and are basic/utilitarian agricultural sheds. These are in addition to earlier applications by Allerton Grange Farm for agricultural buildings. It is not clear what type of additional agricultural use requires these four extra sheds and we could speculate that there may be a future change of use to a light industrial usage.</p> <p>We object to all the planning applications, 20/04649/FUL; 20/04650/FUL; 20/04651/FUL and 20/04652/FUL for proposed agricultural buildings for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They are close to the Registered Historic Park and Garden (HP&amp;G) and within its setting and will be seen from Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>2. The structures are crude industrial buildings constructed of PPC cladding and sheeting and without any attempt to enhance the rural setting.</p> <p>3. There is no road/access drive shown to illustrate how the individual buildings might be serviced.</p> <p>4. There is no form of landscape treatment. (We note that there is a hedge bounding the A168 which would need to be retained and strengthened by further planting but there is no planting at all on the boundary with the A1M.)</p> <p>5. The retention of the existing field forms a pleasant setting for the HP&amp;G and a pleasing rural feature to the A1M and A168.</p> <p>In addition to our objections we question the validity of so many very basic block applications on the same site, all with no access track/road, apparent explanation of preference or reason, and no attempt at landscape treatment in such a rural but busy location.</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	E20/1331	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Agricultural Building. Allerton Grange Farm, Braimber Lane To Allerton Park Interchange. AGRICULTURE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2021</b> As per E20/1330
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1332	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Agricultural Building. Allerton Grange Farm, Braimber Lane To Allerton Park Interchange, Allerton Park HG5 OSE. AGRICULTURE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2021</b> As per E20/1330
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1333	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Agricultural Building. Allerton Grange Farm, Braimber Lane To Allerton Park Interchange, Allerton Park HG5 OSE. AGRICULTURE	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2021</b> As per E20/1330
Castle Howard	North Yorkshire	E20/1357	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Material amendment to planning approval 18/01262/FUL dated 08.01.2019	<b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.01.2021</b> Dear Ms Balmer Application number: 20/01180/73 Material amendment to planning

				<p>to allow alterations to the landscaping and design of the proposal with the inclusion of an approved plans condition. The Arboretum, Castle Howard, Malton YO60 7BY.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>approval 18/01262/FUL dated 08.01.2019 to allow alterations to the landscaping and design of the proposal with the inclusion of an approved plans condition. The Arboretum, Castle Howard, Malton YO60 7BY.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Castle Howard, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at 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>We have noted the proposed alterations to the landscaping and design that we supported in our letter of 10th December 2018 and understand that the budget has changed due to the current pandemic that started to impact on us all in March 2020. We have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Queen's Garden	North Yorkshire	E20/1387	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for erection of 50 No. dwellings (16 open market, 17 affordable/social rented, 17 affordable shared ownership), external works and landscaping at Land off Station Road, Sedbergh, LA10 5HJ.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2021</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 historic park and garden site. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Queen's Garden at Sedbergh was added to the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens in 2012 at grade II. It lies a short distance to the west of Sedbergh Conservation Area. The garden was commissioned by the local landowner Mrs Upton-Cottrell-Dormer from Thomas Mawson (1861-1933) the most renowned English garden designer of his time, a town planner and acknowledged as the founder of modern landscape architecture and garden design. Opened in 1902 Queen's Garden is a good example of a public garden laid out as a memorial to Queen Victoria and remains substantially intact. Mawson's design makes use of the natural topography by using the highest, central point of the symmetrical layout as the site of the memorial cross (listed grade II). The garden was designed to</p>

					<p>be enclosed and inward/southward-looking by heavy planting on the north of the site (which it still is), as it was always anticipated that it would become an urban park, swallowed up by the expansion of Sedbergh. With the closure of the railway station, expansion of the town slowed down and the garden was left rather isolated and somewhat neglected on the western fringe of the town. The full history of the garden is laid out in detail in the Conservation Report commissioned by Sedbergh Parish Council in 2017 (Taylor, H and Vickers, P 2017 Queen's Memorial Gardens, Sedbergh: Conservation Report).</p> <p>The proposal site for 50 new dwellings is on the opposite side (northern side) of the A684 to the Queen's Garden, with virtually no overlap of frontage and in summer it is unlikely the new houses will be very visible from the garden, but obviously more so in the winter; there are some conifers remaining on the northern boundary of the garden, but we understand that some of Mawson's coniferous planting has been lost here. We have noted the details of the Design and Access Statement including the Affordable Housing Statement and Community Consultation and support the buffer planting principle to assist in keying this quite large development into such a rural area and in close proximity to a registered garden. We advise that all the buffer planting has maintenance and management put in place to ensure that is safeguarded and not damaged or removed.</p> <p>The architecture of Sedbergh includes both stone and rendered buildings and buildings with elevations of both treatments. Some of the proposed dwellings do have stone to the elevations fronting the road and part stone part render on other elevations (Plot 1, 13, 39, 43, 44,45, 46,47,48) and we note Plots 4,5,6 are notated Natural White render with stone quoins, heads and cills but we were unable to make out the quoin detail. We hope that stone quoins with the rendered treatment are used throughout.</p> <p>In view of the Conservation Report for Queen's Garden commissioned by Sedbergh Parish Council, and with this relatively large housing development in its vicinity, we suggest that serious consideration is given to restoring and managing Queen's Garden as it is not only an important heritage asset but a public park for an increasing local population. Perhaps a 106 Agreement?</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection in principle to this planning application which should not harm the registered garden but trust that our advice and comments will be taken into account</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>in the determination.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Ribston Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/1424	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reserved matters application for erection of 2 dwellings (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale considered) under outline permission 17/05082/OUT (appeal decision APP/E2734/W/18/3204965). West View, Knaresborough Road, Little Ribston LS22 4ET.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens – Ribston Hall 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>Ribston Hall is famous as the home of the early 18th Century variety of apple known as the Ribston Pippin when the estate was owned by the Goodricke family. The park has 17th Century origins with an 18th Century kitchen garden and later pleasure grounds. The Hall listed grade II* was built on or near the site of an earlier house in 1674 and the Chapel of St Andrew (listed separately grade II*) is attached to the south east side of the Hall. To the north east of the River Nidd and south west of the Hall is the site of the medieval village of Ribston Magna.</p> <p>The reserved matters application is for the development of a detached dwelling house on Plot 2 with a paddock to its east, on land to the east of West View. The boundary of the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) lies to the north and east of the site at a relatively short distance. However, we have been unable to visit Little Ribston due to the current national situation.</p> <p>The Planning, Design and Access Statement makes no mention of the RPG despite the boundary being in quite close proximity and the Location Map provided does not show the plot in relation to the park. We note that the proposed built area is somewhat larger than that approved. The notation on all the elevation drawings appears to be incorrect eg the drawing that is labelled proposed north (rear) elevation is the east elevation. The Planning Design and Access Statement at 2.4 notes that 'Private garden amenity space is provided to all sides of the property and landscaping is proposed as detailed on the submitted landscaping plan.' However, we find that the landscaping detail is sparse; five trees to the front (west side) of the house and a run of native hedge to the north and south of the plot. We have not</p>

					<p>noted the oak tree. The boundary at the east side of the house is proposed to be timber post and rail fence rather than hedge and without any tree or shrub planting. To the east of Plot 2, the Paddock has no indication of any planting at all.</p> <p>We have some concerns about the east elevation (incorrectly labelled north/rear) of the proposed dwelling on Plot 2 which has extensive glazing and five rooflights and faces towards the RPG. However, we think that there is woodland and other land between the plot and the RPG.</p> <p>Nevertheless, we recommend that if there is an opportunity for some landscaping and tree planting to the east of this development, this would soften the impact, and reduce any future harm should the area to the east change.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Mulgrave Castle	North Yorkshire	E20/1449	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Upgrade of existing junction onto A174 and widening of access road, installation at footpath and pedestrian footbridge. Existing Junction Onto A174 And Access Road/track At East Row, Sandsend. ROAD	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens – Mulgrave Castle Hall 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>This planning application is linked to Planning Application NYM/2020/1018/FL to the North York Moors National Park Authority for change of use of sawmill timber yard to visitor car park with associated works. The upgrade of the existing junction onto A174 etc, the subject of 20/02831/FL is immediately outside the registered boundary, but within the Sandsend Conservation Area. Whereas the sawmill timber yard is part of the Mulgrave Estate registered site and within the valley of East Row Beck at the eastern end of the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Mulgrave Castle park was laid out by the first Earl of Mulgrave in the late 18C and early 19C incorporating proposals made by Humphry Repton (d.1818). The site is made more significant because Repton's Red Book of proposals is still held by the family.</p> <p>This is a well-documented and considered planning application after pre-application discussions and incorporating responses from Historic England,</p>

					<p>to minimise its impacts on heritage assets.</p> <p>We have no comments to make on this planning application and understand that the proposals have been developed to sit as sympathetically as possible within the historic environment. In our response to Planning Application NYM/2020/1018/FL we are advising that toilet facilities carefully placed in the proposed car park would be a desirable addition and we would support interpretation boards again carefully positioned and of robust conservation quality to explain the significance of Mulgrave Castle's historic designed landscape; its early history etc., and the history Sandsend.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Bolton Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/1459	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission to Bring Polly Peachum's Tower Back into use, as a Small Entertaining Space. Bolton Hall, Wensley, Leyburn, North Yorkshire DL8 4UF.</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.01.2021</b></p> <p>A colleague in the Yorkshire Gardens Trust has recently notified me of this planning application. On looking at the documents I found that the Folly Fellowship response did not include research carried out in the Bolton Hall Papers/Archive Collection Ref: ZBO held at the North Yorkshire County Record Office (NYCRO) and is inaccurate. Some of the information in the Design and Access Statement, September 2020 at '2.0 History and Significance of the Tower 2.1 is also incorrect with the wrong date. I thought that it would be useful for you to have further research information about Polly Peachum's Tower also known as The Mount. The first reference that I've seen for Polly Peachum's Tower/ The Mount is on the 1723 map at North Yorkshire County Record Office (NYCRO): NYCRO ZBO (M) 1/1 MIC 2002/88- 108 1723 Map of the manors of Wensley and Preston. Scale 4 chains to 1 inch. Tower [Polly Peachum] shown south of notation 'Mount Park'. It is a small tower with a cupola and set within an open square – the garden as suggested by archaeologist Steve Moorhouse?</p> <p>There is a further map of 1737 held by the family: 1737 A Map of Bolton Hall in the North Riding of the County of York being one of the Seats of the Most Noble Charles Duke of Bolton together with the adjoining Mannors of Wensley and Preston by Will Godson, 1737' Large and beautifully annotated estate map. The Mount/Polly Peachum's Tower with a cupola has square area round it thought to have been a garden.</p>

					<p>The early map of 1723 was probably made on the death of Charles, 2nd Duke of Bolton (1661-1722) and when his son the 3rd Duke of Bolton (1685-1754) inherits the estate. It is before Lavinia Fenton portrayed Polly Peachum in the first production of John Gay's celebrated The Beggar's Opera, which was in 1728. Lavinia Fenton/Polly Peachum became the mistress of the 3rd Duke of Bolton in c.1730.</p> <p>From my knowledge of the history of the family I think that the tower was built as a hunting stand possibly by Charles, 2nd Duke of Bolton (1661-1722) who was the son of Charles Powlett, 1st Duke of Bolton and 5th Marquis of Winchester (1630-1699), and Mary Scrope, the illegitimate daughter and heiress of Emmanuel, 11th Lord Scrope.</p> <p>As far as I know Lavinia Fenton/Polly Peachum didn't come to Bolton Hall until after the death of the Duchess of Bolton in 1751 when she married her Duke, Charles 3rd Duke of Bolton (1685-1754). The only evidence I have for her at Bolton Hall is the reference in Viscount Torrington's diaries. Other extracts of my research relevant to this planning application:</p> <p>1771 Jeffrey's Map of Yorkshire: Shows a tower on the hill south-east of Bolton Hall and it appears to have a cupola</p> <p>There is another map in NYCRO which shows Polly Peachum Tower dated: 1778 ZBO(M) 5/1 MIC 2002/193-214</p> <p>A Plan of the Manors of Wensley and Preston belonging to his Grace the Duke of Bolton.</p> <p>The tower is shown as a small square within a larger square. Cupola not evident.</p> <p>It is interesting that although Viscount Torrington visited Wensleydale in 1792, (10 June 1792, Byng's Tours [Viscount Torrington], NT Classics, 1991,137-140), he never mentions the Tower but does refer to Polly Peachum:</p> <p>'Bolton Hall is a gloomy, deserted seat of the Duke of Bolton, all in wild neglect and disorder, which some few years will level with the ground. [Here he met Mr Maude, a poet who had lately suffered a paralytic attack. He had served at sea under the 4th Duke and had been recompensed by being made agent over the Bolton estate.] I had to lead him about...detailing the history of Miss Polly Peacham, of her being here, and showing the bed, in which she always modestly slept alone.'</p> <p>So, it seems likely that by 1792 the Tower was in poor condition (as was much of the estate) and as evidenced by the letters in 1793 (below) in the Yorkshire Estate Papers 1792-1800, ZBO IX 1/14/1- at NYCRO.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>20th March 1793: Letter from Tho. Maude [agent], Burley near Otley to T. Orde</p> <p>'As to the Temple in the Park, dilapidated before I saw the county, might without destroying any Beauty &amp; in the application of its lead covering, particularly as that metal now bears so good a price. The stone work would at a distance appear not left a Ruin and coincide with that idea.'</p> <p>25th May 1793: Letter John Anderson, (Swinethwaite) Temple Ho to T. Orde. 'The Lead Bason in the Garden [formal gardens of Bolton Hall] ought not to be destroyed at best for the present, what difference of opinion may arise as to this point in particular, I think non can arise respecting the Temple in the Park, that building is an ornament to the Dale; to strip it of Lead would be very wrong, I wonder such an idea could enter into any persons head.'</p> <p>10th April 1798: Sadler [agent], Bolton Hall to Lord Bolton '... the lead cupola of Mount Park has fallen in occasioned by a very hurling wind; ? immediately carted down the lead to the hall, fearing deperadations, &amp; which, I suppose will be nearly 4 tons. Mr Foss thinks four or more little turrets at the corners etc would look not amiss, which should appear sufficiently open so as that the horizon might be seen thro' amongst 'em, unless your Lordship might think of covering it again; also the lead might be sold, this your Lordship can however can fix upon either before or when your Lordship comes down hither.'</p> <p>I've not seen references to the Tower and Mount Park on any later estate maps but this may be because the Tower is in a dilapidated condition and at some distance south-east of Bolton Hall on Capplebank.</p> <p>In addition to 1st Ed OS 6inches:1mile pub 1856, The Mount is also marked on OS 25inches:1mile sheet 68/p pub 1913 and OS 6inches:1mile sheet 68 1914/1919 edition.</p> <p>Conclusion: The story about Polly Peachum and the Tower is a nice romantic tale and she may have sung there, but from the documentary evidence the Tower was in existence by 1723 and it is therefore extremely unlikely that her Duke built it for her although he may have made alterations. The tower had a lead cupola.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning  cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Mulgrave Castle	North Yorkshire	E20/1493	II*	<p><b>PLANNING APPLICATION</b></p> <p>Application for change of use of sawmill timber yard to visitor car park with associated works including surfacing, installation of associated infrastructure (pay stations, cctv poles, cycle stands/lockers, electric vehicle charging points, boundary treatment and signage) construction of vehicle bridge and creation of section of footpath at Former Saw Mill Timber Yard, East Row, Sandsend. PARKING Mr Hill</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens – Mulgrave Castle Hall 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>This planning application is linked to Planning Application 20/02831/FL to Scarborough BC for the upgrade of the existing junction onto A174 and the widening of the access road, installation of footpath and pedestrian footbridge at East Row, Sandsend.</p> <p>The sawmill timber yard is part of the Mulgrave Estate registered site, within the valley of East Row Beck. Mulgrave Castle park was laid out by the first Earl of Mulgrave in the late 18C and early 19C incorporating proposals made by Humphry Repton (d.1818). The site is made more significant because Repton's Red Book of proposals is still held by the family.</p> <p>This is a well-documented and considered planning application after pre-application discussions and incorporating responses from Historic England, to minimise its impacts on heritage assets. The sawmill timber yard that is proposed for the car park is an existing 'industrial area' surrounded by woodland set in the valley towards the eastern edge of the Registered Park and Garden near Sandsend. The Planning Design and Access Statement at 7.57 concludes that there would be no key views into or out of the site, nor any historic lost views which would be affected by impacts from the scheme. It does note that the Parkland Management Plan identifies a sequence of views that is experienced while traveling along the track from East Row, with constantly changing views of various features including the beck and woodland. The scheme would result in a visible change in the views from this track at its eastern end, looking over the beck towards the proposed car park. However, the view at present is of the timber yard, vehicles, temporary buildings and timber, and it is therefore considered that the visual change while noticeable, would be small. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust also consider that the impact of the proposals on the RPG, because of the topography, surrounding woodland and current usage, will be minimal. We understand that the proposals have been developed to sit as sympathetically as possible within the historic</p>
-----------------	--------------------	----------	-----	---	--

					<p>environment</p> <p>The car park is for 148 cars, 2 motorcycles, 8 cycle spaces and 2 electric vehicle parking spaces and we would like to make the following suggestions;</p> <p>That toilet facilities carefully placed in the proposed car park would be a desirable addition.</p> <p>That interpretation boards are incorporated into the plans. These would need to be carefully positioned and of robust conservation quality to explain the significance of Mulgrave Castle's historic designed landscape; its early history etc., and the history Sandsend.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning Cc Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
Worcester College	Oxfordshire	E20/0559	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Network Rail Oxford Corridor Phase 2 Capacity Improvement Scheme The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 Request for Scoping Opinion: Botley Road widening and rail bridge replacement.</p> <p>New station western entrance.</p> <p>New Platform 5 and platform buildings.</p> <p>Sheepwash Bridge replacement.</p> <p>BUS/TRAIN</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.01.2021</b></p> <p>Further to our correspondence of 25 August 2020 and 24 November 2020, our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust have not been able to visit Worcester College Garden in person due to restrictions imposed by the pandemic. Also, the College was closed over the Christmas period. However, the OGT have had communications with the Bursar and the Head of Gardening and Grounds at the College.</p> <p>We now have confirmation that the existing YHA building at the Oxford railway station is not visible from the College Garden, nor from the principal first floor buildings. Also, there is no view of the YHA from the new Sultan Nazrin Shah Centre, Sainsbury Library in the centre of the College.</p> <p>We understand from Mr Paul Humphrey, TWAO Consents Manager of Network Rail, that the original EIA scoping opinion has now changed from a proposed 6-storey commercial building to a proposed 2-storey station entrance building only.</p> <p>On the above basis we now do not consider that a 'verification of views' exercise is necessary, and that the important views to and from the Grade II* listed Garden at Worcester College will not be harmed.</p> <p>We trust that we have interpreted the proposed station scheme correctly, but please get back to us if there are any further queries.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E20/1558	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of renewable led energy generating station comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancement. Land to South West of Cowley Substation, Nuneham Courtenay, OX44 9PA	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2021</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We note that the bulk of the planning application was submitted on 10th November 2020, with the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 being submitted as additional information on 8th January 2021. In accordance with Regulation 18 Consultation, we have examined the application documents and wish to make a strong <b>objection</b> to the location of this solar farm as it would present a high level of harm to the setting of the Grade I Registered Park &amp; Garden (RPG) of Nuneham Courtenay (see National Heritage List for England ref. 1000122), the Carfax Conduit (Scheduled Monument and Grade I Listed Building, LEN ref. 1020965), as well as the wider setting of the surrounding landscape character south of Oxford.</p> <p>As Grade I designated heritage assets, the RPG and listed building are of the highest significance which has not been properly examined or understood in the submitted Planning Statement (5.4 Cultural Heritage Assessment) or the Environmental Statement (Ch. 7.11.4), as required by the NPPF and HE's planning practice guidance. In our opinion, NPPF para. 189 has not been implemented. NPPF para. 194 states '<i>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</i>' which we also do not feel has been forthcoming. The HE Register describes the RPG as: A country house surrounded by an C18 landscape park and pleasure grounds laid out in three phases: 1760s, the first Earl Harcourt's classical landscape to offset his Greek 'temple' (church); William Mason's picturesque landscape of 1777 for the second Earl (Mason having laid out a famous flower garden here in 1771); the parkland laid out by Lancelot Brown 1779-82 (supervised by the second Earl and Mason), when he also laid out Brown's Walk in the pleasure grounds. In addition, a pinetum and other work was carried out by W S Gilpin, 1832.</p>



					<p>The earlier Carfax Conduit, the conduit 'house', formed part of an early civic clean water gravity-fed system for the City of Oxford, and was installed around 1600. The conduit has the outward appearance of a Renaissance version of a Gothic market cross with a solid base. It was originally located in Carfax, the central crossroads of Oxford, as a focal structure. In 1786 traffic congestion led the university authorities to widen the road and remove the conduit. The structure was offered to Lord Harcourt, who had it re-erected in its present site in the grounds of his estate at Nuneham Courtenay. The result is a park ornament on a site originally intended for a Gothic tower as an 'eyecatcher' proposed by Capability Brown.</p> <p>The RPG is one the most outstanding examples of a planned landscape in Britain, and one of the most influential in British garden history. The initial choice of the site by the first Earl Harcourt (1717 – 1777) was to take advantage of the setting for a new villa (built in 1757, listed Grade II*) on a hill overlooking the Thames, the pastoral countryside and woodland, and with the spires and domes of Oxford in the distance. The inspiration came from Earl Harcourt's tour of Italy, and from the writings and poetry of Alexander Pope and Voltaire, when the idea of an Arcadian parkland landscape was first developed in Britain. The importance of the villa was that it was intended to be used for pleasure that incorporated both the Palladian architecture of the villa and the experience of the adjoining 'picturesque' landscape.</p> <p>During the early phases of the layout of the parkland a number of landscape elements were built - notably the removal of the original village to its present site on the A4074, and the demolition of the parish church allowing for its replacement with a classical temple. Other novel elements were the layout of a number of 'drives', and the design of an informal Flower Garden by the poet William Mason. The 'drives' were carefully laid out and specific locations chosen to view and appreciate the Thames Valley landscape. To the south of the House, an area of woodland was planted with a woodland walk incorporating a small, steep valley and hillside (now known as Brown's Walk), and with an 'eye-catcher' of a ruined tower proposed by Brown (1779) but never built (now the Carfax Conduit). The Conduit was a stopping point on what has been described as a 'Gilpin picturesque tour', where views to the north take in the River Thames, the boat-house, the west façade of the House, and meadows and fields in-between, the dome of the temple, and spires of Oxford on the horizon.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>There are several paintings of the period, by Paul Sandby and J W Turner, in the spirit of Claude Lorraine, that show this view. The HE Register recognises that the views to and from the Park form carefully designed features, thus contributing to the character and identity of the parkland. Due to Covid restrictions, we have not been able to fully visit the RPG but have consulted Magic Maps (DEFRA) and Google Earth to examine the context of the proposed development at the Solar Farm site and its possible impact on Nuneham Courtenay RPG. A representative of the OGT has been able to visit part of the Park that gives views north from the Church, but we have not been able to gain access to Nuneham House (which is currently undergoing extensive building renovation work) or visit the Carfax Conduit. Views from both these locations form a very important part of the ensemble of the Park and Gardens. We note that the solar panels in Fields 1 and 2, as shown on Aardvark EM Ltd Site Location Plan A drawing ref. SO1.A rev.v.i, will impact on key historic and present views. The planned C18th park and leisure gardens must be seen as a perambulation that takes into account buildings, gardens and woodland, as well as near and distant views. The experience of walking to and from these landscape and architectural elements is intrinsic to the design that gives the parkland its identity and character. This quality still exists today, almost untouched since the C18, with the only harmful impact being from the electricity pylons crossing the fields in the near middle distance. The three main elements impacted by the solar panels in Fields 1 and 2 are : views from the north-facing principal rooms in the House, views north from the Church and views north from the Carfax Conduit. Of particular concern would be the reflective glare of the solar panels when they have rotated west, catching the afternoon sunshine. The applicant has acknowledged that the proposed development would cause harm to the Grade I heritage asset, but states that the <i>'significance of the residual effect will be minor'</i> (ES. Ch.7 7.11.4). The GT/OGT strongly disagrees with this assessment. The proposed mitigation would not address the 'view' problem, owing to the elevated location of the RPG and the height of the solar panels in relation to fields 1 and 2 within the site of the proposed solar farm.</p> <p>The requirements of NPPF para. 194 have not been properly considered in that the proposed development would be highly visible from various viewpoints, changing a planned parkland and an historic rural landscape to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>an industrial one, and would therefore constitute a high level of harm to the setting of the Grade I RPG and Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>The GT/OGT strongly <b>object</b> to this application and suggests that alternative locations for the solar farm be examined, thus avoiding harmful impacts on the Registered P&amp;G and Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Badger Dingle	Shropshire	E20/1284	II	<p>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 .</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p><b>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.01.2021</b></p> <p>With reference to the above application, we are now in receipt of the Heritage Impact Statement (HIA) produced for the applicant by AJM Planning Associates Limited and therefore in a position to comment on the proposed application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Shropshire Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust/SGT object to this proposed development.</p> <p>The historic designed landscape at Badger</p> <p>The accuracy and value of the HIA provided by the applicant is, in our opinion, completely undermined as it fails to mention one of the most significant and salient aspects of the Grade II Registered Park &amp; Garden (RPG) at Badger, the fact that it is the work of the celebrated mid-18th century Midlands landscaper, William Emes (1729-1803). Part of Badger is 'The Dingle' - an ornamented valley surrounded to the west, north and particularly in this case, to the east, by parkland and other areas which are included within the RPG, much of which was formerly planted with trees as shown on the Ordnance Survey 1st Edition plan (1882, see Figure 1 below). What appears even less appreciated is that large parts of the boundary to the linear woodland of Badger Dingle, including that overlooking to the proposed development area, takes the form of a 'Ha-ha' or 'sunken boundary' arrangement (highlighted in green wash in Figure 2 below). In this case, the 'Ha-ha' (still in situ) was specifically intended to allow views eastwards from the path leading from Badger Hall to The Dingle, into the adjacent parkland landscape (shown by the green arrows), as indeed it still does, notwithstanding the considerable damage that has been done in recent years to this part of the RPG. The applicant states that the 'only public view of the East Lawn and the above man-made features is from the Pattingham Road...' Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice</p>

					<p>in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. This states p.2 ‘The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.’</p> <p>Figure 1: Extract from the OS 1st Edition 25” plan (1882) showing the landscape of Badger, including the so-called ‘East Lawn’ which is a part of the RPG. The proposed development area (highlighted in red), lies within the RPG immediately adjacent to the south side of the approach to Badger Hall, and to the north of what was, until relatively recently, the New Pool shown on this plan. A Lodge at the eastern end of the approach still marks the entrance to the historic designed landscape of Badger and the RPG.</p> <p>Figure 2: Enlarged extract from the OS 1st Edition 25” plan (1882) indicating that part of the northern boundary to The Dingle which is shown as a ‘Ha-ha’ or sunken fence (highlighted in green wash). This would have allowed views from the central path within the Dingle, into the adjacent field and beyond, to the wider designed landscape including the approach to Badger Hall and the proposed development area. The green arrows show indicative view-lines from the path, although in practice there are a series of what are known as ‘kinetic’ views, which change as an observer moves along the path.</p> <p>The proposed development</p> <p>The proposal, as outlined in the applicant’s Planning Statement, is for an agricultural-style building clad in corrugated material, of plan size 15m x 19m with double pitch roof of eaves height 2.4m and ridge height 5.75m &amp; with a footprint of 285m<sup>2</sup>. This to stand within an unspecified additional area of hard standing (stated as ‘gravel/stone’) of roughly 590m<sup>2</sup> (not including the area occupied by the proposed building) giving an overall area of 875m<sup>2</sup>, or roughly 0.1 hectares, with the (presumably gravelled) approach track.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed building is stated as being for the preparation of fish bait for use at all six of the applicant’s fishing lakes across Shropshire. It is stated also that the applicant will require users of these fishing lakes to utilise only bait obtained (presumably purchased) from his company.</p> <p>What is not referred to in either the Planning Statement or the HIA accompanying this application, is that it is proposed to cover the southern pitch of the building with photovoltaic panels. This is likely substantially to increase its visual impact within the designed landscape.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The proposal is not, as suggested by the applicant, a benign operation intended solely to ensure the health of fish within each the six lakes under his ownership. Rather, it is for an industrial process located within an area of Green Belt and within the boundary of a Grade II RPG, which is a designated heritage asset.</p> <p>We do not accept that it is necessary for this building, or indeed the process it is intended to encompass, to be located anywhere near to the Badger landscape. Given its description and the intended use of its products, it would seem to be more suited to an existing industrial site, perhaps in a location that is central to all of the applicant's six fishing lakes. We note that the Shropshire Council Officer's letter to the applicant, dated January 26th 2020, states that, for reasons outlined therein, the proposed development is considered to be an inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would require 'very special circumstances' to be demonstrated, alongside a thorough justification for the scale, location and use of the building within this rural environment. The applicant has yet to demonstrate such special circumstances.</p> <p>We similarly consider that the proposed development would cause harm to the Significance of the Grade II RPG of Badger through the introduction of an overtly industrial building and process into this sensitive landscape. The scale and visual intrusion of the building would also be exacerbated by the inclusion of a photovoltaic array on the principal (southern) roof incline. Such harm would be less than substantial, albeit locally significant.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Sheffield General Cemetery	South Yorkshire	E20/1351	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Variation of condition 2. (approved drawings) imposed by 18/00235/FUL and 18/0236/LBC (Conservation works to listed/non-listed historic features; walls/catacombs; and to listed/non-listed monuments, improvements to site entrance points, landscape improvements	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.01.2021</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Sheffield General Cemetery. 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. Sheffield General Cemetery's national importance is signified by its being registered at grade II* on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens; a high grade for a cemetery. It was designated as a Conservation Area in 1986.</p>

				<p>including general footpath improvements, installation of wayfinding signage, management of trees/vegetation, and improvement/inclusion of new amenities, lighting, and car parking) to allow the retention of trees and grave stones and changes to surfaced areas, pathways, accessibility and car parking spaces. Sheffield General Cemetery, Cemetery Avenue, Sheffield, S11 8NT.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS, CEMETERY</p>	<p>The cemetery was set up in response to overcrowding and poor conditions in Sheffield churchyards, exacerbated by the cholera epidemic in 1832 and it signified the emancipation of the independence movement in Sheffield (independence from the Church of England regarding burial). The original section of the Cemetery was unconsecrated ground to symbolise the agenda of the non-conformists and the buildings were in classical style, recognisably different from the gothic style of the Church of England. The design (1834), by Samuel Worth, with assistance from Robert Marnock, was used by John Claudius Loudon, (a notable designer of parks and gardens and arguably the most distinguished gardening author of the age), as a prototypical example for a hilly site in his influential book on cemetery design. [J. C Loudon, On the Laying Out, Planting, and Managing of Cemeteries: And on the improvement of churchyards, London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1843.]</p> <p>As we explained in our letter of 22nd March 2018 in response to applications 18/00235/FUL and 18/0236/LBC, we had serious concerns about some of the proposals then and thus objected to those planning applications. This was in spite of the principle that we were very pleased to support the conservation works to listed and non-listed historic site infrastructure and monuments in this outstanding example of a Victorian cemetery. Sheffield General Cemetery due to its condition has been included on the Heritage at Risk Register.</p> <p>The current applications 20/04142/FUL 20/04297/LBC, from Colvin and Moggridge introduce changes to the previously consented scheme and address our concerns. We are pleased that the submission has been developed in consultation with Sheffield Cemetery Trust, Historic England, various stakeholders and with a visitor survey/questionnaire carried out last autumn.</p> <p>A detailed understanding of the significance of the design, the path layout and the various areas and listed structures, have informed the revised masterplan. This has enabled a more sensitive approach based on historic precedent to be taken regarding various elements such as access, parking and the restoration of designed views. The care being proposed will result in much less impact on the heritage assets and should secure the future of this nationally important cemetery.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly support these applications.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E20/1369	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of two dwellings and associated outbuildings; construction of Residential Care Home for the elderly and associated external works. 6 And 6A Park Avenue, Roundhay, Leeds. INSTITUTION	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.01.2021</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 Nos 6 and 6A, 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, it is known for tree-lined roads with remaining villas constructed in the 19th Century and early 20th Century set in mature landscaped gardens. This proposal is for two adjacent plots, Nos 6 and 6A also adjacent to No 8, another care home and the subject of a recent planning application for its substantial extension, 20/07175/FU.</p> <p>Although the present building at No 6 is said to make a modest contribution to the conservation area, overall, we do not consider that the demolition of both dwellings will be harmful to the registered historic park and garden.</p> <p>The proposed new residential care home of 69 bedrooms and ancillary facilities, although largely three- storey, is of a pleasing design and materials and the landscaping has overall been well-considered.</p> <p>We have the following points to make:</p> <p>The car parking area of 23 spaces is in front of the building facing towards the Park. We question whether this will be sufficient for a 69- bed care home and the associated staffing levels required. Although the boundary trees form some screening, and we note from the Heritage Statement 4.14 that the paving is to be permeable, we would be concerned that further hard landscaping could potentially affect water availability for the trees in</p>

					<p>the future and further erode the 'garden' area. There are a number of care homes nearby and there will no doubt be pressure on roadside parking at times. Overall, it is desirable that tree 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 comprehensive Arboricultural Impact Assessment that trees will need to be removed and tree protection measures are to be put in place. However, we would just like to underline that those trees on the south western elevation and part of the north eastern elevation are quite near the proposed building. We have not been on site but suggest that extra care is taken here and there is careful professional arboricultural pruning and crown-lifting of the trees where appropriate as noted in the Assessment. There should also be a tree maintenance plan for the future care of the trees as they are such a significant feature of the conservation area and the registered historic park and garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposals will impact on the significance of Roundhay Park but we do have concerns as noted above, and ask that these are please taken into consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning  cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---