



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES FEBRUARY 2021

The GT conservation team received 187 new cases for England in February, 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, 47 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Moggerhanger Park	Bedfordshire	E20/1601	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of existing fence and hedgerow with new galvanised estate fencing 332.80 metres long. New estate fencing will be installed 1.5 metres in front of retained historic hedgerow. Moggerhanger House, Park Road, Moggerhanger. BOUNDARY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2021 Thank you for bringing this application to the attention of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for applications affecting registered historic parks and gardens, and to Bedfordshire Gardens Trust. I am replying for both. We fully support these proposals, which have been under discussion for a while. As the applicant states, the removal of this length of somewhat degraded 1960s hedging and chain link fencing, and its replacement with stock-proof traditional estate fencing, will open up views across the North Park towards Bottom Wood and the Avenue. This would be a welcome step in the restoration of the Reptonian historic parkland. Yours sincerely Bedfordshire Gardens Trust Conservation
Sandleford Priory	Berkshire	E20/0341	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 extra care housing units (Use Class C3)	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2021 The Berkshire Gardens Trust, as an interested party, would like to make the following submissions with regard to the above appeal which lies within the setting of Historic England's Grade II

			<p>as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150 sq m, B1a up to 200 sq m) and D1 use (up to 500sq m); the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access.</p> <p>Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury. MAJOR HYBRID</p> <p>OUTCOME Refused</p> <p>APPEAL LODGED 20.01.2021</p> <p>Appeal Ref</p> <p>APP/W0340/W/20/3265460</p> <p>To be determined on the basis of an inquiry</p>	<p>Registered Park and Garden at Sandleford Priory and the Grade I Sandleford Priory itself.</p> <p>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 was consulted during the application process. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. BGT commented on the current application 20/01238/OUTMAJ and the outline application for the adjoining Sandleford Park West application no.18/00828/OUTMAJ which together form the Site Allocation.</p> <p>The appeal site forms the wider historic estate to the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Sandleford Priory and the Grade I Listed house. The importance of the wider setting to these heritage assets has been recognised by both the Council and the appellant for some considerable time which has led to requirements in the SPD and detailed studies by the appellant's consultants into the historic interest and value of the wider estate.</p> <p>We have noted that there are no grounds for refusal on the basis of harm to the historic environment within the Council's Reasons for Refusal. We have also looked at the Wheatcroft Consultation Documents. However we wish to support Reasons for Refusal 2, 3, and 6i) and ii). Each of these refer to either landscape assets of value within the wider estate of Sandleford Priory or to proposed features of the development which would result in harm to these landscape assets. This landscape includes national historical features both of historical significance and of local importance. The importance of the historic aspects on and adjacent to the site is acknowledged by the appellant in a number of supporting documents.</p> <p>The value of a landscape or of its features includes its historic provenance.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>Certain aspects of this development remain to be resolved to ensure that no unnecessary harm arises to the historic environment in its important role in contributing to the value of this landscape in accordance with the Sandleford Park DPD. In this respect the Council's landscape advisor refers to the 2019 West Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment and the principal relevant character area: WH2: Greenham Woodland and Heathland Mosaic.</p> <p>WH2: Greenham Woodland and Heathland Mosaic: This document refers to five Valued Features of which two refer to historic asset (my underlining):</p> <p>2) Scenic and open views from the plateau: Sandleford Priory provides important open views southwards towards Penwood and Newtown. Greenham Common provides views over the valleys to the north and south.</p> <p>3) Heritage and cultural associations: The presence of the airbase and Ministry of Defence land at Greenham Common has had a significant impact in the 20th and 21st centuries. Although many of the buildings are nontraditional and utilitarian, they are evidence of the important phase of our culture and international relations, represented by the designation of surviving structures (Scheduled Monument and Listed Buildings). Sandleford Priory and parkland are also important parts of the historic environment in this area, evidence of time-depth beyond the military intervention.</p> <p>The Landscape Strategy goes on (my underlining):</p> <p>2) Retain and enhance open views: The open views experienced from Sandleford Priory and Park and Cookham Common should be considered in all land management, which may include development outside of the District.</p> <p>7) Conserve the strong time-depth experienced in the landscape: Conserve the setting and integrity of heritage features in the landscape, which provide a sense of time-depth and evidence of past land use in the area. In particular, seek ways to restore the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Sandleford Priory, which is on the Heritage at Risk Register, and maintain the historic interest of the military interventions at Greenham Common.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Aspects of the historic landscape are at risk of being compromised resulting in harm to the historic physical and visual setting of the Registered Park and Grade I listed building. As described below some of these issues have been resolved but we still have concerns about the impacts of a number of transport proposals. These are issues that have been raised consistently over time and could be resolved. The recent consultation responses to the Council, in particular those from Liz Lake Associates on landscape matters, has also drawn to our attention the further impacts of the cycle way proposals and emergency access arrangements.</p> <p>For the most part the proposed development has been adapted to avoid harm to some key historic assets which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The immediate setting of the Registered Park and Grade I listed building east of Newtown Road through the design of the County Park and retention of most of the historic woodland, veteran tree cover and historic routeways; and</li> <li>• The immediate setting of the Registered Kitchen Garden west of Newtown Road by omission of the tennis courts and screen planting to the immediate west of the kitchen garden, and the new proposals for grass and tree planting as shown on the masterplan.</li> </ul> <p>Warren Road (Reason for Refusal 2)</p> <p>We have raised concerns about the adverse impacts of various highway proposals for the access off Andover Road into the Strategic Site. The route is lined with mature trees along Warren Road and then along the footpath leading south-east to Sandleford Priory. This is an historic 19th C routeway which replaced an earlier route linking Sandleford Priory, through the estate land, to Andover Road.</p> <p>Further information has recently been provided by Donnington Homes for application no. 18/00828/OUTMAJ on the history of the routeway, following a review of the information provided, with which now we agree. A revised highway scheme was also submitted which we also accept, subject to details (see Appendix B). It is important that the appellant adopts this approach to the access from Andover Road and that no other</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>arrangements compromise the long term historic and landscape value of the tree lined routeway.</p> <p>Cycle route and emergency access through the Country Park (Reason for Refusal 3 and 6ii)</p> <p>Our attention has been drawn to the changes as a result of the new cycle routes and emergency access arrangements since we last commented in July and August 2020. Vector dwg 172985/A/15 shows the proposals with a 4m wide paved cycle way beyond a 1m wide grass strip to the side of the existing footpath, including a 1m wide and grasscrete strip to provide emergency access. At one point this 4m wide routeway diverges from the footpath. These changes will severely impact on the original surviving estate 18th C routeway linking Sandleford Priory with Andover Road, which is recorded on John Roque Map 1761, and will have an adverse impact on views from the Grade I listed Priory and Registered Park. The existing footpath is quite wide at this point and could be widened to accommodate a cycle route and surfaced without creating a very wide urbanised double track across this rural landscape. So much has already been done by the Council in consultation with the appellant to conserve the character of this landscape whilst delivering the Country Park. This would be wholly compromised by the proposed surfaced path, cycleway/emergency access. The central grass strip is unlikely to survive and will probably require surfacing too.</p> <p>The cycle route/emergency access proposal is urbanising and out of keeping with the character and appearance of this historic landscape and routeway and contrary to the objectives for the Country Park. This scheme would have a severe impact on the historic landscape value of the valley contrary to NPPF guidance paras 8c), 127, 170, and 197, Local Plan policy CS19 and the terms of the Sandleford Park SPD.</p> <p>Link road across the central valley (Reason for Refusal 2 and 6i)</p> <p>We have consistently raised concerns about this crossing, firstly when no details were provided by the appellant and secondly on submission of the current scheme. Vector dwg. No. VD17562-SK01 shows the proposed valley crossing. We have considerable concerns about this very poor design solution within an</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>integral part of the historic landscape, in addition to those raised by the Council on landscape, ecological and arboricultural grounds.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the central valley landscape is acknowledged in the ES Chapter 9 Cultural Heritage. This document in Table 9.4 states that there would be moderate adverse harm to the central valley on the basis that ‘Retention of woodland and avoidance of built development in central valley and between Crook’s Copse and High Wood’(my underlining). The Chapter 9 does not assess the effect of the proposed valley crossing. The sensitivity of the central valley is also noted in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual. Landscape Effects Table G6 in summary states that ‘The new road across the central valley will be designed to respect its character and landform, and minimise severance’ and concludes that there would be a minor to substantial adverse impact if that is the case.</p> <p>The proposed valley crossing has not been assessed and is contrary to both the Council’s and the appellant’s landscape and heritage experts’ evidence. The proposed crossing is a massive structure which will completely block the valley and dominate the valley landscape, severing this historic valley feature and the historic inter-relationship between the woodlands and fields to the north and south. This scheme would have a severe impact on the historic landscape value of the valley contrary to NPPF guidance paras 8c), 127, 170, and 197, Local Plan policy CS19 and the terms of the Sandleford Park SPD.</p> <p>The Appellant’s Statement of Case includes some alternative options but does not select one as a preferred option or substitute that option. We do not believe that such a key design feature in a very sensitive landscape should be dealt with under reserved matters. Not least because neither Berkshire Gardens Trust nor the Gardens Trust would normally be consulted on reserved matters. The proposed crossing is a major structure in its own right, the impacts of any options should be considered in full and consulted on as part of the application and appeal process.</p> <p>Conclusions</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The above development proposals are contrary to NPPF, Local Plan Policy and the SPD and fail to conserve or enhance the setting of assets of the acknowledged high significance and the local historic value of the wide estate. The Berkshire Gardens Trust respectfully requests that the Inspector dismisses the appeal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, BGT Chair and Planning Advisor.</p>
Ditton Park	Berkshire	E20/1592	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation (under Section 73A) of condition 46 of planning permission (13/01667/FULL) condition 45 of planning permission (15/02886/VAR) and condition 45 of planning permission (18/00840/VAR) for (Extraction of sand and gravel at Riding Court Farm, erection of mineral processing and ready-mixed concrete plants and associated infrastructure, creation of new access onto Riding Court Road and restoration of the site by the importation of inert restoration material for a period of 12 years) with amended plans. Cemex Datchet Quarry, Riding Court Road, Datchet, Slough. MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2021</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. Ditton Park is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. As Ditton Park is on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, it is an important part of the history of West Berkshire's parks and the richness of its history. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the application.</p> <p>The proposed variation includes allowing works to start in Phase 7 land without having to comply with the S106 agreement that currently prevents works commencing until an agreement is reached between CEMEX and the land owner of Ditton Park for the reintegration of the Phase 7 land into Ditton Park, once it is restored. It is beyond our remit to comment on the lack of resolution over complying with the S106 Agreement attached to the original approval of 13/01667/FULL, between the owners of the land (since sold on from Computer Associates) and Cemex who have developed the land for the purposes of sand and gravel extraction and the potential for reuniting Ditton Park's currently fragmented Grade II historic parkland. Consequently our supportive comments to the proposed Variation of Conditions (as outlined above) will be confined to Phase 7 land only.</p>

					<p>Phase 7 of the extraction area lies at the western end of Ditton Park and is designated as a grade II registered landscape under Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of historic interest. Ditton Park has a long and well documented history, originating from a medieval deer park enclosed with a park pale. The adjacent ornamental canal, site of Gibraltar Bridge, park pale and woodland falls within the designated heritage asset but is beyond the boundary of Phase 7 land.</p> <p>The BGT had originally objected to the despoiling of an historic parkland, especially as Ditton Park had associations with a (Capability) Brownian landscape. The extraction area forming phase 7 was parkland hay meadow in 1607 and known as Merry's Mead in 1718. It formed part of Brown's landscape park in the late eighteenth century and had been fenced off and converted to intensive farmland by 1932 (Outline Management Plan 2014). At the time of application, this section of the parkland was still in agricultural use where ploughing had already damaged historic features, leaving remnant survivals of brickwork, a widened rubble causeway replacing Gibraltar Bridge, many gaps in hedges with interruptions of some of the surviving views across parkland and neglect of the Canal. The 2013 application was approved with Conditions for restoration of the land after the 12 year period of mineral extraction.</p> <p>The applicant, Cemex has provided a document 'Enhancements for Restoration of Phase 7' (Nov 2020) to argue for a revised restoration plan. For Phase 7 land the BGT is supportive of the restoration methods in principle but expects a greater enhancement of the designated heritage asset, in accordance with the findings of the 2016 Bucks Gardens Trust Recording Project and The Landscape and Historic Environment section of the Outline Management Plan of Jan 2020 which includes comprehensive objectives for restoration of all of the historic parkland known as Merry's Mead. However the pre-application response from RBWM challenges some of these aims which has led to proposed variations to conditions diluting the restoration ambitions.</p> <p>Nicholas Pearson Associates (2019) updated the historical assessment of Phase 7 land and the site of Gibraltar Bridge (P3 / 869 / 2) suggesting what measures would be appropriate to reinstate the significance of this area of Ditton Park. Plan 2366442 clearly shows the boundary of Phase 7 land where the proposal is to restore original ground levels to reinstate parkland. Unfortunately the Cemex ownership</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>boundary excludes the significant aspects of the historic parkland as the canal, site of the former Gibraltar Bridge and the Park Pale lie beyond the ownership boundary of Phase 7 land resulting in the restoration of these areas sadly lacking from the proposed Variations of Conditions.</p> <p>Consequently the current proposals to vary the Conditions will only allow for re-grading the ground levels, supplementing tree banks, part retention of the Park Pale and reinstating (PROW) pathways within the section of land demarcated as Phase 7.</p> <p>Should the ownership issues be resolved we would want to see Conditions to include removing the rubble causeway, burial or removal of pipelines across the canal and parkland tree screening the security fence to the south of the site near to the office complex. It is also critical to protect the key surviving parkland features, namely the parkland pale and ornamental canal, and any surviving designed views in and out of the landscape.</p> <p>Cemex have provided a Historic Land Management Plan with laudable aims except that the works are predicated upon the ownership of the land being reintegrated with the rest of Ditton Park. Prior to determination the BGT would like to see clarification over land ownership and land management after the 25 year period has lapsed.</p> <p>Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan	Berkshire	E20/1706	n/a	<p>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation <a href="https://www.finchampstead-pc.gov.uk/community-projects/neighbourhood-development-plan">https://www.finchampstead-pc.gov.uk/community-projects/neighbourhood-development-plan</a></p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the Finchampstead NDP. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>The key aims of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) are to identify, understand, appreciate, and promote the conservation of historically significant designed landscapes in Berkshire whilst enjoying and caring for our park and garden heritage, now and for future generations.</p> <p>We fully support the principles set out in the NDP to protect the historic environment and green spaces. We have noted that Finchampstead Parish does not have any of Historic England's Registered Parks and Gardens nor does it include any of the new Locally Listed parks and gardens in the Local Plan. Notwithstanding this, the Parish does have a number of landscapes of historic interest which are listed in the NDP.</p> <p>BGT retains a Depository of sites that have been identified as having</p>

					<p>potential historic interest. This list includes gardens at West Court and the White Horse Bungalow within Finchampstead Parish which are not noted in the NDP. We have yet to research these but they may be worth considering for inclusion in the NDP for their historic interest, as well as others we are not currently aware of.</p> <p>BGT are also embarking on a Public Parks Project under the banner of the Gardens Trust's Unforgettable Gardens campaign. We would very much like to draw on your own work in your Local Green Spaces -Topic Paper. The purpose of our project is to identify and record parks in public ownership across Berkshire that are of historic interest. For example, we would be very interested to hear more about the fascinating history of California Park as a very early example of an Amusement Park dating from 1930. As a general rule we will be interested in parks and gardens which pre-date 1945 or are of exceptional merit since that date.</p> <p>We would like to suggest some small amendments to the NDP's Policy IRS3. The three main heritage categories include archaeology, built form and historic landscapes which enjoy separate designations and planning policy. We suggest that this is made more explicit.</p> <p>We very much welcome the work included in the Parish's Local Green Spaces Topic Paper and on Informal Green Spaces in identifying the historic value of the green spaces. We suggest that a plan of the boundary of the designated Green Space is mapped in each case (as shown for example in Site 2). Further research may reveal further historic interest as at California Park.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that IRS3 includes a reference to the setting of historic assets.</p> <p>Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E20/1533	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New Agricultural Building (resubmission of approved application ref: 19/0329/APP). Mentmore Park Farm, Mentmore, Buckinghamshire LU7 0QN. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2021</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 please consider this a joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and acknowledge that planning permission was granted for 19/03291/APP despite our concerns. The current application is concerned with the external materials for the new agricultural building, and as far as we can tell none of the new information</p>

					<p>addresses the concerns we made in response to the previous application. Our concerns therefore remain the same.</p> <p>The GT/BGT object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Milton's Cottage	Buckinghamshire	E20/1453	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of single storey rear extension, erection of single storey rear extension and replacement of window. Hampden Cottage, 19 Deanway, Chalfont St Giles, Buckinghamshire, HP8 4JH. BUILDING ALTERATION Alex Whitehead</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2021</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 please consider this a joint response.</p> <p>Hampden Cottage is semi-detached with Milton's Cottage which lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of that name, which is significant due to being the house of the author John Milton and the site where he wrote 'Paradise Lost' c1665. We have been unable to visit due to Covid restrictions, but note from the listing entry that the garden slopes up to the south from the garden gate on the north boundary in a series of low terraced compartments..."</p> <p>The proposals concern a contemporary style replacement extension is to the rear of Hampden Cottage. Whilst the projecting pitched roof kitchen extension may partially obscure some of the proposed works, we are still extremely concerned that the proposed new extension may still be visible from the garden at Milton's Cottage. We consider that the design for the proposed extension is inappropriate in such a significant setting due to its excessive use of glass and steel, particularly on the slightly pitched standing seam metal roof in a rusted material. We also consider that the substantial rooflight behind the pitched roof will emit and reflect light, which again is inappropriate in this significant setting.</p> <p>We also note that the Local Planning Authority made a pre-planning stage objection to the proposed grey brickwork and the applicant has revised the proposals to use banded brickwork instead. Again, we feel that this contemporary approach is not appropriate in this setting.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust would prefer to see a more traditional conservatory form on the property which sits well in the historic setting. It is unfortunate that the planning authority has already stated that "In terms of design, the proposed extension represents a sleek contemporary interpretation of the garden room style extension. The south elevation is almost fully glazed and</p>

					<p>offers lightweight subservience which will clearly be read as a C21st addition." Whilst we understand the preference to articulate later alterations through the introduction of contemporary architecture, we do not feel this is the appropriate approach in this case.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E20/1484	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION First floor extension to create a sunroom adjoining to the master bedroom. Gayhurst Park, Newport Road, Gayhurst, Newport Pagnell MK16 8LG. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021</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>Gayhurst Court (formerly Gayhurst House), a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) is an 18th century landscape park with mid c19 formal gardens around an earlier house. The gardens are attributed to Lancelot Brown c1750-60 with modifications by Repton c. 1793.</p> <p>This application relates to a recent house on the east park boundary near Park Farm. A previous application 20/01007/FUL was made in 2020 and The Gardens Trust urged the Council to reject this application as we considered that the extensive plate glass in the proposed new conservatory at first floor level to be excessive and would be visible, particularly from Humphry Repton's early c19 Digby's Walk.</p> <p>As we stated in our previous comments, views are particularly important on the approach to the impressive Gothick focal tunnel entrance some 150m north-west of the building. This is the highlight of the 800m long pleasure ground walk from the mansion. In this case the ground between the walk to the tunnel and the application site is less steep and in a dip. It is only possible to judge this effect on site.</p> <p>With regard to this revised application, we have studied the online documentation again and are disappointed that there is still no form of analysis of the effect of the new structure on views from the surrounding registered landscape of Gayhurst Park.</p> <p>We note the reduction in the extent of proposed glazing to both elevations to create more of a first-floor extension rather than a conservatory as was previously proposed as well as the proposed insertion of a large curved glass or lantern style rooflight to the roof of the proposed new extension. The revised glazing is more in keeping with the existing structure and we</p>

					<p>broadly welcome the alterations. However, the form and visibility of the proposed rooflight and light emission from it are an issue to which we object. The proposed extension includes ample glazing to allow for natural light but, if the Council are minded to permit a rooflight to the roof of the proposed extension, we suggest this should be in the form of a flat rooflight flush with the flat roof.</p> <p>There is still no visual mitigation of the site from the RPG proposed in the form of screening with appropriate early C19 woody species. This could be done either against the boundary of Digby's Walk, choosing species from the palette already in the walk, particularly yew, or using parkland species present in the park, scattered in parkland style in the open area between the Walk boundary and the building, positioned to ensure adequate filtered screening.</p> <p>For these reasons, which we believe are relatively minor for the applicant to comply with, we object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E20/1080	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of new walking footpath from Welcome Pavilion to Manor and associated ticket office. Waddesdon Manor, Silk Street, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire HP18 0JH. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.02.2021</p> <p>We appreciate that the footfall at Waddesdon is tremendous as it is the NT's most visited property. Even in lockdown with restrictions, it must still be extremely busy, so we are very aware of the challenges they face. We really appreciate your interaction with our comments, and recognise that this has been carefully considered with our concerns being addressed during deliberations. We are happy to support this going forward with the conditions Waddesdon/NT have offered AVDC. Thank you.</p> <p>Best wishes, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/1570	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of 1970s detached outbuildings at front of property, redevelopment and change of use of site to a hotel with ancillary facilities, including part single, part two storey front extension, single storey rear extension, two storey and second floor linking extensions, alterations to roofs, windows and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.03.2021</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 Bucks Gardens Trust (BGT) has now been able to make a brief visit to Bulstrode on behalf of the GT, to consider the impact of the proposals, which also includes application PL/20/4406/HB, to redevelop and change the use of the site to create a hotel with ancillary facilities.</p> <p>The GT/BGT are aware that planning and listed building consent has been granted for a larger scheme (17/01750/FUL). The current proposals are in</p>

				<p>doors, detached part single, part two storey staff accommodation block, associated landscaping and parking provision. Bulstrode, Oxford Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8SZ. HOTEL/HOSPITALITY</p>	<p>our opinion, less damaging to the registered park and garden (RPG). Bulstrode is perhaps the best surviving non-Royal classic Dutch garden in the UK. William Bentinck, 1st Duke of Portland was William and Mary's collaborator and friend, and heavily involved in the creation of their gardens at Het Loo and Hampton Court. Much of his garden is still there, or at least the western Pleasure Gardens are. It is therefore a very important survivor, shown beautifully in the 1730s map/survey aerial view. When Repton worked at Bulstrode he importantly left the surviving Pleasure Grounds intact and he clearly shows the surviving north-western trapezoidal Wilderness with its surviving two circular ponds and the Lime Avenue leading to the long canal (which might arguably be re-labelled the 'Bentinck Lily Pond' and 'Bentinck Lime Avenue'). The GT/BGT would suggest that the new hotel owners be encouraged to commission a full garden/archaeological landscape survey to show the garden history of the site, especially the of the western Pleasure Grounds and perhaps the southern former garden.</p> <p>With regard to this revised planning application, the GT/BGT would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>Now that we have had the opportunity to visit the site, the significance of the Victorian greenhouse in its original position within the walled kitchen garden is apparent. Could the applicant reconsider the proposals and instead of demolishing the greenhouse instead pursue the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carefully restore all aspects of its structure to include the brick plinth, timber and iron frame, glazing and the internal staging</li> <li>• To reconsider the layout of the car park to allow the greenhouse to remain in its original position</li> <li>• If this is absolutely not possible, then to reposition it as close as possible to the kitchen garden, perhaps where the current plans show 'Sir John Ramsden's conservatory'</li> <li>• The greenhouse is a valuable asset to this landscape and should not be lost</li> </ul> <p>We noted the existence of paving setts, possibly Denner Hill setts, in the service area where the proposed Spa wing will be constructed, as well as within the Kitchen Courtyard. The GT/BGT strongly recommend the retention of these historic paving materials, and if it is not possible to retain them in their current situation, they should be carefully lifted and reused as part of the hard landscaping scheme within the Kitchen Courtyard or the Outer Courtyard. The landscaping scheme within the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Kitchen Courtyard should reflect its historic use.</p> <p>We are reluctant to see changes to the Red Brick Gazebo and suggest that a less major intervention is sought to facilitate access through to the car park and Rose Garden.</p> <p>We support the restoration of the Victorian Rose Terraces and the creation of the 'Gertrude Jekyll' garden. Further research should be undertaken to inform the planting in these areas.</p> <p>With regard to the car parking area, signage and lighting should be minimised, whilst meeting safety requirements. Additional planting around the proposed new car park should create a visual buffer when viewed from the Lily Pond and American Garden.</p> <p>We are unable to comment on the proposed new staff housing as we did not discuss this on the day or visit that part of the garden. We are concerned that this will damage this area of the landscape, even though it is set into the woodland. We strongly encourage the Planning Authority to consider the impact of this part of the proposal and to encourage additional appropriate ornamental species planting to mitigate the impact of the staff housing in the landscape.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that the Planning Authority make it a condition of any planning consent that the applicants commission an historic landscape conservation and management plan by an experienced professional consultant, and its implementation guiding works to the grounds.</p> <p>As we stated in our response to the previous application, divided ownership of historic sites is always problematic. We recommend that the hotel owners consider approaching the other owners to explore adopting a common management plan for as much of the landscape as possible as a long-term aim. We would welcome a further site visit with the landscape architects/garden designers to clarify some points. We feel it would be beneficial to all parties to develop a collaborative approach to restoring and maintaining this highly significant landscape.</p> <p>Therefore, on the whole, we offer our support to this reduced scheme subject to the matters mentioned above.</p> <p>GT Conservation Officer</p>
Cheadle Royal Hospital	Cheshire	E20/0388	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and the development of a new hospice facility including	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2021</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 Cheshire</p>

			<p>access and landscaping; and  Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for a residential development, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.  St Anns Hospice, 20 St Anns Road North, Heald Green, Cheadle, Stockport, SK8 3SZ.  MEDICAL/HOSPITAL Helen Hodgett 0161 474 3656</p>	<p>Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response concerning the detailed application for a new hospice facility which has a material impact on the significance of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Cheadle Royal Hospital. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>The Garden Trust is in general supportive of the application. However, the Trust recognises that the development will result in a) the continued neglect and possible loss of the Tilia (Lime trees) along the southern avenue, also referred to as the west avenue) which is part of the registered Cheadle Royal Hospital site (designated 1995) and b) an irreversible impact on the setting and spatial form of the registered site. The Garden Trust considers that whilst there is a substantial impact to the heritage assets, it should be feasible to mitigate and reduce the impact through appropriate landscape design and management. The Heritage Statement defines the harm to heritage assets as ‘less than substantial’, yet this does not take into account the cumulative impact, in combination with previous urban development, on this nationally significant historic landscape, and its wider conservation area. It should be noted that when English Heritage registered the site, it was used a rare example of an institutional designed landscape that was essentially whole at the time. Cheadle Royal Hospital was featured on the front of their leaflets explaining the range of designated landscapes.</p> <p>In assessing the application, we have referred to Historic England’s Parks and Gardens Register Entry, to historic maps, aerial photos and to application documents including the Heritage Significance and Impact Assessment and the Design and Access Statement. It is noted that the application for full planning permission includes, and depends on, the demolition of the existing St Ann’s Hospice which is shown as a Key Historic Building on the conservation area townscape appraisal plan, linked to the registered site by an area shown as a Key Open Space. Demolition of the existing hospice is one of three options considered, the other two retaining the original building - we are unable to comment on this aspect but any option which reduces the overall footprint of new development would be preferable. There is certainly no objection to the principle of upgrading the hospice facilities.</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>Impact on the significance of the historic landscape</p> <p>The significance of Cheadle Royal Hospital is based on its survival as an early example of an approach where “the design of the hospital and the surrounding grounds reflects the development of progressive attitudes to the care of people with mental illness; the provision of outdoor space was part of a more humane therapeutic approach” (Heritage Significance and Impact Assessment, March 2020).</p> <p>The Register entry states: “Cheadle Hospital is described in the 1850s (Conolly 1856) as being one of several new asylums where: 'One of the chief of the indirect remedial means of treating mental disease is a cheerful, well-arranged building, in a well-selected situation, with spacious grounds for husbandry, and gardening, and exercise'. As built the hospital had thirty acres of meadow and eleven of arable land, two-and-a-half acres of kitchen garden, and five acres of flower gardens with avenues, shrubberies and gravelled walks. As part of their cure patients were involved with planting and improvements to the grounds, as well as using them for exercise and outdoor amusements including bowls and cricket”.</p> <p>The conservation area includes the registered site and listed hospital as well as St Ann’s Hospice. Section 3.10 of the CA appraisal, in defining the special interest of the CA, refers to the Register of Parks and Gardens and states that “The function and spatial relationship of the grounds to the historic buildings in this conservation area are of special interest”. In section 3.5 the appraisal describes the hospital’s landscape setting, views and vistas stating that: “Views towards the Main Wing from all directions, including the avenue leading from St Ann’s Road, are imposing... The grounds have a quality of tranquillity and unrestricted access and openness...”. The contribution of trees, hedges and green spaces is discussed in section 3.8, including: “All main routes within the hospital grounds are laid out as tree-lined avenues, enhancing vistas of the hospital and grounds and providing a picturesque approach from both east and west” .</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (March 2020) describes the site between St Ann’s Hospice and the west avenue (the Tilia avenue) as having medium significance for historic interest but it is clear from the evidence provided that development would remove the only surviving remnant of the original farmland that was converted to parkland and pasture as part of the hospital’s farm. The former hedgerow trees, some pre-dating the hospital, and growing in a naturalised area which is very likely to retain original soils</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>and seedbank, would be put at risk. The masterplan shows one high quality category A tree lost to road development (surely unnecessary as the derelict nurses' home it leads to could be accessed from Oakwater Avenue) and others with much disturbance to their root protection areas. These trees, all with TPOs, currently contribute to the setting of the registered area and conservation area as well as having other values in their own right. Trees along the avenue appear at less risk although in need of management. They are of mixed age and species, although Tilia is the dominant avenue tree - their distribution does not reflect that shown on the 1937 OS map - but insufficient information is provided.</p> <p>The Heritage assessment considers that St Ann's Hospice now makes a low contribution to the significance of the registered landscape but the former farmland/parkland to its south is considered to contribute to the overall setting "for historical, spatial and visual interests", its "open character and mature trees giving a parkland character setting to the formal designed grounds of the hospital".</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>The proposed development conflicts with the objectives of both the Register of Parks and Gardens and Conservation Area (CA) designations in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of open aspect - the CA appraisal is concerned that "Further development in the grounds of Cheadle Royal Hospital may result in the erosion and loss of its special quality, which is the relationship of the hospital to the views and open aspect of the generous landscaped grounds"</li> <li>• Irreversible change in character locally due to loss, risk or degradation of existing features including trees and greenspace of historic as well as potential future value</li> <li>• Further intrusion of new built development and car parking in views along the west avenue towards the hospital, particularly in winter, direct impact at the entrance from St Ann's Road, and possible constraints to future use.</li> </ul> <p>The details of the design, as described and illustrated, are also unsatisfactory in relation to the registered area:</p> <p>The Tilia Avenue: TGT concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TGT considers The Avenue and the open spaces as important historic features that contributes to the understanding and value of the site as a whole.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No information is provided on the avenue’s current surfacing, fencing or other built features. The arboriculture report refers to the ‘Lime Avenue’ but has very little information on the trees themselves - species, age, condition details etc are only provided for trees near to St Ann’s Road. No proposals for enhancement are included in the scheme, although ‘enhancement’ is referred to.</li> <li>• The Design and Access Statement (p30) states that ‘No resurfacing is proposed to any part of the Avenue.’ This contradicts the submitted drawings AL7785-2000/2001 Rev B that show access from St Ann’s Road North leading to an ambulance pick up point. Further details are needed: surfacing type and extent, signage, kerbing, and gate. This could have a direct adverse impact on the historic character.</li> <li>• Insufficient attention has been paid to the potential role of the Tilia Avenue, or west avenue, in its wider context but it is also unclear what its use (if any) could be in relation to access to the registered site itself particularly if cut off by security fencing. Future access to the site of the former nurse’s home, within the CA, has been identified in the Heritage Significance and Impact Assessment. It would be unacceptable for any part of the current proposals to constrain future uses.</li> <li>• The Avenue is not treated as a significant feature in its own right as there are only proposals for its northern boundary and from the perspective of the hospice.</li> <li>• The Design and Access Statement identifies the need for initial remedial work and a long-term management plan (p30). However, it claims that ‘it is not practical to a full schedule of future maintenance at this time’.</li> </ul> <p>The Tilia Avenue: TGT recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed information is provided for the entrance from St Ann’s Road North and associated features.</li> <li>• The renewal and management of the Avenue with appropriate planting.</li> <li>• A management plan that identifies the following: detail clearing, crown lifting, pruning, scrub growth removal, re-planting of lost or severely damaged trees in order to re-instate the formal avenue and proposed enhancement measures. (Note: these are identified in the Design and Access Statement)</li> <li>• Proposed detail planting plan showing trees, shrubs and herbaceous layer.</li> <li>• Cross sections to show how the proportions, materials and setting of the avenue would be retained, enhanced and managed, and how the</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>treatment would coordinate with the remainder of the avenue which should be considered as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed hedging or fencing should preferably be located outside root protection areas. The Trust further recommends that a similar hedge is planted on the south side of The Avenue, that is to the front of the existing rear gardens of the houses facing Gleneagles Road.</li> <li>• That site access along The Avenue for the construction phase of the development is prohibited as this could cause damage to the existing trees, roots and soil structure.</li> </ul> <p>Spatial Form and Open Aspect: TGT concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘The hospice development entails building on an area of open fields in the conservation area, which affects its landscape character...causing some harm.’ Heritage Significance and Impact Assessment p4</li> <li>• The loss of the spatial form and open space will dramatically change the form of the landscape. This is a significant feature of the landscape as identified in the CA listing, the history of the hospital and the treatment of those with mental health issues.</li> <li>• The overall site of Cheadle Royal Hospital has been eroded and adversely affected by other developments and wishes to lessen the impact of further development.</li> </ul> <p>Spatial Form and Open Aspect: TGT recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic map evidence and the remnant field patterns are partly identified by some mature trees.</li> <li>• The Trust would encourage the landscape architects to use this evidence by developing a design relationship to the earlier/lost landscape features through the use of hedges and trees.</li> <li>• Drawings AL7785-2000/2001 Rev B shows a similar approach within the landscape Masterplan</li> </ul> <p>Policy</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Feb 2019) states in paragraph 184 that ‘heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations’. The NPPF further advises in paragraph 189 that the significance of heritage assets includes “...any contribution made by their setting”.</p> <p>In paragraph 193 the NPPF states that “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance". It is considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on a key axial approach to Cheadle Royal Hospital.</p> <p>Stockport MBC Core Strategy DPD (March 2011) states that: "Development will be expected to make a positive contribution to the protection and/or enhancement of the borough's heritage assets. Buildings, sites, monuments, places and areas positively identified as having a degree of historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological significance (including canals and other transport infrastructure of historic value) will be safeguarded for the future". It is not considered that the proposals would safeguard or enhance the remaining heritage of Cheadle Royal Hospital. The proposal conflicts with Stockport Local Plan Policy HC4.1 Development and parks and gardens of historic interest which states that: "Development which would adversely affect the special character and appearance of parks and gardens of historic or landscape interest, or detract from their settings, will not be permitted".</p> <p>Position</p> <p>The purpose of the existing historic park and garden and conservation area designations is to protect the remaining historic landscape significance of Cheadle Royal Hospital and St Ann's Hospice. Whatever its merits in other respects, the proposed development will result in loss of historic fabric. The Tilia avenue is within the registered site and has become an overgrown, near derelict, historic remnant of the original landscape. Its historic character could be enhanced by good management allowing for changes to create a new access to the rear of the proposed hospice, and the future role and use.</p> <p>Within the area between St Ann's Hospice and the Tilia avenue the proposed modern development would result in an irreversible change in character, adding to existing business park and residential development to remove the last area of former farmland/parkland associated with Cheadle Royal Hospital. The sense of space which was so important to the original purpose of the hospital, and which is still retained to some extent on the approach from the west, would be reduced and the value of the heritage asset as a whole would be diminished.</p> <p>Our concerns are based on the development and the significance of this</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>rare and historic designed landscape. There appear to be other options for development of St Ann's Hospice which may be less harmful, retaining the 'parkland' as green space for its historic, environmental and potential health and well-being values.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Eaton Hall, Overleigh Road Cemetery	Cheshire	E20/1505	II* II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of new 2.4 metre high green weld mesh fencing to the rear boundary of the site, new tarmacadam footpath to provide pedestrian access from the front boundary to the main entrance of the school building, existing front boundary wall/fence is to be altered to provide a new pedestrian gate and new 2.4 metre high green weld mesh fencing and vehicular and pedestrian gates are to be installed to restrict access to the carpark. The Catholic High School, Old Wrexham Road, Chester CH4 7HS. EDUCATION, BOUNDARY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Eaton Hall listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) who visited the site in June 2020 and attended a consultation at the school in July 2020.</p> <p>We object to the erection of a 2.4m high perimeter fence to the rear boundary of the site, a proposal which if permitted, would sub-divide and urbanise an open space that forms part of the setting to the north drive linking Eaton Hall with the City of Chester, a slight but evident degradation. The significance of Eaton Hall's RPG lies in the continuity of ownership by the Grosvenors since the C15th; a family whose wealth enabled them to engage a succession of eminent landscape designers to develop the grounds. The estate contains probably the greatest concentration of listed buildings in the county. The Grosvenor connections with Chester, their influence and patronage, are part of the city's heritage – a city to which their estate was directly connected by the Duke's Drive. This drive is central to the green corridor of open spaces and woodland forming the southern approach to the heart of the city, the most attractive and verdant entrance to Chester.</p> <p>Duke's Drive, at 5km, is the second longest drive at Eaton. It was laid out by John Webb (1754-1826) who undertook work on the estate between 1802-1806. At Eaton Webb succeeded his mentor William Emes (1729-1803), who designed the landscape park in a style similar to that of Capability Brown. Historic maps show Duke's Drive passing through plantations and narrow tree belts, providing views through the trees to open areas of fields and parkland enclosed by woodland.</p> <p>The designed landscape of Eaton Hall is so extensive and important that it is the only estate meriting its own designation under the Cheshire West</p>

				<p>and Chester Landscape Strategy 2016, LCT 11 Estate Farmland, 11a Grosvenor Estate. 'The four formal wooded approaches to the Hall in this character area are very conspicuous within the surrounding field system with its low hedgerows. A mix of broadleaves and coniferous with beech, holly, hornbeam, lime, Scots pine and yew, they make up much of the woodland content of this character area. In the northeast the linear woodland along the Chester Approach dominates the edge of the Dee Valley. This area, a local wildlife site with a range of species indicative of older woodland, is managed as a public access area, a reflection of its location on the southern edge of Chester.'</p> <p>The impact of the proposal to erect a 2.4m high rear boundary fence will cause less than substantial harm to the designed heritage assets of Eaton Park Grade II* and the Curzon Park Conservation Area. However, the harm will come from subdividing a space which is all used for recreation and where public access has been established over many years. The style of fence would increase the sense of urbanisation, spoiling the sense of 'natural' landscape that has developed over time, a characteristic valued by local people for its accessibility and rarity within Chester. It is understood that the Grosvenor Estate gave the land to the Council who leased it to the school. The terms of the lease are not known.</p> <p>Since submitting the original application, the applicant has carried out a consultation, undertaken a Design and Access Statement which provides some justification for the proposal, reduced the height of the fence to 2.4m and offset it from the boundary. Notwithstanding these modifications, and acknowledging the safeguarding issues, we would strongly recommend fencing a reduced area following existing tree lines, with the outer area continuing as a single space allowing the occasional use by the school to continue alongside public use. We believe that this would mitigate the harm caused by the proposal while still meeting safeguarding requirements.</p> <p>We still consider that the proposal remains contrary to several Policies within Cheshire West and Chester's Adopted Local Plan 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SOC 6 Open Space Sport &amp; Recreation – if permitted the proposal would diminish the network of open spaces in south Chester;</li> <li>- ENV2 Landscape – this application would harm local character and distinctiveness as described in the Cheshire West &amp; Chester Landscape Strategy 2015 and as recognised in the Chester West &amp; Chester Green Belt Study;</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>- Policy ENV3 Green Infrastructure – this would be degraded by the proposal</p> <p>- ENV5 Historic Environment – This proposal does not ‘respect’ or ‘respond positively’ to the designated historic assets of either the RPG or Curzon Park Conservation Area and their settings.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Peover Hall, Radbroke Hall	Cheshire	E20/1666	II, N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid Application comprising of; a) Full application for the Demolition of Kilburn House, Lovelace House and Brooker House to create "Town Square" and landscaped areas and an extension to Furber House to create additional Food &amp; Beverage / support space; facade upgrades to Turing House, Babbage House and Furber House; retrospective application for installation of generators, installation of roof mounted air handling units; creation of a new security lodge; removal of a visitor car park; creation of new public realm; internal highways improvements; landscaping and other associated works; and b) Outline planning permission (including matters of Access, Scale and Layout) for the erection of new office floorspace (Use Class B1a) including employee wellness facilities and associated works. RADBROKE HALL, STOCKS LANE, OVER PEOVER, WA16 9EU. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) with regard to proposed development affecting Radbroke Hall, listed Grade II and the associated Rose garden wall and pavilions, also listed Grade II, and the setting of Peover Hall Grade II, a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (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>. This document (p5) makes clear the distinction between designated and non designated heritage assets in the planning system, and the importance of non designated heritage assets in local plans.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the extremely late notification, we are grateful for the opportunity to comment on proposals which have a material impact on the significance of Peover Hall Grade II, the Rose garden wall and pavilions associated with Radbroke Hall listed Grade II, and the wider parkland, a non designated heritage asset.</p> <p>We do not object to this application which seeks to provide improved facilities and an enhanced work environment for this established business campus, but we have concerns regarding landscape design and noise which may cause some harm to the significance of these irreplaceable heritage assets.</p> <p>We are familiar with Peover Hall park and gardens. A representative of the CGT visited Radbroke Hall on February 12th 2021, meeting with Brendan Hatzar, Barclays Site Manager, and Harry Bolton of CBRE. From this</p>



					<p>meeting it is understood that proposals are being developed for a later phase of work which will encompass access improvements, repairs and refurbishment of Radbroke Hall and its associated gardens, work which will be the subject of a future listed building application. We welcome the intention to undertake conservation work in the garden.</p> <p>Significance</p> <p>The significance of Radbroke Hall lies in its architectural and artistic interest, one of the last country houses designed by Percy Worthington, and possibly the only one of this period built in a neo Georgian classical style. A measure of its significance is its listing Grade II. The associated garden with garden wall and pavilions is also by Percy Worthington, with the structures listed Grade II. Both elements remain substantially intact complemented by retention of part of their parkland setting and tree lined approach from the west. The garden is limited in extent but the carefully detailed, high quality hard landscaping is a little gem of Arts and Crafts style. It is the only portion of the original more extensive series of garden spaces to survive, offering fine westerly views of the Hall. The layout and pavilions reflect the development of a design undertaken at Kerfield House near Knutsford by Percy Worthington in 1912 where an axial path connects two summer houses or alcoves with arched entrances.</p> <p>The significance of Radbroke Hall also lies in its historic interest as an early 20th century country house continuing the tradition of classical country house building begun in the 18th century. It is an addition to the classical halls around Knutsford, Tatton and Tabley but built with money from trade, not by gentry. Like them it takes advantage of its setting with probable views towards the sandstone ridge and Welsh hills prior to the growth of boundary tree planting. It contributes to the rich diversity of country houses in East Cheshire. Gardens are more often subject to change through time as well as by design, but here a garden space survives intact, in Arts and Crafts style, reflecting the pre war garden of the 'golden afternoon'. Though limited in extent, it too adds to the richness and diversity of Cheshire's heritage, a historic garden standing alongside gardens of the same period at Tirley Garth (C E Mallows and T. H Mawson) and Thornton Manor (Lord Leverhulme and T. H. Mawson), both registered Grade II*.</p> <p>The property changed from private to corporate ownership in 1956, the very nadir of interest or awareness of built heritage. Each decade has added an undistinguished layer of buildings, associated clutter and car parking, largely turning its back on the historic core of the site. With</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>proposals now being developed there is the opportunity to redress the situation, provide design clarity and an improved environment for Barclays' business and employees in what has become a business park in the North Cheshire Green Belt.</p> <p>Impacts on Significance</p> <p>The Heritage Statement (Setting) October 2020 describes the heritage assets but does not actually state their significance in accordance with NPPF or Historic England guidance.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this omission we concur with the assessment of impacts of proposed development on the designated and non designated heritage assets. However we are concerned that the landscape design of the proposed 'kitchen garden', which provides a new green space, a transition between the rose garden and proposed landscape corridors, is a missed opportunity and as presented may cause some harm to the significance of the garden. The design appears generic, not informed by an understanding of the Radbroke Hall site. Hidcote and Great Dixter are cited as 'Manor Garden Precedents', but there is precedent here, both in the history of the site and in the surviving details and materials, as well as in two contemporary local gardens, Tirley Garth and Thornton Manor. The design, quality, choice of materials, furniture and detailing can be classic or contemporary but must be exemplary, with the potential to become a registered garden of the 2020s. They must seek to enhance the significance of the heritage asset in accordance with CHESHIRE EAST LOCAL PLAN Strategy 2010-2030, Policy SE7 Historic Environment, specifically paragraph 4,</p> <p>For all heritage assets, high quality design should be achieved. It should aim to avoid poorly executed pastiche design solutions and should foster innovation and creativity that is sensitive and enhances the significance of heritage assets in terms of architectural design, detailing, scale, massing and use of materials.</p> <p>And Policy SE4 The Landscape: "All development should conserve the landscape character and quality and should where possible, enhance and effectively manage the historic, natural and man-made landscape features that contribute to local distinctiveness of both rural and urban landscapes."</p> <p>We acknowledge that there is no visibility between the Radbroke Hall site and Peover Hall Registered park and garden, but the assessment of impacts on significance has not considered the impact of traffic noise and movement in accordance with Historic England Guidance – The Setting of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice note 3, p11 'Experience of the asset' can include 'Noise, vibration and other nuisances, Tranquillity, remoteness, 'wildness', Busyness, bustle, movement and activity'.</p> <p>The landscape character of the parkland at Peover Hall provides a sense of going back in time, natural beauty and peacefulness, qualities that form part of the experience of being in the park and upon which the noise of large amounts of traffic intrudes. It is acknowledged that when operating 'normally' Radbroke already generates a considerable volume of traffic and that the proposed development does not seek to increase the number of site staff, but the proposals should aim to actively decrease car use in line with CHESHIRE EAST LOCAL PLAN Strategy 2010-2030</p> <p>Policy CO 1 Sustainable Travel and Transport, and paragraph 180 of the NPPF which states that: 'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should... A) Identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.'</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We appreciate and support the aspirations of the client and design team to improve Barclays Technology Centre at Radbroke Park, and the importance this has for the Northern Powerhouse and local employment, but consider that this must be founded and develop from a thorough understanding of the historic environment and local context.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Thomas Wright's House and Garden, Byers Green	County Durham	E20/1589	N	PLANNING APPLICATION 37 no. dwellings including site landscaping, drainage/SUDs, access and demolition of 130/132 High Street. Land To The North East Of 100 To 132 High Street, Byers Green. RESIDENTIAL	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) who have made a site visit, and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and object to the proposed development for its failure to address the historical significance of the</p>

				<p>landscape on the east side of the village. The development site, lying on the east side of the Byers Green, impacts upon the open landscape behind the village, an area that includes both the site of, and setting for, the house and garden of the famous eighteenth-century polymath, Thomas Wright. As recognition of its importance was not a requirement of the design brief, the submitted scheme is damaging to that landscape.</p> <p>The whole of this open landscape, east of the village, has been designated by Durham County Council as an Area of Higher Landscape Value (AHLV) in the County Durham Plan 2020, a reaffirmation of an earlier (and slightly smaller) AHLV designation.</p> <p>Thomas Wright, his house and garden</p> <p>Thomas Wright (1711-1786) was notable in the fields of astronomy, mathematics, architecture and landscape design. As an astronomer he was the first to describe the shape of the Milky Way and to speculate that faint nebulæ were distant galaxies. He designed a number of important garden buildings and landscapes across the country. He wrote influential books on both astronomy and garden buildings. He was born in Byers Green and returned to spend the last thirty years of his life there, building a house-cum-museum-cum-laboratory, also laying out an important garden, on the east side of the village. In short, Wright's life and work demonstrate he is one of the greatest men of the eighteenth century from the North East of England.</p> <p>Wright's garden at Byers Green was small but designed in the English Landscape style that he did much to promote. In Wright's own words, 'The house stands in the centre of a plantation of my own rearing, mostly of forest trees and flowering shrubs of every kind both foreign and domestic..... plantations full-grown, with Chinese and other seats every where disposed to take in several large and pleasing views; some of which are well clothed with wood, and others very extensive.....with the cathedral church of Durham, a noble Gothic building, as the principal point of view. On this side of my house I have a prospect from my dining-room windows, of upwards of 500 beautiful inclosures in a most picturesque situation, truly pastoral, in all the scenes of agriculture.'</p> <p>While Wright's house and garden have regrettably gone, the site of the latter remains. What also survives is the 'natural amphitheatre' that Wright so admired to the east of the village - the enclosing valley sides across the Hagg Beck, the hills to the north and south, with the valley of the Wear running out to the NE. This was a 'borrowed' landscape taken from the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>surrounding countryside, but absolutely integral to the design of his garden, where he could appreciate nature and enjoy the distant views, the latter no doubt shaped and framed within his garden and admired from those Chinese seats. It is this land that is being partially eroded by the proposed development, a development completely lacking the landscape appraisal that takes account of the considerable heritage value and significance of the area, a study that might have informed the subsequent design work.</p> <p>Heritage landscape appraisal  Given the total lack, in all the submitted planning documents, of any reference to the adjacent Wright site, its surrounding landscape and its significance, a heritage statement is needed, commissioned from an experienced landscape historian. It would consider the Wright site, as well as its setting and significance in relation to the current development proposals. Where there are conflicts it would address them and recommend changes to the design to either remove or mitigate them. We would suggest that two such conflicts are obvious.</p> <p>The proposed housing development; oversized and poorly screened  The proposed housing develops from the village street frontage back east as far as the existing hedge line, at first glance, probably the most appropriate eastern boundary for the development. But analysis of the village shows that this hedge line is the former edge of the pre-1805 village green, so a further line of houses on its eastern side would conform with other housing in the village. What seems excessive and damaging is the further, second row of five houses to the east which clearly thrusts the development out into the open landscape. Ideally this row should be omitted. Perhaps out of a sense of developer guilt, the site is given a very thick (and welcome) tree belt on its eastern boundary, but its northern boundary, where it extends beyond adjacent buildings, is completely open to the countryside, an exposed raw edge without any tree screening. This aspect of the proposal is detrimental to character of the open landscape east of the village, eroding Wright's 'amphitheatre' and should be screened either by reducing the number of houses to accommodate a tree belt, or acquiring more land to the north for planting to screen the houses.</p> <p>The drainage pond; visually intrusive in the open landscape  East of the housing, a deep drainage pond is proposed surrounded by a ring of trees. In the context of the open landscape east of the village, this</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>might well appear as a highly intrusive feature, a rather strident clump of trees where there had never been one before. We feel sure that given the landscape's heritage significance and informed by the specialist report proposed above, a much-improved design can be achieved that will lessen its visual impact; possibly a pond with much smaller scale peripheral planting, or may be one set lower down east, towards the beck?</p> <p>Durham County Council: County Plan 2020</p> <p>The land east of the village is designated as an Area of High Landscape Value.</p> <p>Policy 39: Landscape. For the reasons set out above we consider this proposed new development causes 'unacceptable harm to the character, quality or distinctiveness of the landscape' and, therefore in accordance with Policy 39, should not be approved in its present form. Any proposal thought acceptable under the policy 'will be expected to incorporate appropriate measures to mitigate adverse landscape features and visual effects'. Currently, this scheme does not include any such measures.</p> <p>Policy 44: Historic Environment. By failing 'to sustain the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets' we consider this development contravenes Policy 44 of the County Council's County Plan 2020, and should not be approved in its current form.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/NGT object to the proposed development because of its damaging impact on the important heritage landscape to the east of the village, an Area of High Landscape Value. This aspect is not considered in any submitted documentation and we recommend the commissioning of a heritage landscape appraisal that will address this omission. That report should also assess the impact of the development on the special value of the landscape and identify any mitigating measures required. We would suggest at least two areas are worthy of examination. This development also currently contravenes two major policies in the County Council's own County Plan 2020.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
East Devon Local Plan	Devon	E20/1537	N	<p>LOCAL PLAN A new local plan for East Devon Issues and Options report consultation</p> <p><a href="http://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/newlocalplan">www.eastdevon.gov.uk/newlocalplan</a></p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2021</p> <p>A new local plan for East Devon – Issues and Options report consultation</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the Issues and Options Report of the new local plan for East Devon.</p> <p>The built heritage is rightly given a strong emphasis in the local plan but the significant contribution made by historic designed landscapes to the</p>

					<p>heritage of East Devon is not fully acknowledged. There are eight sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and twenty five sites on the Devon Gazetteer of Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest (para 2.33,2.34 &amp; 2.49 of the Heritage Strategy). Admittedly, there is a brief mention of registered parks and gardens in para 9.6 but we suggest that it is important that historic designed landscapes should be given more emphasis in the text.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust suggests that perhaps Chapter 9 'Our outstanding built heritage' should be re titled 'Our outstanding historic environment' as this would embrace listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments and designed landscapes Objective 7 should be changed to 'To conserve and enhance our historic environment' and there should be a specific reference to the historic designed landscapes in the text.</p> <p>We hope that you can see your way clear to making these few changes.</p> <p>Yours faithfully DGT Conservation Officer</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E20/0166	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To install new perimeter lighting illuminating Drakes Statue, Merchant Navy Memorial, Britannia Memorial and the RAF War Memorial on the Hoe Promenade. The Promenade, The Hoe, Plymouth. EXTERNAL LIGHTING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Devon Gardens Trust on the resubmission of the previous 20/00616/FUL and 20/00617/LBC. We note that the only proposed change is the new location of 1no. light to south elevation of the Armada memorial. We are happy to support the proposals.</p> <p>John Clark Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Sharpham House	Devon	E20/1657	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters reserved except appearance and landscaping for erection of a farm managers dwelling. Farm Activity Centre, Lower Sharpham Barton Farm, Ashprington, Devon TQ9 7DX. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the setting of Overbecks an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website. It would appear that the</p>

					proposal would have a less than significant affect on the historic designed landscape of Sharpham House. We have no objections to the proposals. Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust
Sharpham House	Devon	E20/1742	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of forestry workshop, animal care workshop, tool and machinery workshop, extension to existing bunkhouse and decking and siting of two mobile cabins. Farm Activity Centre, Lower Sharpham Barton Farm, Ashprington, Totnes TQ9 7DX. HYBRID	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the setting of Overbecks an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website. It would appear that the proposal would have a less than significant affect on the historic designed landscape of Sharpham House. We have no objections to the proposals. Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust
Upper, Central and Lower Pleasure Gardens, and Coy Pond Gardens	Dorset	E20/1582	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolish existing garage and erect 2 storey side extension. 2 Havelock Road, Poole, BH12 1LA. BUILDING ALTERATION Eleanor Godesar	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2021 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 studied the online documentation. The crucial element as far as the GT/DGT are concerned, is the relationship between the garden ground of No 2 Havelock Road and the upper reaches of the Grade II registered Central Gardens. The landscape proposals appear to the GT/DGT to provide a thoughtful solution to the changed site and this relationship to the public gardens. However, any change to these plans needs to be considered carefully by your officers, and we therefore ask that the approved scheme be conditioned judiciously, and that any changes be subject to your approval. We also ask that the offered 5-year maintenance regime be also conditioned, or if necessary be made subject to a S.106 agreement. The GT/DGT makes no comment on the size and massing of the proposed extension.



					Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0547	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of full width rear extension with two storey element. Proposed single storey kitchen extension and dormers at first floor to provide additional bed and bathroom in roof. Garden Cottage, Shortgrove, Newport. BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2021 Shortgrove, Newport, CB11 3TX. Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to the amendment for the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. This revised application does not address the reservations we had about the original application, and we similarly regard it as an extension that would be unsympathetic to the existing house and the wider landscape context. Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Thorndon Hall	Essex	E20/1578	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Conversion of existing garage to habitable space including new glazed link to front. Two storey extension Alterations and extensions of detached listed building with a two storey extension to replace the existing 1968 extension. Orchard Cottage, Thorndon Park, Warley, Brentwood, Essex CM13 3SA. BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2021 Alterations and extensions of detached listed building with a two storey extension to replace the existing 1968 extension. Orchard Cottage, Thorndon Park, Warley, Brentwood, Essex CM13 3SA. 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. Thorndon Park is a country park which has its origins in late medieval parkland which was later landscaped for the 8th Lord Petre in the early 18th century, and then redesigned by Capability Brown and Richard Woods at the end of the century for the newly built Thorndon Hall. South-west of the house, which is now flats, subsequent to a fire, are the conjoined walled kitchen and orchard gardens. Orchard House is a late 18th century building located in the wall between the two gardens, probably originally having had an entrance lodge function. In about 1960, a clumsy and very much of its time extension was added to the side of Orchard House. It is proposed to replace this with a new extension, and also to improve several outbuildings which abut the garden wall. In principle what is proposed would seem to have little effect on the wider setting of the country park. However, the design of the replacement extension takes no more account of the Georgian character of Orchard House and the walled garden than did the 1960s one. It would benefit from

					revision, particularly with a reduction of the amount of glazing. Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Danbury Park Riffhams	Essex	E20/1622	II, II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a solar photovoltaic (PV) park generating up to 25 MW of electricity spread over two sites (sited either side of St Cleres Hall Pit), comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, grid connection cables, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements. Land East And West Of St Cleres Hall Pit, Main Road, Danbury, Chelmsford. SOLAR	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2021 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. These two application sites are located on the Danbury ridge, an area of low hills much valued locally for amenity and recreation. Adjacent to the more easterly site is the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Riffhams, where there is a house built by John Spencer in 1815 who called in Humphrey Repton to advise on its siting and landscape. The house with its gardens lies in an area of rolling parkland which drops down to a valley where a dammed stream has created two lakes. On the other side of the A414, there is Danbury Country Park which is also a Grade II RPG registered landscape. This has its origins in the site of Tudor house with a deer park. By the 18th century, an estate map reveals the house as surrounded by gardens with avenues cut through the park. In the 19th century, the house was replaced, and new gardens laid out. In 1947 the site was bought by Essex County Council which has designated it a Country Park and established the Danbury Outdoors Youth Camp. Although it might be argued the solar farm would be screened by trees, there can be no doubt that it would intrude into views and affect the way the wider setting is perceived. The provision of solar energy may be in the wider interest, but this is certainly not the place for it, and we would like to register a very strong objection. GT Conservation Officer
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E20/1502	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing two storey teaching block and single storey changing rooms and erection of two/three storey 'Digital Building' with associated hard and soft landscaping (Variation of Condition 2 (drawing numbers) of permission 19/04741/FUL)	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for development proposals that might impact on Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. This proposal has previously, in 2019, been the subject of a consultation with GGLT. In that instance, GGLT was of the opinion that this proposal had marginal impact on the Grade1 Cirencester Park. This proposal ,although of greater volume than the buildings it replaces, helps to resolve the visual

				involving alterations to design of approved scheme at Cirencester College, Fosse Way Campus, Stroud Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. EDUCATION	quality and setting of the existing development. Therefore GGLT would not wish to modify its view. However, it would have helped in submissions like this if the CAD drawings which lacked an illustration of the building's wider setting, gave a better impression of its materials, colour, and texture of the proposal. (on behalf of GGLT)
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E20/1619	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of two new three-storey teaching buildings and associated landscape, demolition of two existing buildings at Cirencester College, Fosse Way Campus, Stroud Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire. EDUCATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Registered Parks, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf. Having recently commented on the replacement building for the current E block, which abuts the main carpark to the East; this development now completes the renewal and expansion scheme overlooking the sports field to the South. The new buildings have marginal impact on the Registered Grade 1 Cirencester Park, and their character fits into the overall Campus design strategy. Yours sincerely, (on behalf of GGLT)
Kiftsgate Court	Gloucestershire	E20/1677	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Single storey rear extensions at Front Lodge Kiftsgate Court Kiftsgate Mickleton Chipping Campden BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to these applications on its behalf. Having considered the aesthetic qualities of this property, the impact of the demolitions; and primarily, the impact of this work on the overall Listing of Kiftsgate Court and its garden; GGLT is of the opinion that this work will have little impact on its setting. Yours sincerely, (on behalf of GGLT)
Kiftsgate Court	Gloucestershire	E20/1678	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Demolition of existing 1970s garage and construction of single-storey rear extensions at Front Lodge Kiftsgate Court Kiftsgate Mickleton Chipping Campden	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2021 As per E20/1677

				DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION	
Miserden Park	Gloucestershire	E20/1683	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Relocation of kitchen into the Library on east wing. Proposed opening between new kitchen and pantry. Reinstatement of dining room wall to original position BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2021 The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscape, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. GGLT considers that these internal alterations to Miserden Park House will be well executed and will have no adverse impact on the House or its setting. (on behalf of GGLT)
Stratton Park	Hampshire	E20/1634	II	PLANNING APPLICATION To install a new set of wooden gates, replacing a damaged wrought iron gate in situ. 6 The Clock House, Basingstoke Road, Micheldever SO21 3DP. ACCESS/GATES	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.02.2021 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. Please accept my apologies for the slight delay in responding. We have looked at the very sparse online documentation supplied by the applicant, and are surprised that there is no mention whatsoever that the application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Stratton Park. Humphry Repton produced a Red Book for Stratton, and some of his suggestions were implemented. We would therefore have expected a heritage statement and also at the very least, a photo of the damaged gate they seek to replace. Due to the sensitivity of the site we feel that there is insufficient documentation for us to ascertain whether the rather utilitarian gate suggested, is appropriate. We have no way of knowing either how old the original gate is, whether it is worthy of restoration, or if not, whether something more closely resembling it, might not be a more appropriate solution? We would like to submit a holding objection until the applicant provides more detailed information. Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
7 Wendover Drive, Welwyn	Hertfordshire	E20/1531	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two, 4-bedroom dwellings with associated access, garages, parking and amenity space	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comment to make on the replacement of the current dwelling with 2 dwellings as described. We concur with the advice given in the Arboricultural Report submitted

				following demolition of existing dwelling. BUILDING ALTERATION	with this application that the extent of the roots area of trees likely to be affected during construction work, were determined and any mitigation and protection measures be approved before any work is commence, should permission for this application be given. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E20/1577	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration including the installation of a juliet balcony. 5 Great North Road, Hatfield AL9 6LB BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The property is part of the setting, and therefore significance of the Registered parkland of Gobions, and part of the former park. We have considered the plans for additional fenestration, and the extant screening from garden hedge and trees. We have no objections to the plans as proposed providing that sufficient screening is maintained. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
76 Brockwood Lane, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1596	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Oak tree but retain stump, fell 2 x Hornbeam trees, 1 x Acer tree, 1 x Oak tree to ground level with stumps removed. 76 Brockwood Lane, Welwyn Garden City AL8 7BQ TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.02.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that applications 6/2020/1573.TC and 6/2020/2409/TC were for extensive felling of trees which are part of the historic Sherrardswood Park. It would appear that an arboricultural report is available for this application although not included here. We are concerned at the volume of work proposed cumulatively for this site and that it will alter the character of both the historic landscape and the character of the area. We trust that WHBC can assess the arboricultural report and ascertain the necessity for the felling of these trees. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Poles Park	Hertfords hire	E20/1603	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of covered pergola and enclosure of both the pergola and former smoking shelter with removable canvas sides. (Retrospective). Maltons, Cambridge Road, Thundridge, Hertfordshire SG12 0ST. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE> 05.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application and our knowledge of Registered Poles Park (Hanbury Manor) and its landscape history, we do not wish to comment. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E20/1626	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Certificate of Lawfulness for the erection of a loft conversion. 5 Great North Road, Hatfield AL9 6LB. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 08.02.2021 Object. Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property overlooks the Registered Parkland of Gobions including the listed Folly Arch and as such is within its setting and affects its significance.

					<p>The height, bulk and amount of fenestration proposed for this loft conversion would cause harm to the parkland, it would be out of character with the more low rise adjacent properties and cumulative harm to the landscape is possible due to this application, the outstanding 6/2021/0084/HOUSE extension application and various extensions to the house over the past few years.</p> <p>We object to the proposal as detailed due to harm caused to designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
10 Newgate Street Village, Hertford	Hertfords hire	E20/1652	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Felling works to restore woodland in accordance with management plan - limited to no more than 5m3 per calendar quarter. 10 Newgate Street Village, Hertford SG13 8RA. TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 10.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Ponsbourne Park is on the List of Parks and Gardens of Local Interest and was formerly Gacelyns Park, dating back to 1300. The current design of the park is largely 19th century, including the ornamental lake and islet. We note that selective felling will produce woody biomass but there is no mention of appropriate replanting and a heritage statement detailing the suggested restoration of the historic elements.</p> <p>We would expect that a Management Plan would include detail of this, informed by historical research, rather than the summary supplied with this application.</p> <p>WHBC's own policies and the NPPF both require conservation and enhancement of heritage assets, including those of local designation.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Nyn Manor Farm	Hertfords hire	E20/1719	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Submission of details pursuant to condition 2 (external lighting) on planning permission (6/2019/1813/FULL). Nyn Manor Vineyards Road Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4PQ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the lighting as proposed in this application.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth	Hertfords hire	E20/1775	n/a	<p>LOCAL PLAN Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.02.2021</p> <p>We consider that this plan does not fulfil the criteria for sustainable development as detailed in the NPPF, specifically 2.8c, the environmental objective in conjunction with 16.184 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. This sets out that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. There are no policies in this plan considering Historic Parks</p>

					<p>and Gardens and their settings.</p> <p>Historic Designed Landscape</p> <p>Further, nowhere in this plan is there any consideration of historic designed landscapes, nationally designated or locally identified.</p> <p>Policy DM58 Mobile Communications lists Chilterns AONB, listed building, sites of archaeological importance or of nature conservation importance as constraints in siting of development. This should include at the least those Parks and Gardens on the Historic England Register as setting, both of the Registered landscape and the buildings it contains is of importance to its significance (HE GPA3.2 Setting of Heritage Assets).</p> <p>Policy DM 36 must include the retention or replacement of trees as necessary in accordance with any historic design intent, in historic parks or garden or setting of listed buildings. Species and layout are important to the heritage value of these sites and need to be considered.</p> <p>Paragraph 19.1 states natural, built heritage.</p> <p>The NPPF states (Chapter 16) that locally recognised heritage assets should be also considered when weighing harm against benefit and that local authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or any part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps. Dacorum Borough Council has for some years had a list of Local Parks &amp; Gardens of Historic Interest which contribute both to the character of the local area and are of heritage value in themselves. This was prepared by HGT with guidance and funding from English Heritage and the maps now used by DBC Development Control for these were developed in conjunction with HGT. This list has now (2020) been updated by HGT in consultation with DBC. We consider that such a Local List, in addition to the nationally designated List, Schedule and Register is essential to inform policies such as DM58, DM36 and any policies dealing with built development in the towns and villages within Dacorum.</p> <p>Development of Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>Although the Draft Plan states in its Mission Statement (23.11) that Garden City Principles will be followed in development plans, the expansion of Hemel Hempstead as proposed is against both Garden City Principles and against the New Town Principles laid out by Jellicoe and others. These require communities to be within easy reach of green open space for health and recreation. In the New Towns including Hemel, this was achieved by having discrete neighbourhoods separated from each other by green open space.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>HH01, HH02, HH05, HH22 destroy those principles by building on the open land at present available to residents of the communities adjacent to the proposed development areas.</p> <p>The heritage of the 20th century is increasingly being recognised, including addition of 20th century parks and gardens to the HE Register. Dacorum's 20th century heritage as one of the first New Towns should be conserved and enhanced in line with NPPF Chapter 16.</p> <p>The proposed employment development area west of the M1 should have policies to control buildings' height and lighting. The Registered Park and Listed mansion of Gorhambury lies to the east of the M1 and the setting could be harmed by ill-considered proposals.</p> <p>Development in Tring</p> <p>The large scale development north east of Tring will destroy Green Belt land with insufficient justification put forward contrary to NPPF Chapter 13. It will harm the setting of the Locally Listed Pendley Manor landscape: the development to the south of that will harm the setting and significance of the Registered Tring Park and the historically important Dunsley Bungalow small holding with its listed dwelling and outbuildings. The development infilling the area between the western edge of the town and the designed (and locally important) Tring Cemetery will harm the setting of this rural landscape laid out by the Rothschilds with significant buildings by William Huckvale. We consider that the huge proposed expansion of Tring will harm the current character of the town and its historic centre.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>DBC has sufficient information in the HE Register and the Local List of Parks and Gardens to conserve and enhance these irreplaceable designed landscape heritage assets as required by NPPF. The Local Plan now needs some policies to ensure that, both in the development of the Plan and subsequent use, these heritage assets are considered along with other constraints when considering development.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Knebworth	Hertfords hire	E20/1602	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Temporary use of land for film making with associated temporary set and supporting facilities vehicles, access, parking and storage for 23 weeks.</p> <p>Knebworth Park Estate,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 09.02.2021</p> <p>We have no objections to the plans as proposed in this application providing sufficient safeguards are in place to protect both the Jubilee avenue trees and the listed lodges and war memorial from damage and that any harm to the fabric of the parkland be remediated on completion of the film use. We note that the position of the parking area as shown in Figure 2.2. in the supporting reports appears to be in the middle of the</p>



				Knebworth Park, Old Knebworth, Hertfordshire, SG3 6PY. MISCELLANEOUS	avenue which frames the Lutyens view towards the monument. This does not accord with the parking area indicated on the the Proposed Plans, where it is to one side of this important view. We would not support a parking area situated in the Lutyens view and suspect that this is just a mistake in Figure 2.2 Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Northaw House	Hertfords hire	E20/1786	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Repair, refurbishment and conversion of Northaw house to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwellings at Oak Cottage, construction of 2 new Gate Lodge dwellings, 4 new dwellings on the East Drive, 3 new dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 new dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 09.02.2021 Thank you for consulting the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust. We have previously objected (6/2019/0217/MAJ)to the substantial harm to be caused to the listed mansion, stable block and locally listed historic landscape by the overdevelopment of this site. The addition of more houses as detailed in this application would seriously harm not only the Northaw House landscape but those of Nyn Park setting and the open approach to Northaw village. The density of housing being proposed for this site is not appropriate for this rural setting within the Green Belt contrary both to the provisions of the NPPF (Chapters 13 and 16) and WHBC's own policies on heritage and Green Belt. The latest Green Belt Review undertaken on behalf of WHBC does not propose new housing developments within Northaw. We object to this current proposal. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Aldenham House	Hertfords hire	E20/1787	II	PLANNING APPLICATION. Construction and operation for 35 years for a grid-connected solar photovoltaic farm with battery storage and other ancillary land north of Butterfly Lane and surrounding Hillfield Far, and west of Hillfield Lane	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 18.2.2021 On behalf of The Gardens Trust and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens works closely with Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, and has authorised HGT to respond to planning issues in Hertfordshire on its behalf. The proposed solar facility would affect the RPG of Aldenham House (Grade II) and the Grade II* buildings within it and its wider agricultural landscape which forms part of the setting of the RPG. The Aldenham RPG also contains the complex moated site of Pennes Place, now a Scheduled Monument. This is situated close to Butterfly Lane,

					<p>adjacent to the main entrance drive to Aldenham House and was a feature of some importance in the design of the RPG.</p> <p>It would also affect Hilfield Castle (Grade II*). In 1799 Humphry Repton was consulted by the owners to lay out a landscape park around the Castle (as detailed in published research by the HGT). Although much of the wider estate has been converted to other uses, there are still remnants of the earlier designed parkland and the wider landscape is still largely agricultural.</p> <p>We have studied the desk-based report on Archaeology included and do not agree with their comments stating that there would be no harm to the significance of Hilfield Castle, Penne's Place and Aldenham Park. We would expect to see a Heritage Impact Statement on the effect on the historic designed landscapes in the area, especially as they include an RPG. This would have demonstrated the adverse impact this solar farm would have on the landscapes themselves and on their settings and thus their significance, contrary to provisions in the NPPF (Chapter 1) and Historic England Guidance (GPA.3.2) the Setting of Heritage Assets.</p> <p>We note that this development does not accord with the provisions of Hertsmere BC Policy SADM29 on Heritage Assets, of Policy SADM10 on Biodiversity (We note that there is also a number of designated wildlife sites within the RPG, near Hilfield and in the wider landscape but no mention of Green Corridors), on Policy SADM14 on Green Belt. We note that Appendix E, Policy SADM24 lists Aldenham House (Haberdasher Aske's Boys School) as a Key site within the Green Belt (although it does not include the whole of the Registered parkland area) as requiring development proposals to take account of them. The evidence advanced in the proposal does not adequately fulfil that requirement.</p> <p>We have serious concerns regarding the heritage assets, both designated and undesignated, and their settings, within the application area.</p> <p>We trust that you will give due weight to the heritage assets and the requirements of the NPPF in determining this application.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Hatch Park	Kent	E20/1495	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The Construction of Additional Retail/Commercial Units (A1/B1/Class E Uses) to the Existing Business Village. Mersham Le Hatch Business</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting the Grade II registered park and garden of Hatch Park, a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge</p>

				Village, Hythe Road, Smeeth, Kent, TN25 6NH. RETAIL, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	<p>informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and the proposal appears to be sympathetic with the existing structure of former farm buildings and stables of Hatch Park, which have been converted into business units. The GT/KGT would support the views of KCC's Heritage Conservation Officer, who suggests that an archaeological field evaluation be carried out, which may determine that further site investigation is required to ensure that any archaeological features are examined and recorded.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Conservation Officer</p>
Swaylands	Kent	E20/1580	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a temporary access road off the B2176 into the curtilage of Drummond Hall, including a temporary compound area. Land West Of Drummond Hall, Penshurst Road, Penshurst, KENT TN11 8DF. MISCELLANEOUS	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>The boundaries of the boroughs of Sevenoaks DC and Tunbridge Wells BC pass through the area affected by the above application. The GT/KGT's response will therefore be sent to both local authorities.</p> <p>The GT/KGT's main concern is that the proposed access route has been chosen to pass within the perimeter tree belt along the western edge of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Swaylands. The various reports submitted with the application state that the 17 trees proposed to be felled are of low quality and are designated as Category C trees in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 Table 1.</p> <p>SAJ Transport Consultants Ltd have produced a report stating in paragraph 3.3 that "the position (of the access road) is largely influenced by the positioning of existing trees within the grounds and to ensure that any potential impact on the trees is minimised".</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7 of this same report refers to the access used for previous works at Swaylands and Drummond Hall which cannot be used for access this time because of a refuse store located on the original access route. It is GT/KGT contention that in order "that any potential impact on the trees is minimised" this previous access should be reconsidered, as it obviates the need to remove 14 trees and protect many others along the current proposed access and will not harm the setting of the perimeter tree belt. This alternative access could pass between the garage block and Drummond Hall and extend southwesterly to the construction compound</p>

					<p>passing to the west of Tree No T64 without requiring significant tree protection or tree removal along its route. Figure 12 found in the Heritage Statement shows the absence of trees along this alternative route.</p> <p>GT/KGT consider that to specify a 5m wide access road and a 30m by 40m compound when the contractor for the work has not yet been chosen may be excessive. Previous and current works on the site have been accommodated using the current access roads within the property. The proposed compound includes the removal of three cherry trees, T344-346, surely the compound boundary could be realigned around these trees to avoid their removal?</p> <p>We trust that you will take our comments into consideration where we have suggested alternative measures to reduce the impact on this Grade II Registered Park and Garden during the remedial works to Drummond House.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Conservation Officer</p>
Lullingstone Castle	Kent	E20/1604	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of polytunnels with associated landscaping and drainage works and ecological enhancements. Land South West Of Partridge Cottages, Lullingstone Lane, Eynsford, KENT. Charlotte Van De Wydeven</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have read the online documentation and do not object to this application. We suggest however, that similar conditions are imposed as for the previous application for polytunnels on the farm (SE/14/02932), where the use of the polytunnels is limited to 9 months of the year. This will ensure that they will be less intrusive during the winter months where the tree screening to Lullingstone Castle grounds is not in leaf.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Conservation Officer</p>
Miller Park, Avenham Park	Lancashire	E20/1525	II* II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION WORKS ASSOCIATED WITH AREAS 1 AND 2 OF THE PRESTON AND SOUTH RIBBLE FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT SCHEME CONSISTING OF NEW AND REPLACEMENT FLOOD DEFENCES ALONG THE NORTH AND SOUTH</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.02.2021</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. 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>BANKS OF THE RIVER RIBBLE AND OTHER ANCILLARY FLOOD WORKS, INCLUDING: LAND REPROFILING, LANDSCAPING AND HABITAT CREATION, WORKS TO TIE-IN TO THE GRADE II LISTED PENWORTHAM OLD BRIDGE AND RAILWAY VIADUCT OVER RIVER RIBBLE, A TEMPORARY REMOTE CONSTRUCTION COMPOUND AND TEMPORARY SITE ACCESS. BROADGATE, RIVERSIDE AND RIVERSIDE ROAD PRESTON. DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF</p>	<p>This application involves works within Area 1C located immediately adjacent to the western entrance to Miller Park, Preston, a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG), laid out to the design of Edward Milner after 1860. Subject to the following comments and reservations we do not object to the principle of the application and support the Flood Risk Management objectives.</p> <p>We have reviewed the planning documents submitted for the application and note that there is a comprehensive heritage statement supporting the application. The works within Area 1C comprise concrete flood walls and two flood gates, all located within the enlarged Avenham Conservation Area. The northern floodgate is located within the western spur of the designated area of the RPG as described within the Heritage Statement. We note that Historic England in their response to this application gave the opinion that the impact of the works would be negligible to the significance of Miller Park. Indeed, the relocation of the Council depot boundary to the west will confer some potential improvement to the visual appearance of the area, despite being located partly beneath the very dominant railway viaduct.</p> <p>Our concern is that there is an inconsistency in the treatment of the flood walls in the Conservation Area, indicated as concrete on the General Arrangement Drawing of Area 1C. The Landscape Vision Document at Section 2 indicates in the Design Strategy Table that concrete floodwalls are intended for use outside Conservation Areas. This suggests that within the Conservation Areas there should be more sympathetic treatment with more appropriate natural materials. As the new walls will abut stone viaduct abutments a natural stone facing for walls and copings within the conservation area should be used. We recommend this amendment to the proposals.</p> <p>The western side of the railway embankment is faced with massive rockwork, as mentioned within the listing description. This feature is repeated within Miller Park on the east side of the WCML embankment, where there is a very extensive area of rockwork cliffs, tunnel and grottoes. These features are a contemporary with Milner's work and were probably the work of Pulham and Son of Broxbourne. At the location of the northern floodgate these rockwork features may exist under a curtain of long-established ivy and this needs investigation prior to any construction work commencing. Extreme care will be required to avoid disturbance to any such rockwork in this location during the construction of the northern</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>floodgate.</p> <p>A further inconsistency arises in the treatment of the area in front of the flood wall, previously within the Council depot. On the General Arrangement this is indicated as topsoil, but on the Environmental Masterplan Sheet 5 is shown as tarmac. A more appropriate design is required which recognises the sensitivity of this area giving access to the Grade II* Miller Park and lying within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan Sheet 5 indicates an 'Opportunity to enhance park entrance. Proposals to be agreed with PCC and landowner'.</p> <p>We look forward to this dialogue securing an improvement to this area beneath the viaduct, to be coordinated with the redesign west of the viaduct described above.</p> <p>We look forward to seeing this project and designs develop taking forward the suggestions and comments made in this response.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this response, please contact LGT on <a href="mailto:conservation@lancsgt.org.uk">conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</a></p> <p>Yours faithfully Chair, Conservation &amp; Planning Group</p>
Nevill Holt	Leicestershire	E20/1496	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a ha-ha (revised scheme of 20/00710/FUL). Nevill Holt Hall, Paddock Lane, Nevill Holt, Leicestershire. BOUNDARY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to the revised scheme for proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation supplied and have nothing further to add to our original comment of 10th June 2020.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Raynham Park	Norfolk	E20/0711	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of agricultural field and woodland to camping site for use by 10 yurts (retrospective); installation of associated raised yurt platform bases (retrospective); erection of a covered seating, wash-up and refuse storage area, shower block and two toilet blocks; installation of underground drainage tanks;</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE CGT COMMENT 17.02.2021</p> <p>Ref : PF/20/1384 - Change of use of agricultural field and woodland to camping site for use by 10 yurts (retrospective); installation of associated raised yurt platform bases (retrospective); construction of access track (retrospective), erection of a covered seating, wash-up and refuse storage area, shower block, two toilet blocks, firepit, water treatment plant, associated car parking and landscaping [Revised Description and Plans]; Land West Of Walled Garden, Raynham Hall, Raynham</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the revised plans for the proposed camping site, associated facilities and landscaping at Raynham Hall, a Grade II listed Registered Park</p>

				<p>construction of access track and 11-space car park; construction of 1.2 metre high earth bund; creation of fire pit, and associated landscaping. Land west of Walled Garden, Raynham Hall, Raynham.</p>	<p>and Garden (List entry 1001015). We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The consensus of comments received in 2020 on the initial planning application was that the change of use and proposed development were basically acceptable, but that the proposed landscaping would be crucial to mitigating the visual and heritage impact of the development.</p> <p>The new planting is broadly in line with that shown on the 1886 OS map in terms of position of trees and choice of species, reflecting its parkland past. It will extend to the west of the site and help to assimilate it into the wider setting, as well as linking with the existing belts of woodland immediately north, west and south of the walled garden.</p> <p>We further note that the biodiversity of a former field site will be enhanced by the establishment of wood pasture and meadows and the choice of mainly native and naturalised species will build resilience to climate change. Overall, the site will benefit from some 160 native standard trees and six semi-mature natives planted at 10-20m distance to achieve a parkland landscape, and some 500 woodland ‘whips’ planted to form a series of low level copses.</p> <p>We have carefully examined the plan for restoration of parkland and the landscape specification submitted in January 2021 and conclude that the proposed landscaping will have an overall beneficial impact by restoring an arable field to parkland, as well as effectively screening the yurts and new facilities.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Blickling Hall	Norfolk	E20/1568	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 1. Retention of a five bar timber gate set into the existing vehicular entrance to the walled garden. 2. Retention of steel drop down bollards set into tarmac roadways in two locations: The entrance to the car park to the Buckinghamshire Arms Public House and on Church Walk to the East side of Blickling Hall. 3. Installation of 2 additional steel</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021</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. We have considered the online documentation and are familiar with the site. This retrospective application is for the erection of a wooden shed in the visitor car park serving Blickling Hall. It is required temporarily to facilitate dealing with visitors during the Covid pandemic. The car park has an open character, with visitor facilities in buildings in one corner. It is separated from the walled garden and grounds. The shed is best described</p>

				drop down bollards into the tarmac roadway known as Park Gates to the West of the main visitor car park. Blickling Hall, Blickling Road, Blickling, NR11 6NF. ACCESS/GATES	as functional. Permanent additional buildings of this type would not be appropriate. However, in the circumstances there is no objection to the retention of the building for the temporary period as proposed. Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Blickling Hall	Norfolk	E20/1569	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of a Timber shed erected in the visitor car park to act as temporary Visitor Welcome Base during the Covid-19 Pandemic. The shed is to be retained for a period of 12 months. Blickling Hall Blickling Road, Blickling, NR11 6NF. VISITOR FACILITIES	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021 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. We have considered the online documentation and are familiar with the site. This retrospective application is for the erection of a wooden shed in the visitor car park serving Blickling Hall. It is required temporarily to facilitate dealing with visitors during the Covid pandemic. The car park has an open character, with visitor facilities in buildings in one corner. It is separated from the walled garden and grounds. The shed is best described as functional. Permanent additional buildings of this type would not be appropriate. However, in the circumstances there is no objection to the retention of the building for the temporary period as proposed. Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Great Harrowden Hall	Northamptonshire	E20/1548	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for the construction of 3 x buttresses constructed with a reinforced central column dressed with matching brickwork. General wall repairs undertaken using matching bricks and materials all with traditional lime mortar. Replacement of wall copings with reconstituted stone, colour matched to be in keeping with the extant (original) copings (iron stone). Harrowden Hall, 1 The Slips, Great Harrowden,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2021 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 Northamptonshire 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 From a practical perspective there is an understanding that ironstone is not the best choice of a coping material as is evidenced by the extensive survey undertaken. As is reported the coping is "not performing as designed due to the spalling and delamination of the iron stone copings, mortar bed and joints failure due to age" (Survey undertaken by Andy Mills MCI0B) It is porous and allows for deleterious damp to seep in over time. Limestone of course would be preferred but there is a degree of sympathy



				Wellingborough, Northamptonshire, NN9 5AD. REPAIR/RESTORATION	<p>with the extent of the damage and size of the area of wall (being over 80 metres long) that urgently needs repairing. In these difficult times with many challenges to follow, economic considerations cannot be ignored. It could be contested that if the expense of limestone cannot be met then this will lead to increased deterioration through stalling resulting in the further disintegration of this rare Eighteenth-Century walled garden which is one of the best examples in the country.</p> <p>We are relieved that there is a serious intention to restore the wall and are pleased to note the salvaging of materials that cannot be used on that wall to be used for the other walls of the Hall gardens.</p> <p>On balance the NGT has no objection to the Haddonstone twice weathered coping proposed and trust that it will, as stated, match the colour to ensure that the wall will be restored in sympathy with the original construction and materials.</p> <p>on behalf of Northamptonshire Gardens Trust</p>
Alnwick Castle	Northumb erland	E20/1534	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) pursuant to planning application 18/00079/FUL to allow material changes to the design. The Treehouse, The Alnwick Garden, Denwick Lane, Alnwick, Northumberland. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The NGT objected to the original application on our behalf, (18/00079/FUL) and their letter outlined the significance of the eastern pleasure grounds (see attached). We continue to think that inserting a play village in such a sensitive part of the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) is a retrograde step and does nothing to enhance this irreplaceable heritage asset. We therefore disagree with the statement (Design and Access Statement (D&amp;A) p14) that the changes can be described as 'enhancing the registered park and garden and the setting of the heritage assets including the castle as well as the understanding of the history of the landscape by providing inclusive access.' In our opinion, the already extensive access for visitors affords more than sufficient opportunity to understand the history of the landscape; additional parking and development will, if anything, make the landscape harder to read. We also would draw attention to the disingenuous statement on p25 of the D&amp;A 'The proposals enhance the wider setting of the heritage asset by improving the existing scrubland and spoil mounds present on the site which are incompatible with the rest of the carefully designed landscape.' We would question the compatibility of</p>

					<p>acres of parking and an Elfic village with an historic designed landscape. We note that Appendix A mentioned in the D&amp;A does not appear to be included within the documentation.</p> <p>The GT/NGT continue to have grave doubts about this application, and the inevitable permanent damage this will cause to one of England's most important landscapes. We do not agree that this is outweighed by public benefit as the site has already undergone huge development and is now a tourist attraction bringing as many visitors as the local infrastructure can easily bear.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens	North Yorkshire	E20/1511	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of former educational building to 32.no residential apartments, demolition of former ceramics workshop, erection of a 3 storey block of 18.no apartments, and associated parking and landscaping.</p> <p>Yorkshire Coast College, Westwood Annexe, Valley Bridge Parade, Scarborough, North Yorkshire YO11 2PL. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens at Scarborough which are registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Coast College, Westwood Annexe is situated immediately above and to the north west of the Valley Gardens part of the wider registered and significant historic park and garden. Both the existing college building, and the proposed three storey block of apartments to its south west, overlook the Valley Gardens. The boundary of the site is clearly defined and the existing trees there break the views north west across the valley to the existing and proposed buildings. The site is within the Scarborough Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Westwood Annexe is a special building and the proposal should secure its future in a manner compatible with the heritage assets. We do have some reservations about the new building which is a three storeys high block and quite close to the gardens but is at a little distance from the Westwood Annexe.</p> <p>We have the following additional comments:</p> <p>We have not seen a landscaping plan for this development although we note the Arboricultural Impact Assessment. This states at 5.3 the removal of eight individual trees, one entire group of trees and part of another group. Tree and shrub planting would assist with mitigating the tree losses</p>

					<p>required.</p> <p>We request that a landscaping plan is drawn up and implemented with a maintenance schedule to ensure that the development and its continued maintenance is sympathetic to the heritage assets of the area, augments the green space, be aesthetically pleasing and a mitigating factor in climate change.</p> <p>We note that the car parking provision appears to be fourteen spaces for the new apartment block and a total of thirty- four spaces for the existing building. We trust that this will be adequate with additional visitor parking, although we note the close proximity of bus stops and the rail station. We suggest that there are electric charging points and that the surface treatment of the car parks makes them permeable.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make and defer to the expert conservation advice of your Authority.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust 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 in the determination.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Newby Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/1524	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of two new picnic canopies each 7.5m in width and 20m in length which will extend 3m high. Newby Hall, Newby, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 5AE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2021</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 – Newby 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>The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Newby Hall encompasses the five main areas typical of an historic designed landscape and garden viz. Principal Building, Gardens, Pleasure Grounds, Park and Walled Kitchen Gardens. At Newby, the Hall (listed grade I) dates from the end of the 17th Century and the park probably also has 17th Century origins. There is a 1707 Knyff and Kip view. It is thought that the designed landscape and gardens at Newby Hall were laid out in the late 18th Century to a partially executed design by the notable landscape improver, Thomas White (1736-1811). The significant flower gardens are from the 20th Century and include a late 19th Century rock garden. The kitchen gardens also have</p>

					<p>origins in the 18th Century and are shown on the White plan.</p> <p>The proposal is for two picnic canopies made of high tenacity Polyester Interlock fabric that is waterproof-treated. They will be 4m high at the highest point and one is proposed to be located in the walled kitchen gardens near the tea rooms and the other in the parkland north of the walled kitchen gardens and in close proximity to the car parking. They will be in place between 1st March and the end of October and then taken down for winter storage. We have been unable to find any information regarding the colour of the canopies or the surfacing that we presume will be needed for access.</p> <p>Due to the present pandemic, overall, we sympathise with the proposal for canopies to facilitate outdoor refreshments and activities to take place and consider that they will cause less than substantial harm to the heritage assets. We note at 5.24 in the Planning Design and Heritage Statement that it mentions 'three of the proposed canopies located within the registered area and therefore within its setting'. We are unaware of a third. And at 5.26 '... summary has been provided below in relation to the Park only, given that the proposed development is located within and on the edge of the Park and not within close proximity to the Garden.' This is not quite accurate as only one of the canopies is as far as we are aware, proposed for the park, and the other is proposed for the Walled Kitchen Gardens. Although the proposed picnic canopies will cause less than substantial harm to the RPG, it will inevitably be an additional change to the historic asset. We advise that the determination of the planning application looks at the following:</p> <p>The colour of the fabric - particularly because of the massing of the canopies which are large and 4m high at the highest point, the colour should be a 'quiet' colour that does not attract the eye and impacts the environment as little as possible.</p> <p>The access to and surfacing within the canopies is carefully considered. That if possible, the application for picnic canopies can be temporary and that the canopies can be removed in the future when we hope the situation improves.</p> <p>[You probably know that there was a fashion for tents in the 18th Century designed landscape and at eg Painshill in Surrey, Charles Hamilton developed a natural and picturesque landscape including a Turkish Tent, but that was a very different design to that proposed here for Newby Hall.]</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours sincerely, Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E20/1547	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Consultation on planning application for the purposes of the Variation of conditions 1,6, 7, 10, 14, 20, 24, 26, 27, 30 of planning permission C1/14/00747/CM which relates to site access arrangements at Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, Richmond, DL10 6NJ on land at Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, DL10 6NJ. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Middleton Lodge 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. Middleton Lodge was designed by John Carr of York and built between 1777 and 1780 with the grounds being laid out at a similar time. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and walled kitchen garden. This application for the purposes of the Variation of Conditions of the planning permission C1/14/00747/CM, is connected with the extraction of stone and associated works, from an area of the RPG largely to the north of Middleton Lodge. We understand that this proposal should reduce the time-scale for the quarrying operations and preparation, prior to the Tom Stuart-Smith designed new quarry garden being implemented. We have no comments to make. Yours sincerely, Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Moreby Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0234	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed building consent for conversion and extension of former garage. Moreby Hall, Moreby, Stillingfleet. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2021 Thank you for re- consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regards to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens – in this case Moreby Hall registered grade II with the house listed 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. YGT has liaised with the GT and is authorised by the GT to respond to this re-consultation. On file you will have our responses to the original application documents (our response dated 19th June 2020) and to the amended plans (our response dated 11th September) and we would be grateful if you could please add these comments to those earlier responses. Although this latest design is smaller, more modest and pays more heed to the garage structure, we remain rather concerned about the principle of

					<p>making the garage into a dwelling with all the domestic infrastructure that will entail and other issues such as lighting. The garage, listed grade II, lies in close proximity to the grade II* listed Moreby Hall and is highly visible on the approach to the Hall from the current access point as well as along the public road and from within the parkland. We consider that the design and domestic infrastructure to make the garage into a dwelling will be at odds with the design and setting of this significant country house by renowned architect Anthony Salvin (1799-1881). He designed it shortly after he had gone to live in London where he worked for many years with his brother-in-law the significant landscape gardener William Andrews Nesfield, and the architects John L Pearson and R Norman Shaw.</p> <p>We are also concerned that in the future there may be pressure for incremental and inappropriate changes to enlarge the garage/dwelling. We have no further comments except to write that we defer to the expertise of your Authority's Conservation Officer and request that if permission is granted that Selby DC removes permitted development rights, so that future residents would need planning permission for those changes that usually fall under permitted development rights.</p> <p>Yorkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Broughton Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/1598	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to holiday accommodation, construction of side conservatory, and other alterations. The Manse, Church Lane, Broughton, Skipton, BD23 3AE. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Broughton Hall is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Manse, listed grade II, is situated immediately to the west of the registered park and garden (RPG) boundary across Church Lane, with the eastern elevation facing towards the home farm complex and the walled garden. The conservatory is proposed to project from The Manse's south elevation.</p> <p>Looking at the 1st edition OS map there appears to have been a lean-to glasshouse on the south elevation of The Manse in the mid- 19th Century. This is likely to have been for growing tender fruit and vegetables under glass. It is not in evidence on later OS maps. The proposed new conservatory involves the loss of some historic fabric in making the access</p>

					<p>from the kitchen by constructing a new doorway. However, this is minimal. The conservatory is of glass and timber on a stone base. We have not seen any notes about the type of timber, its finish, the openings for ventilation which we consider will be necessary for a south-facing structure, or the type and finish of the guttering and rain water goods. As The Manse is a listed building, immediately beyond the western boundary of the RPG and part of the historic Broughton Estate we consider that the conservatory detailing is important and advise the following:</p> <p>The stone-work should be similar to that of the south elevation. The timber should either be a treated natural finish or painted with linseed-oil based paint of a sympathetic colour that sits 'quietly' with the building. The rain water goods should match those of the historic house.</p> <p>We have not noted any information regarding vehicle parking but trust that there is sufficient in the Front Forecourt (east side). However, we understand that the surface of the Front Forecourt is very worn and we suggest that the opportunity is taken to implement a simple and sympathetic landscape design with bound gravel for vehicle movements and parking and some shrub and/or herbaceous planting. This would form a pleasing and welcoming area for visitors.</p> <p>We have no comments to make on the internal changes to The Manse itself.</p> <p>Yorkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1610	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Consultation on Submission of Addendum Estates Gates Report to fulfil completion of works required in Schedule 2 Part 3 of Section 106 Agreement for permission C6/500/63/Q/CMA on land at Allerton Waste Recovery Park, Allerton Park Quarry, Knaresborough, HG5 OSD</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.02.2021</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. As you will know 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 have noted the Essential Landscape Works Covenants, Estate Gates</p>

					and Railings report. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust had hoped for a full restoration but we have read and support the comments from John Wainwright, Principal Landscape Architect, Heritage Services at NYCC. We have no further comments to make. Yorkshire Gardens Trust
Montacute House	Somerset	E20/1561	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a new pavilion, re-submission of 18/04084/FUL. Montacute Recreation Ground, Montacute Road, Montacute, Yeovil, Somerset. GR:349509/117292) SPORT/LEISURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have read the online documentation, and despite the involvement of the NT are very surprised to see that none of the reports even makes a passing reference to the fact that the application site lies within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Montacute. Although the current application is an improvement on the previous, withdrawn application, we would like to see at least some consideration for the historic impact of the proposals. In our opinion, a landscape scheme is required to help integrate the proposals into the local landscape. Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Brodsworth Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/1529	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for restoration of Eyecatcher. Brodsworth Hall, Brodsworth Estate Road, Brodsworth, Doncaster. REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Brodsworth Hall, which is registered grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The Eyecatcher – listed grade II – is situated above the former quarry, elevated high above the Target Range. The Target Range, with the Grove, is c160m long and truncated at the north end by the Target House or Archery Pavilion (listed grade II). The recent planning application (20/03277/LBC) that we supported was for repairs to the Target House. The Eyecatcher is the focal point at the opposite end of The Grove and consists of an earth mound and limestone façade with sandstone copings. The façade has a blind doorway and windows. It was constructed in c.1866 of reclaimed



					<p>masonry from the Old Hall (demolished 1861).  The Eyecatcher is of is of high architectural value, and of very high significance in terms of group value with the Garden Temple (listed grade II) – also in an elevated position - and the Target House.  We agree that the architectural significance will be enhanced by the proposed works, reinstating missing elements of the building. Its enhanced visibility will add to the visitor’s experience  The gardens at Brodsworth Hall are not only important as the setting of the Hall but are a significant example of Victorian design and horticulture and are much-visited and enjoyed by the public. We support the careful restoration of the Eyecatcher.  Yours sincerely,  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Walsall Arboretum	Staffordshire	E20/1617	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  DETAILED PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL COTTAGES AT NO. 55 AND 56 LICHFIELD STREET (INCORPORATED INTO D1 USE) TO FACILITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TEACHING ACCOMMODATION BLOCK AND THE INTERNAL REMODEL OF NO 57 LICHFIELD STREET (FODEN HOUSE) AS WELL AS ASSOCIATED SITE AND LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS. QUEEN MARYS HIGH SCHOOL, UPPER FORSTER STREET, WALSALL, WS4 2AE. EDUCATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2021  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.  St Mary’s School has given considerable thought as to how to extend the school facilities within their confined site. It is a pity that Nos 55-56 Lichfield Street need to be demolished, but having read the options appraisal, the logic behind their choice is apparent. The CGI images are helpful showing how the new building would fit into the streetscape and we are glad to note that the building is no higher than neighbouring Foden House. We would have liked to have seen a CGI image of how the new building would look from Hatherton Lake, as it stands at an important focal point, only partially blocked by one tree. Should this mature tree fail, the new build would become very exposed from this important view within the Grade II registered park and garden of Walsall Arboretum. Perhaps the school might consider approaching the Arboretum to plant a strategically placed replacement tree to take over once the existing lime (?) reaches the end of its life? This would have the benefit of partially disguising the façade of the new building whilst being far enough away not to block light from the classrooms. We appreciate that care has been taken to echo the glazing treatment of neighbouring Foden House. The colour of bricks chosen seem to have a far more orange tint that the adjacent houses (although this may be due to the effects of the CGI) and we would prefer to see a closer match.</p>

					<p>The GT has considered the information provided in support of the application and on the basis of this, confirm we do not wish to comment on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Hampton Court	Surrey	E18/1384	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Development to provide 97 dwelling units, a hotel (84 bedrooms) and retail units (within use classes A1, A2 and/or A3) together with access, station interchange, car parking, servicing, new public realm, landscaping and other associated works following demolition of some existing buildings and structures on site including Hampton Court Motors. Jolly Boatman and Hampton Court Station Redevelopment Area, Hampton Court Way, East Molesey, Surrey KT8 9AE. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONMSE 22.01.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has checked on progress with the above application as it is now nearly 2 years since the GT originally objected in February 2019. Environment Agency issues seem to have delayed the decision-making process. In reviewing the case we make the following three additional comments and requests for further information.</p> <p>1. In comparing this application with the 2008 application, this revised application is taller than the original as now only one of the two parking levels is underground. The VIA accompanying some assessments of key views from the Palace grounds is only a wire frame one which is inadequate and taken in summer. We request that the applicant provide full photo montages of views 2-5 in both winter and summer and from the upper rooms of the Palace, particularly from the Kings Apartments on the first floor of the Wren block, overlooking the Privy Garden and sunken garden, and also from the Banqueting House, the views from which elevate the viewer over hedges and undergrowth and give a clearer line of sight from one of the most significant rooms : murals and ceiling by Verrio (<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yy_yVm_tyjE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yy_yVm_tyjE</a>) which is at the heart of the Grade I landscape as a garden building, as none have been provided. This we believe will present a more realistic demonstration of the impact and the consequent damage to the setting and views of the Palace and grounds.</p> <p>2. The Arboricultural Report was written in December 2018, now over two years ago. It states that even then 'a number of' horse chestnuts were affected by Horse Chestnut Leaf miner (para 2.6) and one by bleeding canker (Para 2.7). The canker in particular is infectious and can seriously damage trees, leading to their removal which is especially likely for health and safety reasons in this public park. It is likely that this has spread since the report was published, and the loss of any mature trees will increase visibility of the application site from the Registered Park and Garden and seriously damage the impact upon the setting and significance. We request updated information on the state of the trees and their likely longevity in</p>

					<p>view of their crucial role in partial screening (albeit inadequately to achieve full screening).</p> <p>3. In the period since our response in 2019 we have become aware of the South Western Railway Act of 1913 which prohibits the erection of any building on the property of the railway owner (i.e. Network Rail) which exceeds the height of fifty feet within half a mile of Hampton Court Palace without the approval of the DCMS. While this is a material consideration in its own right in assessing the building height, this is also relevant with regard to the setting of the Palace and its grounds in indicating the high significance it has been accorded for over 100 years.</p> <p>We would be grateful if your officers were able to request this information and images as it will be necessary for them to gain an up-to-date assessment of the harm when deciding this information.</p> <p>The GT continues to strongly object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Ashstead Park	Surrey	E20/1689	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Vehicle crossover to access land to the rear of the property. Arlington, Rookery Hill, Ashtead, Surrey, KT21 1EG ROAD</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.02.2021</p> <p>The following comments are submitted on behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust a member of the Gardens Trust which is the statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>The site of the proposed works is within the Register area of Ashtead Park located at its western extremity within an extensive wooded setting. The applicant has not submitted any supporting Planning, Design or Heritage statements (NPPF para. 189). In this case a proportionate level of detail would not be onerous. Indeed, it might help to explain the need for this development. Given the wooded character of the site and its surroundings a tree survey would also seem necessary.</p> <p>This part of the Register site seems from the 19th and 20th century Ordnance Survey maps to have been lightly wooded and marks the western boundary of the extensive historic estate. It presents a lengthy wooded frontage to the main Epsom Road. The curtilage of Arlington is unusual in extending from Rookery Hill to the Epsom Road, and the wooded area has already been opened up for incidental residential uses. The proposed access from Epsom Road will further extend this open break and separate the woodland to the southwest from the main block fronting the road to the northeast. Given the history and character of this part of the Register site this would be regrettable but less than substantial harm to the significance of Ashtead Park. If the new access were to be acceptable</p>

					on other grounds then the visual impact should be mediated with new planting especially along the Epsom Road curtilage boundary. Surrey Gardens Trust
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E20/1681	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a general purpose farm building for agricultural and forestry use. Spring Bank Cottage, The Avenue, Wynyard. BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and although there is a Heritage Statement (HS) it contains no empirical evidence as to how visible the proposed farm building will be from key spots within the Grade II* registered Park & Garden of Wynyard Park, in particular from at least one critical viewpoint – the view from the Hall terrace. There may be others in the cone of visibility, roughly ESE – SSE from the barn? Higher parts of the south western parkland and the eastern parkland/Wellington Monument areas may also have a view if the site can be seen from the hall. If it can be seen from the Hall terrace, and a simple photograph could show this, then despite it being some distance away and dark coloured against trees, we would suggest it will form a prominent backdrop to views along the Brierley Beck valley, and thus be detrimental to the character of the RPG. If it is visible, we would suggest a far more substantial 10m tree belt be planted on the S and E sides of the barn, which would give total reassurance that there can be no intrusion, especially as other possible parkland views have not been assessed. If it cannot be seen, and we appreciate foreground trees may play a part here, then the photograph will demonstrate that and we shall all be relieved. In the absence of any assessment at all, we are placing a holding objection until receipt of further information that may disprove our own observations, or we receive the applicant's agreement to provide total screening with a thick tree belt on the two exposed sides (S+E). Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer
Gibside	Tyne and Wear	E20/1605	I	PLANNING APPLICATION New gravel path between the walled garden and the Grand Walk. Gibside, Hillhead Lane, Gibside,	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.02.2021 The Northumbria Gardens Trust notified us of the above application affecting the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) at Gibside. We are surprised that your planning department failed to notify the Gardens Trust (GT) as we are statutory consultees for all grades of RPGs listed by Historic

				<p>Whickham NE16 6BG. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet which sets out guidance for local authorities in such instances.</p> <p>We fully support the proposed conservation repairs to one of the doorways in the southern wall of the walled Garden.</p> <p>We do however, have some reservations about the proposed installation of a new hard surfaced pathway along the whole of the southern wall, and offer the following suggestions for your consideration.</p> <p>We appreciate that the greatly increased visitor numbers to Gibside and the use of the site year-round means that in some areas, where foot traffic is concentrated, grass surfaces are not coping with the traffic. Hard surfaced pathways would help to alleviate the problem, particularly in the winter months. We would however encourage the Trust not to go down that route until all other possible options have been considered and to aim to continue with grassland wherever possible. In our opinion, it would be preferable to present the site to visitors, as far as possible, as it was when it was a private garden, rather than making it more like an urban park, with all hard surfaces to the paths.</p> <p>We are not aware of any historical precedent for a hard path in the location proposed. A hard surface here will directly affect the setting of the Listed walled garden walls, and also, to a lesser degree, the wider setting of the Grade 1 Listed Chapel and the Chaplain's Cottage.</p> <p>We would ask that the Trust give full consideration to grassland reinforcement techniques along the corridor proposed for alternative routing to the avenue in winter, before providing a new hard surfaced path alongside the walled garden. Given the proposed location, along the foot of the avenue north slope, it might also require improving localised land drainage.</p> <p>It may be that this approach has already been fully considered, and if this is the case, we would encourage a combination of the proposed hard surfaced path with a wider corridor of reinforced grass. Particularly when the site is busy, visitors are unlikely to stick strictly to the hard surface, and the result may be compaction and creeping wear parallel with the surfaced path.</p> <p>If a surfaced path is felt to be the only practical option we would ask that consideration is given to making some distinction between the paths which were historically hard surfaces and modern paths, perhaps by surface colour, to accommodate the much heavier volume of visitors now using</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>the site. This approach would help visitors to appreciate the evolution of the site by seeing a visual indication of which paths were there historically (eg. from the Chapel Cottage up to the Chapel) and which are pragmatic modern additions.</p> <p>Consideration might also be given to an alternative to the proposed Breedon Golden Amber gravel which, although eminently suitable for surfaces which were historically gravel surfaced, will be quite bright, at least until it muddies down. A darker material, such as whinstone dust, would perhaps be less visually striking. Bark chip would read as a “temporary” path – as used initially to service the playground area to the south of the chapel – but would of course require regular maintenance. The authority might consider asking for a trial of various surfaces, given the sensitivity of the location?</p> <p>We appreciate that the proposals form part of the welcome conservation works undertaken recently with great success to conserve the structures associated with the traditional walled garden at Gibside. We have been greatly encouraged by its conservation and restoration to the historic layout. It is a model for the region, where so many walled garden sites have been lost to redevelopment or modern reinterpretation.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2021 Thank you for getting back to me about our response to the above application.</p> <p>We appreciate that a clear-cut response one way or another is obviously easier for you. We are not keen on the gravel path unless other options have been considered and rejected with the reasoning being made clear, and this should have been part of the application. We would therefore like to submit a holding objection until the points we raised in our initial letter are addressed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Radway Grange	Warwicks hire	E20/1377	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Demolition of conservatory, erection of extensions and fenestration changes. The Grange	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire</p>

				Stables, Tysoe Road, Radway, CV35 0UE. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation provided by the applicant and our main concerns are with light emittance from the new extensive glazed structure and how this impacts upon the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Radway. The Grange Stables and the proposed extension are visible from the upper storey of Grade II* Radway Grange as well as from public footpaths and the Grade II* Castle at Edgehill which is a wedding venue with B&amp;B rooms. We consider that this linking structure is preferable to the existing conservatories and that their demolition is to be welcomed. Should your officers approve this application we would ask that the glass chosen minimises light spillage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, GT Conservation Officer</p>
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E20/1479	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building application for Installation of blinds to Tudor Wing and the Georgian Library on the First Floor. Temple Newsam House, Temple Newsam Road, Halton. MISCELLANEOUS	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Temple Newsam registered grade II with the house listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The application is for blinds in two rooms where blinds are not installed and where lux levels are damaging objects in the rooms and the interior. We support this proposal and are pleased that the design of the blinds specified in the Planning Statement and Heritage Statement for an inner vision blind with a perforated fabric allows people to see through the blind to the landscape. We think this is admirable, so our thanks for this; visitors will now be able to enjoy the views out into the landscape as historically would have been the case for family and visitors alike.</p> <p>Although not relevant to this planning application we would just like to mention our concerns regarding the future of East Lodge at Temple Newsam, which we understand is being considered for sale by Leeds CC or indeed may have already been sold. East Lodge is one of the pair of brick lodges listed grade II, with an 18th C brick wall also listed grade II which forms part of the boundary of the registered park and garden. Temple Newsam House and the assemblage of other listed buildings within the designed landscape setting are important national heritage assets and are</p>

					<p>well-loved and well-used not only by the wider Leeds community but by visitors from across the country. Selling part of the Temple Newsam estate such as East Lodge has the potential to lead to further fragmentation, new private owners are likely to have issues about noise during the financially successful events at Temple Newsam, there may be pressure to sell the other lodge and planning applications for changes that would have a detrimental effect on the heritage assets.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Heath Hall	West Yorkshire	E20/1550	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed reinstatement of the carriageway at Sycamore House and on the common. Sycamore House , Heath, Wakefield. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.02.2021</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 (RPG). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The gardens of Sycamore House at Heath are not on the RPG. Sycamore House is a grade II listed building and situated in the historic village of Heath; a conservation area.</p> <p>In 2018 the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust commented with no objection to the proposed reinstatement of a horseshoe-shaped drive in front of the house as shown on early 20th Century OS maps; the previous applications 18/02687/FUL; 18/02688/LBC. But we understand that these applications were withdrawn. We now understand that the access to Sycamore House will require encroachment across common land currently leased to Wakefield Council. We also note that the proposal will require the removal of existing trees and vegetation and parking spaces (shown on the Access Statement but with amendments 14.10.19) in the front garden.</p> <p>We have been unable to visit the site and defer to the expert advice of your Authority's Conservation Officer, Arboricultural Officer and Countryside Officer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>