



### CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES MARCH 2021

The GT conservation team received 244 new cases for England and two for Wales 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, 68 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Page Park	Avon	E20/1720	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 4 no dwellings approval of reserved matters to include appearance and landscaping (to be read in conjunction with PK18/5362/O). 87 Hill House Road, Mangotsfield RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting a building site, which is opposite Page Park, a municipal park recorded in the Avon Gardens Trust Gazetteer for South Gloucestershire. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The significance to this application, of Page Park, formerly part of the Hill House estate, given to the public in 1909 by A.W. Page, and laid out over the following few years, is that the surrounding roads are lined with houses of that period. The house next door, no. 85, is an example of the style, materials and scale of the buildings facing on four sides of the park. Page Park contains an elaborate shelter with clock tower in the centre of the park; a hexagonal bandstand; drinking fountain circa 1910, which Avon Gardens Trust recently contributed towards its restoration; fine wrought iron gates, 1913; and a WW1 cenotaph.

					<p>Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that has been provided concerning this application and on the basis of this we consider that the proposal is too high in relation to its neighbours, the glazing does not reflect the character and materials of the surrounding properties. And the repetition of four identical plans and elevations set on this elongated plot will expect too much of the landscaping to cover up the extreme regularity of the current proposal.</p> <p>As it stands, the current proposal contravenes the South Gloucestershire Local Plan. Policy CS1 expects a higher quality of design. And the submitted scheme fails to incorporate 'Local Distinctiveness', as required by Policy PSP1. The proposal fails to display an acknowledgement of the features that prevail locally which respect the massing, scale, proportions, materials and overall character of the street scene, and surrounding area.</p> <p>Summary: Avon Gardens Trust, therefore, objects to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Tracy Park	Avon	E20/1762	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Repairs to listed garden wall and bothy to facilitate the erection of a wedding venue. Park Hotel And Resort Bath Road Wick South Gloucestershire BS30 5RN REPAIR/RESTORATION, BOUNDARY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the curtilage of the Grade II Listed Walled Garden which forms part of Tracy Park, and the wider association of the Green Belt and the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>An earlier application [PK17/2390/F] for the erection of a temporary wedding marquee within the walled garden was approved in April 2018, and the permission is still extant. However, in order to secure the repair of the listed wall and bothy, this new application seeks permission to erect a glazed permanent wedding venue with formal gardens, within the walled garden.</p> <p>The condition of the wall is recorded in 1984 as "Partly demolished at north west and in poor condition" Since that date, a large part of the south east wall has collapsed. It would seem that there is no viable alternative but to allow the permanent venue to be built in return for the restoration of the wall and</p>

					<p>bothy. However, the application is for 31 car parking spaces to be laid out inside the walled garden, with access road from the south east restored entrance. A parking solution away from the walled garden would improve the opportunity to make a memorable garden inside the walls, which would benefit the whole ambience of the venue.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust consider that prior to the commencement of the development a detailed condition survey and schedule and specification of repairs to the walled garden, bothy and fountain should be submitted for approval, before any site work commences.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Sunningdale Park (Civil Service College)	Berkshire	E20/1729	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 5no.dwellings with associated landscaping and parking following the conversion and part demolition of the existing cottages. Gardeners Cottages Silwood Road Sunninghill Ascot BUILDING ALTERATION, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.03.2021</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. Sunningdale Park is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden containing a number of curtilage listed buildings and Northcote House listed at grade II. 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. One of the key activities is to protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. The revised plans for the curtilage listed row of Victorian Gardeners Cottages appear to retain the fabric and character of the garden fronts to the central parts of these buildings. The proposed development after partial demolition and retention of the central section of the terrace maintains the prevalent character of this tucked away part the estate located to the north-east boundary of the site. The frontages to the five proposed market houses overlook parkland but tree belts screen views of the cottages when viewed from it. Additional parking, domestic paraphernalia and boundaries to the front gardens will be detrimental to the landscape but on balance it is considered to be 'less than harmful' to the significance of the Registered Park and Garden overall.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

					Helen Parvin Planning Advisor to the Berkshire Gardens Trust
Ruscombe NDP	Berkshire	E20/1782	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the Ruscombe 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 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.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Parish does some landscapes of historic interest which are listed in the NDP.</p> <p>BGT retains a Depository of sites that have been identified as having potential historic interest. This list includes the grounds at Stanlake Park, part of which lies in Ruscombe. We have yet to research this but we can see that there are surviving features of the parkland shown on the 1882 OS map. It may be worth considering the historic value of this designed landscape for inclusion in the NDP, as well as the listed buildings and Scheduled Monument. The Wokingham Landscape Character Assessment 2019 notes the 'Remnant parkland landscapes with veteran trees and moats' at Stanlake Park as a key characteristic of the area. The historic green spaces and parkland have their own protection through national and local planning policy which we feel should be recognised in the NDP in addition to the listed buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that policies RU3 and RU5 include a reference to the setting of historic assets which often provides protection to the historic landscape setting of these assets. We are also pleased to see that the Local Green Spaces Appendix includes identifying the historic value.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>

					Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI Chair and Planning Advisor for the Berkshire Gardens Trust
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1853	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 130 dwellings, associated access and parking, landscaping and amenity space and the change of land from agriculture to use as sports pitches/recreational open space and informal open space. Land West Of Moreton Road And Castlemilk, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire. MAJOR HYBRID	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.03.2021 Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in regard to the above development. We have looked at the applicant's amended plans and discussed these with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) who are extremely familiar with the Grade I landscape at Stowe. Unfortunately, we were not able to see anything within the amended documents which addresses our original concerns, and would be glad if the applicant could point out anything we may have inadvertently missed. We therefore stand by the points we made in our original response dated 27th April 2020. The LVIA does not in our opinion provide accurate or full coverage of key aspects of views from Stowe, and significant visual harm is likely from more than one key viewpoint with the Grade I RPG, particularly in winter. The site falls within the boundary of the historic setting of Stowe identified in 2009 by Land Use Consultants in their Setting Study for the National Trust and shared with AVDC. This study identified that the Buckingham Avenue is especially vulnerable due to its narrow linearity. The photograph from Viewpoint 10 in the LVIA Addendum, January 2020, conveys no image of the direct view, nor provides any understanding of how much more the new buildings on the site would be visible, particularly in winter. We would again ask for detailed analysis and montages of the visual impact of the development in likely views from the Buckingham Avenue, the environs of the Bourbon Tower and the field south of the New Inn drive before a decision is made. In our opinion, your officers should not approve this application until they can confirm there is no significant damage to the setting of Stowe. The GT/BGT therefore object unless it can be demonstrated adequately that these key vistas are not significantly harmed by the proposal. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E20/1533	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION New Agricultural Building (resubmission of approved application ref: 19/0329/APP). Mentmore Park Farm,	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.03.2021 We have been re-considering the above application and our earlier responses and wish to add further comments. We have been made aware that the applicants propose to increase the height of the building by nearly 1/3, from the permitted 11.7m to approximately 15.5m. This will be far

				Mentmore, Buckinghamshire LU7 OQN. AGRICULTURE	<p>higher than the existing building on the site and even higher than the conveyor.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust are extremely concerned by this and wish to object strongly as it will markedly increase the impact upon the Registered Park and Garden at Mentmore.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung 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 doors, detached part single, part two storey staff accommodation block, associated landscaping and parking provision. Bulstrode, Oxford Road, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8SZ.</p> <p>HOTEL/HOSPITALITY</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 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 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>Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E20/1715	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement garage, cart shed and store. Yeat Furlong Kingswood Lane Wotton Underwood Buckinghamshire HP18 0RL BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and this is a two-storey building and the footprint is larger than the building it replaces. Our concerns relate to its visual effect in the setting of the north drive of the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Grade I Wotton Underwood which passes to the west of the site. We have been unable to visit the site but aerial photographs appear to show the new building will be screened by mature trees in views from the drive as it moves along the 500m stretch south from the Wotton Brook bridge towards Middle Farm.</p> <p>We ask the Council to ensure that this is the case and that the building will remain fully screened from the drive. We would be happy to review photographs of these views from the drive if the Council has any concerns that the building will not be fully screened.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>



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

					<p>where woodland might be planted in compensation, nor the species this would contain. This is of concern as inappropriate planting or location could have an impact on the significance of the designed landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The information submitted does not include the design of the car park e.g. levels, and location of excavated soil; it does not show how it would be integrated with the existing car park, or how the traffic would flow, information which should be part of the application in such a sensitive site. What is the justification for the 150 parking spaces?</li> <li>• Application form, 16: the applicant has answered 'no' to the question "Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character?" Given the location of the car park within designed parkland, an area classified as 'wood pasture' - a BAP priority habitat, surely the answer should be 'yes'?</li> </ul> <p>We would be grateful to be advised if further information is submitted. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grosvenor Park	Cheshire	E20/1854	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of one detached dwelling Redcliffe 9 Lower Park Road Chester Cheshire CH4 7BB RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT RESPONSE 31.03.2021</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which has a material impact on the significance and setting of a number of heritage assets in Chester.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust and its object is "To promote the appropriate action for any or all of the following: the restoration, enhancement, preservation, conservation, protection and understanding of designed landscapes that may exist or have existed in and around the pre-1974 historic county of Cheshire." In furtherance of this objective, we liaise closely with the Gardens Trust regarding planning applications and consultations. 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://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/">http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/</a></p> <p>We write to object to this application which if permitted would have a detrimental impact on the significance of the setting of Grosvenor Park a historic landscape designed by Edward Kemp which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II*, listed buildings and their settings, and on the landscape character of the Queen's Park Conservation Area and the setting</p>

					<p>of the Chester City Centre Conservation Area. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>The significance of No 7 and No 9 Lower Park Road lie in their ownership and development by the Frost brothers, prominent businessmen in 19th century Chester; the layout of the two gardens as an integrated design by Edward Kemp, Superintendent of Birkenhead Park, and illustrated in his influential book "How to lay out a small garden"; for the originality of the design for two modest plots enabling the 'borrowed landscape' of one to contribute to the setting of the other and encompassing a sandstone cliff face of the River Dee; for</p> <p>"The quality of exterior and interior and their relation to the contemporary garden make this item probably the most complete example of a C19 suburban house in Chester." (Listed building entry); for the survival of original plant material including trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders; for their contribution to the character and quality of the Queen's Park Conservation Area, to views from the Groves and boathouses on the north bank of the River Dee, and to the principal view from Grosvenor Park taken from the belvedere, all of which lie within Chester City Centre Conservation Area; for being an important part of the collection of Kemp's work in Chester which includes Grosvenor Park and the Lead Works.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the changes that have taken place to both No 7 and No 9 Lower Park Road, to development within the Queen's Park Conservation Area as a whole, and other developments permitted and proposed within the locality, these properties still retain much of original character and integrity. We acknowledge that change has occurred, but past development is no justification for permitting further change that adds to the cumulative negative impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>Our objections are that if permitted the proposal would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a degree of prominence in views from Chester City Conservation Area and Grosvenor Park due to the building's strong form, one that seeks to respond to its riverside locale but provides a considerable contrast with the adjacent villas.</li> <li>• Have a slightly negative impact on views from the belvedere in Grosvenor Park, the principal viewpoint which terminates a main axis and is an important part of Kemp's design;</li> <li>• Contrast with the listed buildings and their setting, which in some circumstances is to be commended as an honest intervention, but in this situation we consider adds to the complexity of the overall visual pattern,</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>diminishing the setting and ability to appreciate the existing historic fabric;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Result in loss of space and infilling between properties, space which is important to their understanding of Kemp’s design and historic character and contains mature planting ;</li> <li>• Lie in immediate proximity to garden features which should be regarded as curtilage listed;</li> <li>• Is situated immediately beneath and adjacent to mature planting that is part of the original planting, historic fabric, and covered by Tree Preservation Orders. The proposal is likely to have a detrimental impact on these trees which make a significant contribution to the setting and character of the listed buildings, Conservations Areas and Registered park; We object to the application because we consider that it does not comply with Cheshire West and Chester policy, as follows:</li> </ul> <p>ENV 5 Historic Environment  CH 5 Conservation Areas  CH 6 - Chester key views, landmarks and gateways and historic skyline  DM 3 - Design, character and visual amenity  DM 46 - Development in conservation areas  DM 47 - Listed buildings  DM 48 - Non-designated heritage assets  DM 49 - Registered Parks and Gardens and Battlefields</p> <p>The application does not comply with National Planning Policy Framework: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, 189, by providing a statement of significance nor an assessment of the impacts on the heritage assets, namely the adjacent listed buildings and their gardens which in the case of no 9 is curtilage listed as affirmed by the listing description.</p> <p>REDCLIFF, WITH WALLS, PIERS AND GARDEN STRUCTURES, Non Civil Parish - 1375876   Historic England</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust can completely understand that the applicant loves living at this property and we appreciate their wish to provide care for elderly parents on site, but believes that the harm to historic assets, by infill in this location, outweighs the benefit to the individual owner.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Susan Bartlett  cc. Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and we have seen their response to the above application.</p> <p>The CGT have laid out their objections and detailed the various policies within the Cheshire West and Chester local plan, as well as NPPF Para 189, with which this affecting Grosvenor Park does not comply. Rather than repeat these, for brevity we wish to state that we fully endorse all the comments made by our colleagues in the CGT and also object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tarn Lodge Estate	Cumbria	E20/1490	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting Of 2no. Holiday Lodges &amp; 2no. Pods Together With Landscaping, Newt Ponds, A Sealed Foul Water Drainage System, Access Track &amp; Parking (Revised Application). Land to north of Tarn Lodge Farm, Heads Nook, Brampton. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for notifying the Gardens Trust of further amendments to the above scheme. We have no further comments to add and maintain our objection.</p> <p>Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Renishaw Hall	Derbyshire	E20/1832	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Buildings to B1(a) Office Use, A3 Cafe; Conversion of Farm Building to B1(c) Joiners Workshop; Demolition of Existing Agricultural Buildings and the Provision of Car Parking (Conservation Area/Listed Building/Resubmission of 17/01251/FL) (Amended Plans/Amended Title) CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for bringing the above application and appeal to the attention of the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee. We very much regret that we were forgotten in the original consultation because Renishaw Hall is of course an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II* and one on which we would have almost certainly offered comments.</p> <p>Equally regrettably, we simply do not have the capacity to fully consider and assess the information provided in support of the application and appeal in the very short time frame now available to us. Therefore on this occasion we feel forced to lodge a no comment response but would emphasise that</p>

				ALTERATION, DEMOLITION	<p>this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, please contact us, and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the appeal in due course.</p> <p>With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E20/1823	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 1no. bronze totem sign (No. 7)</p> <p>Top Of Belvedere, Plymouth Hoe</p> <p>ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects The Hoe, 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>Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website and conclude that the proposal would have a less than significant impact on the historic designed landscape of The Hoe.</p> <p>We have no objections to the proposal, and would support the aspiration for improved interpretation on The Hoe.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E20/1825	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 1no. bronze totem sign as part of the Hoe Trail walking route</p> <p>Tinside Pool Hoe Road Plymouth PL1 2NZ</p> <p>ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2021</p> <p>Installation of 1no. bronze totem sign as part of the Hoe Trail walking route Tinside Pool Hoe Road Plymouth PL1 2NZ</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects The Hoe, 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>Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website and conclude that the</p>

					<p>proposal would have a less than significant impact on the historic designed landscape of The Hoe.</p> <p>We have no objections to the proposal, and would support the aspiration for improved interpretation on The Hoe.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Hillersdon House	Devon	E20/1830	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for the erection of single storey extension and alterations Janes Cottage Hillersdon House Cullompton BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the historic designed landscape at Hillersdon House, Cullompton. While the historic designed landscape at Hillersdon is not nationally designated, it is included on the Devon Gardens Trust Gazetteer of locally significant designed landscapes. Jane's Cottage (Listed Grade II) lies within the setting of, and forms an integral element of the designed landscape of, Hillersdon House (Listed Grade II*).</p> <p>We have given careful consideration to the material relating to this proposal on your website, including the response made by Historic England on 15 March 2021.</p> <p>While we are concerned by the visual impact of the enlarged roof when viewed from the walled garden, which will be greater than the impact of the existing roof, on balance we conclude that the proposal will cause less than substantial harm to the listed and un-listed heritage assets, and therefore raise no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Preston Manor and Preston Park	East Sussex	E20/1660	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two storey rear extension to basement and ground floor levels and extension to create a partial first floor level including front balcony, with addition of access ramps and associated works. Cricket Pavilion, Preston Park, Preston Road, Brighton BN1 6LA</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and also the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications. The site lies within Preston Park, which is included on the list of registered Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II designation.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. Historically the pavilion is one of the oldest structures in the park and retains its late Victorian character and most of</p>

					<p>its detailing. The Trust recognises such structures are only likely to survive if they can serve very varied C21 community needs and proposals for modernisation are welcome in principle. However, a key issue is the significance of the design adopted for the building in relation to the park and the adjacent conservation area. In this regard the appearance of the pavilion is heavily compromised by the raised roof which is at odds with the late Victorian pavilion character, although the design has some positive features in that it retains the majority of the façade and the raised roof section does make the necessary stronger visual impact on the sports field that is currently missing. On balance, the Trust suggests it may be possible to meet the social and sporting needs with an alternative design with the gable pushed back from the façade, reduced in scale and the balcony removed. This would be more in scale with the Victorian gables. Some CGIs of the appearance of the building from Preston Drove would help an understanding of the impact of the raised roof section on the conservation area.</p> <p>The Trust has a concern regarding the detail of the steps and ramp proposed to the front of the pavilion. The design introduces sloping lines which conflict with the horizontal lines of the pavilion itself. Moreover, if we are interpreting the plans correctly, the design will result in an unsympathetic trench between the velodrome and the new ramp.</p> <p>The Trust would welcome and support an investigation into raising the general level of the forecourt area to satisfy access requirements and improve visual interconnectivity with the sports field and cycle track. This could obviate the need for sloping railings in the area to the front of the pavilion.</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Clacton Seafront Gardens	Essex	E20/1826	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of Observation Wheel. The Pier Clacton On Sea Essex CO15 1QX MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (LGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This application is for a 33m high ferris or observation wheel which would be located between the Venetian bridge at the end of Pier Avenue and the entrance to Clacton pier. This is a confined space, vibrant and lively, occupied by attractions. In our opinion, the wheel would be poorly related to it and the surrounding buildings, dominating the bridge and the pier</p>



					<p>entrance which retains elements of its Art Deco design.</p> <p>More particularly, it would have an adverse impact on the Seafront Gardens to the west, which are a grade II Registered Park and Garden. Within them is the grade II listed war memorial, an imposing statue of an angel bearing a sword. Originally laid out by the Council's surveyor Daniel J. Bowe in 1921, the gardens were restored in 1999, and added to the statutory list in 2002. Extending in a long narrow strip from the Martello Tower to the Venetian Bridge, they comprise a series of themed gardens (Sensory, Mediterranean, 1920s, Rose, and Garden of Remembrance). They are one of the most attractive features of the resort, well used and much appreciated by visitors and residents alike.</p> <p>We feel that the proposed location for the ferris wheel is unsuitable and would be harmful to the setting of the Seafront Gardens and we therefore object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/1922	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling</p> <p>The Bungalow Shortgrove Newport</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The above application is a reworking of UTT/20/1078/FUL which was withdrawn. We have studied the online documentation and would particularly like to mention how useful and informative the heritage assessment is. The GT/EGT welcomes this revised application. It is much better documented and identifies the Bungalow as a mid-19th century estate building. The proposed rebuild respects its character and extends it in a way which is proportionate.</p> <p>The GT/EGT support the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Rosebery House Hallingbury Place, Great Hallingbury	Essex	E20/1937	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of deer proof fencing and hedging to rear of property.</p> <p>Rosebery House Hallingbury Place</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021</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</p>

				Great Hallingbury BOUNDARY	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and Rosebery House is situated in what were the gardens of Hallingbury Place, a mansion demolished c.1923, but within the centre of an estate which included Hatfield Forest, and which was landscaped by Capability Brown. Hallingbury Place had a major garden redesign in the early 20th century and is included in the Essex Gardens Trust's Inventory of Historic Designed Landscapes in Uttlesford District. The GT/EGT support this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mount Olivers Meadow Hartpury	Gloucestershire	E20/1687	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from agricultural (i.e. forestry) to outdoor leisure activities (i.e. shooting and archery). Agricultural Shed, Mount Olivers Meadow, Blackwells End, Hartpury GL19</p> <p>3DB CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.03.2021</p> <p>I responded to the above application in a personal capacity but wish to lodge the same objection in my official capacity as Conservation Officer for the Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) are statutory consultees for applications relating to all grades of site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens but we also respond to applications affecting non-registered heritage assets if we feel they are of sufficient importance. In this instance we consider the above application to meet this criteria. We have looked at the online documentation for the above application and wish to OBJECT to the above application.</p> <p>Gloucestershire has a long tradition of orchards and perry pear growing, but since the mid 20th century, orchards have been disappearing at an alarming rate. The People's Trust for Endangered Species (PTES) suggests that as many as 90% of traditional orchards have been lost since the 1950s to neglect, development or conversion to intensive modern orchards which contribute a negative impact on biodiversity . The importance of traditional orchards has been recognised as they are now listed as Priority Habitats under the UK Biodiversity Official Action Plan . The 25 acres of Hartpury Orchard Centre contains the National Collection of Perry Pears, an irreplaceable genetic reference collection, studied by students from all over the world. Almost all known perry pears (approximately 100 cultivars) are Gloucestershire varieties, more than from any other county. There is a local legend that perry pears only thrive within sight of May Hill. The site has been transformed over the past 15 years, from an area of sterile, intensive farming to a nature conservation area attracting nationally scarce birds and insects. This is a success story of far more than local importance</p>

					<p>which your council should celebrate and support. Indeed, glassmakers in the Forest of Dean were responsible for quantum leap in the history of cider making in the 1620s when they switched from wood to coal in their manufacturing process. With the addition of iron and manganese a tough green glass, or verre anglaise was developed. Previously bottles had been much weaker and the gases given off during fermentation had caused bottles to explode. By the end of the seventeenth century apart from London, the West Country led the way in bottle production, securing the Forest of Dean an important place in our national heritage of cider/perry making.</p> <p>Unfortunately, should this application be permitted, and 200 days a year of noisy and disruptive shooting be allowed, it is inconceivable that the 15 species of bird on the red list and the 16 on the amber list for the Birds of Conservation Concern, will be returning to this wildlife haven. The impact of the application upon the setting and significance of Hartpury Orchard Centre will be severe. The application documents do not assess the impact of the proposals upon this asset of national heritage significance.</p> <p>The NPPF (Para 122d) requires ‘the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting’ – Gloucestershire has been known for its orchards, in particular Perry Pears, for hundreds of years. This application would change this character. The application is also contrary to Para 170a as it fails to protect and enhance ‘valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity .. (in a manner commensurate with their ... identified quality..) Para 170d is also relevant as it sets out to minimise ‘impacts on and providing net gain for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.’ Your officers will also be aware of Para 174a and the need to ‘identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including .... locally designed sites of importance for biodiversity’ and 174b ‘promote the conservation restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species ...’</p> <p>Hartpury Orchard Centre is effectively a ‘museum’ of all known perry pears from the three counties of Gloucestershire, Herefordshire and Worcestershire. It would be an incalculable loss should this project be allowed, and the resulting loss of income from training courses (which could not continue if repeatedly interrupted by the noise from shooting) caused the Orchard Centre to become unviable economically. In my</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>opinion, this national collection of perry pears is a non-designated heritage asset, containing our national collection of Perry Pears, from the area in which they first originated. As such The Forest of Dean District Council's proposed forthcoming Heritage Character Assessment 2019 (HCA) should surely include Hartpury Orchard Centre? If this document has not been finalised in time to include and thereby save the viability of this irreplaceable heritage asset, it would be a grievous loss for the Forest of Dean and indeed the history of perry pears nationally. The HCA indicates that it will be preparing a list of locally important heritage assets which will be 'recognised as having particularly local importance and are worthy of being acknowledged and preserved as such.' (Heritage Character Assessment 2019 Para 7.6). Statement 2, Issues and Implications for Heritage, goes on to say that 'Planning policies and future planning applications must ensure that ... non-designated heritage assets (including their setting) are preserved and not harmed by new development. Potential enhancements for the long-term preservation of all heritage assets must also be sought.' Section 10 of this document is devoted to non-designated heritage assets, and states (10.3) 'Benefits of a 'local heritage list' would be that planning policies would be created with an improved understanding of potential future impacts on those ... landscapes. Furthermore, planning decisions would be better informed, thereby affording a greater level of protection and potentially enabling development through the preservation of those heritage assets.' Statement 5 encapsulates this message : 'There are many non-designated heritage assets which have not yet been recorded for their historical or local importance. Planning policies must provide a framework in which heritage assets and their settings, whether designated or not, should be protected and/or enhanced.' If your officers accept that the Hartpury Orchard Centre is an unregistered heritage asset, then you will also be aware of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I Settings &amp; Views (GPA). This states that (p11) the experience of the asset is affected by 'noise, vibration and other nuisances' as well as 'busyness, bustle, movement and activity' and on p4 that 'the contribution of setting to significance does not depend on numbers of people visiting it; this would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting...' Gloucestershire has historically always been regarded as the national</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					epicentre of Perry Pear growing and if this application is permitted it will do our heritage a great disservice and for all the reasons listed above, the GT would urge your officers to refuse this ill-considered application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung
Chavenage House	Gloucestershire	E20/1841	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Part relocation of car park (consented under 17/04110/FUL); retention and siting of a tipi for 12 month temporary period; and change of use of the stables to flexible commercial use (Class E). at Manor Farm Chavenage Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8XW PARKING, CHANGE OF USE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.03.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might result on adverse impacts on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes; has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Having looked at relatively similar proposals that resulted in a Planning Approval in 2017; this scheme obviously has recognised the constraints of operating under Covid restrictions, and has had the benefit of trial running the commercial operation. The current scheme seems to be an operational improvement and with additional remedial landscaping will have marginal environmental impact. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Chavenage House	Gloucestershire	E20/1842	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Siting of 10 glamping units at Manor Farm Chavenage Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8XW CAMPING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2021 The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes; has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust to respond on its behalf. GGLT was somewhat surprised that there was an absence of a Heritage Statement that helped guide and justify the siting of this development to ensure that its impact was reduced to an acceptable minimum. This was bearing in mind that some of the proposals are within the boundary of the Registered Grade 11 parkland. However, GGLT considers that the proposals have in fact minimised visual intrusion, and would not wish to impede such a scheme to diversify the Estate's activities. But having said this, GGLT would also seek to limit intensification , and be consulted on any proposals to relocate the tents and shepherd huts that are subject to this Application. Yours sincerely, David Ball,(on behalf of GGLT)
Syon Park	Greater London	E20/0871	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for the demolition of existing building	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.03.2021 Further to our letter of 4th December 2020 and the additional information supplied by the developer, our objection remains.

				and car park and erection of buildings to provide 473 residential units, a replacement retail foodstore with additional commercial, business and service space, and a flexible community space, and ancillary plant, access, servicing and car parking (400 customer spaces and 105 residential spaces), landscaping and associated works. HOMEBASE LTD, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5QE. MAJOR HYBRID	Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Hyde Park	Greater London	E20/1710	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary installation of a viewing platform, landscaping, walkway and staircase, and other associated works, at Marble Arch for a temporary period of six months. BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.03.2021 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 London Parks & Gardens Trust (LP&GT) and their local knowledge informs this response with regard to the impact upon the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Hyde Park. We have looked at the online documentation and apart from drawing between 130-220 visitors per hour for 10 hours a day, probably only paying a 'nominal' entry fee if at all, we struggle to see the justification for this enormous building project which will take several months to erect, more to dismantle, requires 24 hour security guarding for the duration of its life, and which will only be in situ for six months. There seems to be no indication of how much this project is due to cost, just that it is part of the '£150 million initiative known as the Oxford Street District Framework.' We sympathise with the aim of bringing more people to the western end of Oxford Street to encourage shopping footfall, but we struggle to understand how the enormous cost of this temporary structure is economically justifiable. Marble Hill would be a huge artificial feature of 22.5m tall (not including the 25.5m lift structure) which would tower over the 14m tall Grade I listed Marble Arch. Westward facing views show a structure abruptly severed by a precipitous northern edge, as if a huge pile of soil had been mistakenly

					<p>left on East Island. Seen from the south, Grade I Marble Arch fades into insignificance, dominated by the enormous, hill, alien to the surrounding topography, in particular the Grade I RPG of Hyde Park. Marble Arch seems to be about to be overwhelmed by soil slippage. In our opinion, this structure, whilst conceived with the best of intentions, seems incongruous and out of place, and fails entirely to integrate with its very sensitive historic setting. The Planning Statement devotes just three sentences (para 10.34) to describe the impact upon the Grade I RPG, the highest level of designation. Your officers will be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017Part I – Settings and Views. (GPA) Page 2 states : ‘A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it’. In our opinion, this cursory dismissal of the impact upon the RPG, and the overwhelming effect of the structure next to the Grade I listed Marble Arch and from Hyde park, is insufficient. The artificial hill is visually extremely dominant and negatively effects views from, towards, through, across and including the heritage assets (GPA p11). We concur with our colleagues in the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust in regretting the proposed commercialisation of what was previously freely accessible public open space, adversely affecting the setting of both the Grade I RPG and the Grade I Marble Arch.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT object to the above application and feel that better use could be made of the substantial construction/maintenance/demolition costs, perhaps providing funds for the greening, improvement and conservation of existing open spaces within the borough.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.03.2021  I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Marble Arch (<a href="http://londongardenstrust.org">londongardenstrust.org</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>We have studied the proposal for the above application and although we share the ambition to see people return in numbers to Oxford Street and Central London once restrictions allow, we consider these proposal to further restrict open access to what is currently a freely accessible public space and gardens. It will not contribute long lasting public benefit, but give a vantage point to those who can pay to use it at the expense of others. There is potential that it will damage an important designed landscape and offer no lasting landscape benefit.</p> <p>In addition to our joint comments with the Gardens Trust, we also consider the setting of the Grade I listed Marble Arch as a high-quality post-war designed landscape in and of itself. This was partially restored circa 2008-9, but WCC did not have the funds to complete the restoration, especially the paving around Marble Arch. We consider it to be of a quality and rarity which may warrant its inclusion on the register of parks and gardens and we have applied to Historic England for their assessment.</p> <p>While we support many of your Interim Public Realm Improvement Schemes, we would prefer to see the money invested into permanent green space / heritage and access improvements such as completing the job that WCC/TfL funded at Marble Arch circa 2008. Additional tree planting and greening of routes linking Central London's many attractions, from shopping to major parks and squares, the Thames and other cultural centres would be of benefit and not harm heritage and publicly accessible green space.</p> <p>The LGT OBJECTS to this planning application on the following grounds: Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals may be temporary but will cause loss of free, accessible open space adjacent to Oxford St for a considerable time.</li> <li>• It will most likely damage elements of this high-quality post-war designed landscape. We consider the existing landscape, partially restored in the 2008-9, should be completed and considered for listing in its own right.</li> <li>• The works required to erect and remove the hill will cause further loss of</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p>open space, hinder accessibility and increase traffic movements and materials storage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The hill misdirects funding from permanent and sustainable landscape improvements. Funding should be used to restore or create lasting publicly accessible (without charge) designed landscapes which promote and sustain local communities and tourism footfall for years to come.</li> <li>• It is unacceptable to section off public land and charge entry for such a time period.</li> </ul> <p>Please inform us of your decision once available. Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Wanstead Park	Greater London	E20/1731	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition of existing clubhouse and timber frame outbuilding. Single storey extension incorporating a roof level terrace and external access staircase. Internal alterations. Removal of T3(Birch tree). Crown lift 6m above ground T6 and T10 2x (Oak trees) Wanstead Cricket Club, Overton Drive, Wanstead, London, E11 2LW DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION, LANDSCAPE</p>	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.03.2021
Grove Park	Greater London	E20/1745	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of the existing office building (Grove House) to C3 (residential) to provide 10 self contained residential units including the demolition/removal of two external fire escape stairs, rear toilet blocks and roof over rear stair tower, flank server room and an entrance porch, erection of a rear entrance portico canopy, three first floor</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.03.2021 I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see The Grove Park (<a href="http://londongardenstrust.org">londongardenstrust.org</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p>

				<p>balconies and one second floor balcony, provision of cycle/refuse stores, new boundary treatments and associated landscaping works.</p> <p>The Grove House Grove Park High Street Carshalton SM5 3AL CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>The Grove House, to which the application relates, stands within the Grove Park. It is a key part of the Carshalton Conservation Area which includes the Ponds and the surrounding buildings and is one of the most distinctive landscapes in southwest London. The building is locally listed and a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The Grove was originally part of the Grounds of a house called Stone Court which was located on the opposite (northwest) side of the River Wandle. The area was probably first landscaped by John Cator who rebuilt Stone Court at the end of the 17th century. Further landscaping was carried out by Thomas Scawen in the first half of the 18th century including the construction of the small Portland Stone Bridge (Grade II The Leoni Bridge. North retaining wall of the pond to the east of North Street, Sutton - 1065681   Historic England) where the river flows from the Carshalton Lower Pond. The road bridge, Leoni Bridge, culvert and retaining walls to Carshalton Ponds form a listed group with No 1 High Street and entrance gates to the Grove, with Honeywood Museum and Wall and Gatehouse, Honeywood Walk, with Anne Boleyn's Well, St Mary's and Madeley Cottage in Church Hill and with the following items on the south side of the High Street: Greyhound Inn, wall to east of Greyhound Inn, Church of All Saints, north churchyard wall and Nos 6 and 12 High Street. Grove House, the subject of this application, is highly visible within this group given its elevated aspect overlooking the open ponds.</p> <p>The Pond itself was probably created by either Cator or Scawen. The estate was split in two in the early 19th century and The Grove house was erected about 1827. The house and park were bought by the Council in the 1920s. The Council did not substantially change the grounds when they acquired the park, so much of the planting and the rockery survive from the late 19th and early 20th century.</p> <p>The original building forms the centre of the west elevation. The south end of this elevation may also be original but with later alterations to the fenestration. The north end is an extension, but in keeping with the rest, so that it forms a harmonious front facing into the ornamental part of the park. The back or east side is the result of more piecemeal development and is of less architectural merit. It is, however, highly visible to the public and seen as part of an historic group of interesting ex-park buildings, some of which have been recently restored as a training centre.</p> <p>The building was used for council offices but is now surplus to requirements.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The view across the lawn which slopes up to west front of the house is integral to the setting of the Leoni Bridge and highly visible from the river and pond beyond and is therefore one of the key elements in the design of the park. The feature is clearly shown on the first 25 inch Ordnance Survey map of 1868. We welcome the fact that this elevation is preserved in the proposals, so this view is largely unchanged.</p> <p>We note the changes to the east side of the building. We accept that this elevation developed over a period and is of less architectural merit and that it does not face the ornamental part of the park and is therefore less significant.</p> <p>We note the limited areas taken for the private use of the residents are largely at the back of the building. And we consider any attempt to extend these should be resisted as this reduces the public area of the park which is extensively used by the many visitors using the playground and the café beyond.</p> <p>We note that the planting at front of the building is to be maintained by parks. We suggest that this arrangement should be a condition of any grant of planning permission as the bedding is part of the key view from the river to the house. The planting needs to be considered in the relation to the wider park rather than be at the whim of residents in the house.</p> <p>The Council stopped staff parking in the park some years ago. This has been a significant improvement as the cars impinged on the key view from the river to the front of the house and the traffic was also a hazard to park users – especially small children. This change was widely welcomed by park users. We note that the application limits resident’s vehicle access to deliveries and does not allow parking within the park. We think that this should be enforced by a clear and explicit planning condition which may also require time limits to avoid deliveries or parking when the park is at its busiest.</p> <p>The LGT conditionally supports this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals preserve, to a great degree, a key and highly prominent building within a well-used park, within a conservation area and within an exceptionally large group of statutorily listed heritage assets. This indicates the need for great sensitivity regarding any changes to the west elevation of Grove House or alterations to the surrounding landscape to accommodate residential use.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditions should be used to ensure maintenance of the interface between public and private spaces to protect key views and public access around the park.</li> <li>• Vehicular access to the house, including deliveries, should be conditioned to avoid dangers to park visitors, especially the many children running about, and may need to be set within clear times of operation.</li> <li>• The peripheral requirements of the conversion should not lead to a proliferation of small sheds, buildings, fencing or immediate parking. The small existing shed, identified within the application for waste storage, should be the absolute upper limit.</li> <li>• Opportunities should be taken to make weather safe and secure the small parks buildings along the boundary to the South. Although these buildings are not part of this application, their prospects for reuse for parks related activities will be hugely affected as a result of their proximity to new residential housing. Every effort should be made to stem any deterioration and retain them for future use.</li> </ul> <p>Please inform us of your decision once available. Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Canons Park	Greater London	E20/1928	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Tree preservation order: unknown tree t1 cedar and t2 wellingtonia of mwa arboricultural report works - remove reason: the above trees are considered to be responsible for root induced clay shrinkage subsidence damage to 41 Canons Drive Edgware HA8 7RB</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE (FINALISED) 25.03.2021 I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Canons Park * (londongardenstrust.org) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Thank you for contacting us about the application to fell protected trees on Canons Drive and your time this afternoon to explain the case and surrounding issues. The LGT would strongly urge the retention of these rare and important trees. The conservation area and park would be greatly damaged by their loss which would set a dangerous precedent. The detrimental impact of</p>

					<p>such loss on the quality of the designated heritage assets would, in our opinion, put the designations at risk and as such we would seek Historic England's assessment on whether the site should be added to the Heritage at Risk Register.</p> <p>We understand the refusal of the applications could put the Council at financial risk either through unlimited responsibility for subsidence or the cost of remedial works such as a possible root barrier to at least two of the houses seeking tree removals. We would urge the council to resist the temptation to make this a deciding issue when assessing the removal of the trees given the opening this will then give every insurer to pin problems of subsidence on any tree within the orbit of the houses they insure.</p> <p>The problems identified at Canons Drive such as the drying out of deep substrata can not all be blamed on the trees. The percentage of paving over with impermeable coverings at the front of properties and the development of up to 50% of rear gardens has diverted the long held draining of rainwater to the lower substrates and greatly exacerbated the drying out caused by recent droughts. The removal of the trees would not solve these problems brought about by the householders' management of their own land. The fellings could even cause other problems as the trees are removed and deep roots die back.</p> <p>The trees at Canons Drive are exceptional and deserve their TPO status. They are integral to the designation of the conservation area, and as mature examples of rare trees they are of great regional and national importance.</p> <p>We strongly advise the retention of these magnificent trees.</p> <p>Please let us know if we be of any further help,</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Hounslow Local Plan	Greater London	E20/1936	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.03.2021</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer on behalf of the Planning and Conservation Working Group of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of</p>

					<p>registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Inventory Search Result (<a href="http://londongardenstrust.org">londongardenstrust.org</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>We have received a recent email drawing our attention to the Examination of the Hounslow Local Plan. We have contributed to earlier drafts.</p> <p>We note the schedules of major and minor modifications and in particular a proposed change which appears not to have a reference. We outline the changes which are of concern to us because they change the meaning of the policies and would bring into question the soundness of the plan at this stage.</p> <p>Policy WoB4(d)</p> <p>We regret the deletion of "landscape features" in Policy WoB4(d) as this drew attention to the value of landscapes. Generally, attention is paid solely to structures.</p> <p>(WOB_SP_19_M)</p> <p>We are concerned that strategies and masterplans which are not subject to the robust scrutiny, engagement and consultation of the development plan are being brought into policy, and even before they have been prepared. This does not pass the test of soundness.</p> <p>Policy WOB5Design and Culture</p> <p>Modified paragraph "Our response"</p> <p>The Council will seek to preserve and enhance areas which are of heritage value and have high quality, well established coherent characters the historic environment.</p> <p>The Council's proposed modifications (no ref?) to Policy WOB5Design and Culture have had unintended consequences.</p> <p>The policy addresses heritage assets. Heritage value can derive from historic or from cultural significance to the community.</p> <p>This modification has changed the meaning of Policy WOB5, restricting its application to the historic environment rather than to the wider definition of heritage.</p> <p>We think this is important because Hounslow has a wealth of cultural assets and because many parks and open spaces may not be recognised as historic environments but do have valued designed landscapes.</p> <p><a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sitelist/?sitename=&amp;borough=Hounslow&amp;type=%25&amp;keyword=&amp;Submit=Search">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sitelist/?sitename=&amp;borough=Hounslow&amp;type=%25&amp;keyword=&amp;Submit=Search</a></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We continue to support WOB5g  We hope that our comments help you in your consideration of the documents. Please let us know if we can be of further help.  Yours Sincerely,  Rose Wakelin  Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Brompton Cemetery	Greater London	E20/1946	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Redevelopment of the site to provide new residential units (Class C3) and flexible commercial (Class E) floorspace within a new building ranging in height from 4 to 9 storeys; together with plant and cycle parking facilities and associated servicing, access, landscaping and all associated ancillary works and structures  MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.03.2021  The above planning application has literally been brought to my attention within the past ten minutes. I note that today is the final day for consultation, and as this application is very likely to have a damaging effect on the setting and views of Brompton Cemetery (we have not yet had time to look at the online documentation), a Grade I designed landscape of international significance, and containing many listed structures, the Gardens Trust should have been consulted. As you will be aware, the Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee, and as such LPAs must consult The Gardens Trust in relation to Grades I, II* and II registered sites and also Historic England in relation to Grades I and II* registered sites. Statutory consultation requirements have been in place since 1995 in relation to 'development likely to affect' registered parks and gardens. The requirement for consultation is currently set out in Article 18/Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Before granting planning permission for development, LPAs must consult the Gardens Trust. I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet for your information, which sets out guidance for LPAs with regards to historic parks and gardens.  We are extremely concerned by this inexplicable omission on the part of the RBKC. We would be grateful if you could please allow us a further 21 days to consider this application and send in our response.  With best wishes,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p> <p>S RUTHERFORD WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.03.2021  I write regarding the damaging effect of this development on Brompton Cemetery, a designed landscape of international significance – listed at Grade I on the Register of Parks and Gardens, and containing many listed structures. I have been a professional garden historian and historic environment adviser for over 25 years and have an expertise in C19</p>

					<p>cemeteries. As Head of the English Heritage Parks and Gardens Register I managed a national review of cemetery sites after which 60 sites were added to the Register. I have seen and studied many cemeteries and published a book on the Victorian Cemetery in 2008 which has sold 7,000 copies, as well as conducting many professional surveys of cemeteries and their significances for Historic England and other public bodies. I frequently review and comment on planning applications on behalf of the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust to advise the Statutory Consultee, The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Undoubtedly Brompton Cemetery is one of the most important and possibly the most magnificent in the country. The setting and views have been damaged to a degree by modern buildings in localised places, but these stand at a distance and there is no reason to allow further damage to this Elysian landscape particularly in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>I object most strongly to this development because of the damaging effect it will have on the Grade I Registered cemetery and the nationally significant structures within it.</p> <p>It causes 'substantial harm' to the setting of these heritage assets as defined in the NPPF because of its overbearing scale and height, visible as a large and alien intrusion at the main entrance (on both sides) and from many points within the cemetery and its structures.</p> <p>The council must reject this application.</p> <p>Sarah Rutherford</p>
Pylewell Park	Hampshire	E20/1775	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of land for a temporary period of fifteen years to mixed use comprising of incidental residential and for holding weddings and events; permanent siting of marquee and gazebo; associated parking Pylewell Park, Pylewell, East End, SO41 5SJ</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have reviewed the online documentation making clear that the estate needs substantial funds to repair many years of inadequate maintenance within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) as well as the Grade II* mansion house. It is unfortunate for the applicants that the various Covid lockdowns effectively cancelled the 2020 wedding season making it hard to assess with certainty whether their proposals will be sufficient to fund the dauntingly large heritage restoration programme required. We hope that many of the cancelled events can be fitted into the 2021 season as suggested by the online documentation and we have sympathy with the</p>



					<p>applicants faced with such an overwhelming list of necessary work. The GT were not involved in any pre-app discussions relating to the current temporary marquee, and it is unfortunate that this structure is aesthetically so utilitarian in appearance and unsympathetic to its sensitive surroundings. In our opinion it negatively affects the setting of the main house when seen from the southern parkland and other key views. We understand that holm oaks (<i>Quercus ilex</i>) have been planted to mitigate this visual harm, although it is not easy to understand from the online documentation how this can be achieved without spoiling the views of the Solent from the marquee. The Heritage Statement (Para 6.06) states that 'if the marquee is removed at the end of its life the harm could be easily removed and the site made good.' We have strong reservations about the marquee remaining in situ for a further 15 years, as it will be difficult to argue that it is a temporary structure and it is likely that it, or its successor, will become a permanent feature, which currently we feel unable to support.</p> <p>We concur with Historic England that a Heritage Management Plan (HMP) is vital to quantify and prioritise all the necessary repairs and ensure that the wedding venue will provide the requisite funds in the long term. Once this information has been gathered, we agree with our HE colleagues that these could be secured by a Section 106 agreement and programme of phased repairs.</p> <p>The online documentation states that repairs to the HaHa and sunken garden have been restored using revenue generated from the wedding business. However, we do not know how much work these features required so it is difficult to say whether they are major achievements or more minor maintenance problems which were relatively inexpensive to repair.</p> <p>The GT/HGT are unable to support a 15-year extension for this unsympathetically sited and utilitarian building. We would suggest that your officers consider a shorter extension during which time a HMP can be put together and a better idea of revenue generation obtained, so that a clearer way forward can be ascertained.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dogmersfield Park	Hampshire	E20/1820	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land for	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory

				<p>residential purposes for 2 no. gypsy pitches comprising of a mobile home (caravan), a touring caravan and a utility/day room each together with the formation of hardstanding. Farnham Lodge Farnham Road Odiham Hook RG29 1HS CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have not been able to undertake a site visit and therefore our comments are based entirely on the online documentation. Photographs included within the online documentation shows that the application site on the southern boundary of the Grade II registered park and garden of Dogmersfield Park looks somewhat degraded. Good Maps/Streetview confirms the visibility of piecemeal development in the immediate vicinity to the east of the development site. Looking at the Streetview images, the landscape beyond the application site is still readable as parkland, and we would support landscaping which does not hide or detract from this. Your conservation officer Beverley Mogford has stated that in her opinion the development should be contained within the existing built development envelope, which was in place when the RPG was first registered. We would support this.</p> <p>The online documentation states that the site will be landscaped both from the A287 and to the north of the development site, to mitigate the impact of further development from within the RPG. We would have liked further details of this, and would urge that should this application be permitted, that suitable species be chosen which would formerly have existed in the Emes design for the landscape and that any hedging be native including some evergreen species such as holly.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). Page 4 of SHA states ‘Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset’ and on P2 ‘When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.’ We feel this is something of a judgement call for your officers, as currently the degraded appearance of the site is detrimental to the setting of the RPG, but if the proposals are carefully undertaken and suitable mitigation planting put in place, with conditions attached for their long-term maintenance, this would undoubtedly be helpful. However, making sure that such maintenance will be carried out in perpetuity, is more difficult to ensure</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>and if this does not occur, in our opinion, the setting of the RPG would be further negatively compromised. We noted the comments of the Planning Inspector in appeal ref : APP/N1730/19/3238533, Para 10, who felt that the proposed industrial site on the opposite side of the road would be 'at odds with the rural aspect which is in close proximity to, as well as forms part of the setting, to the listed park and garden, harming its significance as a grade II listed area.' The proposed gypsy pitches are less industrial in feel and as long as they were contained and suitably screened, would be less harmful than an industrial site.</p> <p>We also note that Policy H5 in the Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2032 states that Gypsy sites will only be supported if there is a demonstrated need for them. The applicant has not demonstrated this in any of the online documentation that we could see. We also feel that the application does not comply with the NPPF Para 195 as there are no discernable public benefits to the scheme, unless the mitigating effects of suitable landscaping alongside the A287 are counted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Spetchley Park	Hereford and Worcester	E20/1857	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from residential dwelling to children's home. Red House, Spetchley Road, Spetchley, Worcester WR5 1RS.</p> <p>INSTITUTION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hereford &amp; Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&amp;WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and have no reason to object to the application per se, but we are concerned that a change of use should not entail the removal of existing vegetation. The setting of the Red House is particularly sensitive, its timeless character being almost unchanged over the last hundred years. It is substantially dependant on the tree and shrub cover around the house which, not being protected, is vulnerable and may not be valued by new incumbents.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bayfordbury	Hertfords hire	E20/1647	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed outdoor swimming</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 02.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.</p>

				<p>pool. Bayfordbury Mansion, Lower Hatfield Road, Bayford, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG13 8RE. SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>Bayfordbury is a II* listed building set in a Grade II Registered landscape. HGT is familiar with the landscape, its history and its planning history. The historic designed views across the landscape include those from the house terrace at the rear of the property towards the woodland, including the important Clinton-Baker Pinetum; from the first floor windows both towards the woodland and along the terrace beneath the windows; and views from within the landscape towards the house.</p> <p>The proposal for a swimming pool in this prominent position would destroy the unity of the terrace and the symmetry of the house and immediate grounds, retained in the fairly recent layout of hedging round individual house gardens.</p> <p>The harm to both landscape and mansion is contrary to the policies of EHDC, HA1 for designated heritage assets, HA7 for listed buildings and HA8 for historic parks and gardens, and to the NPPF. NPPF Section 194 requires convincing justification for harm to heritage assets, which has not been supplied; Section 196 requires harm to be weighed against public benefit, and we do not consider there is any public benefit here.</p> <p>We therefore object to this proposal on heritage grounds.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Former Shredded Wheat Factory, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1675	N	<p>PLNNING APPLICATION. Detailed Planning Application for 399 Private Rented Sector (PRS) dwellings and 153 dwellings (Class C3), 250 units of residential care accommodation for the elderly (Use Class C2) with associated communal facilities, 15,247m2 of community and commercial hub (Use Classes E and F1) with associated cycling hub, car parking, landscaping, public art and other supporting infrastructure: and Outline Planning Application for up to 418 dwellings (Class C3) with all matters reserved except access.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2021</p> <p>In 2008 WHBC produced a Supplementary Planning Document for Broadwater Road to inform planning decisions coming forward, to ensure that key heritage assets and the character of the historic town were respected.</p> <p>We are therefore disappointed that this application does not accord with some of the provisions in the SPD.</p> <p>1. The SPD recognises the spirit of the garden city and requires that any development enhance the local environment , including at an appropriate scale. We consider that the proposed height of the blocks at 9/10 storeys is not an appropriate scale and is double the SPD's limit. This will harm the setting of the WGC town centre and the Conservation Area</p> <p>2. The SPD also notes that the former Shredded Wheat silos (Listed by Historic England), are a main landmark on the skyline which should not be adversely affected by any new development. The nearby former Roche buildings are also Listed. The excessive height of the proposed blocks will severely harm the significance of these Listed structures., contrary to the SPD and the NPPF Chapter 16 which requires the conservation and</p>

					<p>enhancement of heritage assets, including their setting.</p> <p>3. Unwin's Garden City Principles, reflected in de Soissons Welwyn Garden City, specified 12 dwellings per acre with adequate green space for healthy living. The proposed density here of 121 per acre is contrary to garden city principles and is above many urban housing developments elsewhere.</p> <p>4. Garden City Principles require a mix of housing types and sizes, from detached houses, through cottages to modest 3-storey blocks as found at Knightsfield. The proposal of so many flats and so little green space per dwelling is contrary, and harmful, to the character of Welwyn Garden City.</p> <p>5. Many of the traditional houses in the town will be adversely affected, not only by the looming bulk of these blocks, as demonstrated in the application at Appendix 10.3, but also by increased traffic densities.</p> <p>Welwyn Garden City is the most visually coherent of our Garden Cities and an expression of the importance of providing a healthy, integrated way of living as realised by de Soissons. This application not only negates these ideas but will have a harmful effect of designated and undesignated heritage assets and the character of the town. The Gardens Trust and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, therefore object to it.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gorhambury	Hertfords hire	E20/1755	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of security cameras, external lighting, new TV aerials and satellite dish and associated works.</p> <p>Gorhambury House Gorhambury St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 6AH MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. HGT is familiar with the Gorhambury Registered landscape and its history. We have no objections to the proposal as detailed in this application. The proposal seems to fulfil the need to security without harming the significance of the listed mansion or Registered parkland by excessive light pollution.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
42 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1764	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Crown lift of 1m for 1 x Magnolia tree (T1), crown lift of 1m and reduce 1 top branch by 1m for 1 x Liquid Amber tree (T2), reduce crown by 2m and lift crown by 2m for 2 x Hornbeam trees (T3, T4), fell 1 x Elder tree (T5), fell 1 x Holly tree (G1), reduce 1 x</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 02.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that AG Treecare is the Agent specified on the application form but there is no information as to the advice given and the reasons these reductions and felling are necessary.</p> <p>We have no objection to this application if they are proved necessary and supported by expert evidence.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

				Holly tree by 1m covered by conservation area. 42 Sherrardspark Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LB TREES	
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/1776	II	PLANNING APPLICATION: Loft Conversion and installation of roof lights at 22 farm Crescent, London Colney, Hertfordshire AL2 1UQ	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. At present the street facades of Farm Crescent present a coherent character. We do have some concerns that the large amount of roof lights, 3 on the street elevation(7 in total), would harm this coherence. We would suggest modifications to minimise this harm from changes to the streetscape and from possible glare. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Charter House Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1839	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 43 no. replacement windows Charter House Parkway Welwyn Garden City AL8 6JL BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 12.03.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Charter House is an important part of the design of Parkway on the east side and reflects the neo-Georgian of the John Lewis building further north and the houses on the west side. the fenestration is a key part of this design. The WGC Conservation Area appraisal (para 78) stresses the 'Georgian style sash windows' as strongly characteristic. It further states (para 162) that incremental alteration [to buildings] is the most seriously degrading threat to the character of the conservation area, including replacement windows of different patterns and materials to the original. We are concerned that the replacement windows are of UPVC whereas the original are wood. This will harm the appearance of the west elevation. We are further concerned the opportunity to enhance the CA has not been taken by replacing the glazing bars in the 2 ground floor windows on the north of the entrance, to match those on the south. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
South Side Former Shredded Wheat Factory Broadwater Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1853	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 317 dwellings (Class C3) with associated access, parking, landscaping and other supporting infrastructure, and outline planning for up to 404	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.03.2021 In 2008 WHBC produced a Supplementary Planning Document for Broadwater Road to inform planning decisions coming forward, to ensure that key heritage assets and the character of the historic town were respected. We are therefore disappointed that this application does not accord with

				<p>           dwellings (Class C3) with all matters reserved for access.            South Side Former Shredded Wheat Factory            Broadwater Road Welwyn Garden City            RESIDENTIAL, PARKING         </p>	<p>           the provisions in the SPD.            1. The SPD recognises the spirit of the garden city and requires that any development enhance the local environment, including at an appropriate scale. We consider that the proposed height of the blocks at 9 storeys is not an appropriate scale and is double the SPD's limit. This will harm the setting of the WGC town centre and the Conservation Area            2. An indicative density of 75 dwellings per hectare is given in the SPD, with a lower level of 50dph. The dph for the proposed layout is far higher than this and greater than the site can accommodate if also following the SPD guidance on the 'density of development' which should include in the balance 'the residential character that exists in Welwyn Garden City'. There is nothing like this in the very important garden city, which is being increasingly recognised as a forerunner not only of Garden Cities worldwide, but also the principles behind post-war New Towns and the best of the new developments elsewhere. Tthis is a metropolitan design not suited to this town.            3. The excessive height of the proposed blocks will severely harm the significance of Listed structures, Roche office buildings and Shredded Wheat Silos contrary to the SPD and the NPPF Chapter 16 which requires the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets, including their setting. It will also appear, as indicated in the ES Vol2 Appendices on wirelines, so bulky and high as to be apparent from Hatfield Park and Hatfield House, both Grade I, to their detriment and harm to their significance.            4. Garden City Principles require a mix of housing types and sizes, from detached houses, through cottages to modest 3-storey blocks as found at Knightsfield. The proposal of so many flats and so little green space per dwelling is contrary, and harmful, to the character of Welwyn Garden City.            5. Many of the traditional houses in the town will be adversely affected, not only by the looming bulk of these blocks, as demonstrated in the application at Appendix 10.3, but also by increased traffic densities. This is particularly so for the residential areas to the south of the site, both adjacent as at Broadwater Crescent, and further afield as in Woodhall and the residential area west of the railway line.            Welwyn Garden City is the most visually coherent of our Garden Cities and an expression of the importance of providing a healthy, integrated way of living as realised by de Soissons. This application by itself not only negates these ideas but will have a harmful effect of designated and undesignated         </p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					heritage assets and the character of the town. Cumulatively with application for the North Shredded Wheat site and the Biopark site, it will destroy the character of the town. The SPD states that Broadwater Road is a 'Key Gateway into Welwyn Garden City'. The proposals will make it appear as a Gateway into a Metropolitan business district, such as Canary Wharf, and not a Garden City. The Gardens Trust and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, therefore object to it. Kate Harwood, Conservation & Planning, Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/1980	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion, insertion of bi-folding doors at rear, replacement windows, alterations to openings and removal of silver birch. 6 Farm Crescent London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1UQ BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.03.2021 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee. We note that there are no documents showing proposed elevations for this conversion. We have no objections to the works for which details are available but are concerned about the design of the garage door replacement as this could affect the character of the Farm Crescent streetscape where the present houses retain their garage doors and appropriate window designs within them. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E20/1868	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Part two storey and part first floor rear extension. High Trees 8 Beech Drive Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 0AA BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.03.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. The property lies within the setting of the Registered Park of Pishiobury. On the basis of the information in this application and our knowledge of the landscape and its history we do not wish to comment. We would note, however, that the covering letter mentions a Juliet Balcony to the 1st floor rear extension which is not shown on the plans. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hemel Water Gardens	Hertfords hire	E20/1892	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposals for a new vehicular access from Leighton Buzzard Road to the Water Gardens Car Park (South), alongside car park reconfiguration, pedestrian improvements, removal of two trees, tree planting and landscaping, and other associated works	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2021 The Gardens Trust, as the Statutory Consultee for historic designed landscapes on the HE Register, has authorised Hertfordshire Gardens Trust to respond on its behalf to planning matters in Hertfordshire. We welcome the removal of 2 way traffic on Bridge Road and have no comment to make on the new access from Leighton Buzzard Road. We do have the following concerns: 1. Jellicoe designed a number of views across the Water Garden and the Gade Valley to connect old and new towns. The most important of these is that through Bank Court and the Flower Garden. 2 other views are also



				Water Gardens South Waterhouse Street Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1ED PARKING, TREES	important; along Bridge Street, and across the market area at the north of the Water Garden. We note that the proposed position of the recycling bins will obscure the Bridge Street view. Moving the position of the bins a little further south would ensure that the view remains open and Jellicoe's design intent, recognised by HE including it on their Register of historic parks and gardens, is not harmed, contrary to NPPF Chapter 16. 2. We note that there is to be a raised pedestrian crossing of Bridge Street to facilitate the route along the water gardens. Views are key in the Jellicoe design and the original views along the waterway have been restored as part of the recent programme of works. However, the views are interrupted by cars parked on Bridge Street between the 2 parts of the Water Garden. We would welcome measure to prevent parking here , not only for the safety of pedestrians but also to restore the north-south views along the Water Garden. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/1904	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extension incorporating bi fold doors. Replacement of existing french doors and fixed glazed panels with bi fold doors. 14 Beningfield Drive London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1Uj BUILDING ALTERATION C	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Although we consider the proposed alterations would not cause harm to the Registered Park of Napsbury Hospital the change to the windows at the front elevation would cause some harm to the rhythm and visual coherence of that part of Beningfield Drive. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/1917	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of part single storey side extension, part replacement of existing side railings with installation of part side fence and gate Napsbury Tower 67 Beningfield Drive London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1Ux BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.03.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We are disappointed that the applicant has not considered either the Registered Park or the Napsbury Conservation Area in their Design & Access Statement, although GT/HGT pointed this lack of consideration out in our comments on the previous application, 5/2019/2923. Given the prominent position of the Napsbury Tower and its historic significance within the Registered Park we would wish to see a more informed justification. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/1920	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Rear outbuilding (retrospective) 4 Strawberry Crescent London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1US BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. This application for a building erected in contravention of the condition of removal of PD rights within this Registered Park situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt . We are concerned that neither the Green Belt nor the Registered Park are considered within this application. Further no evidence has been advanced as to the effect of this building on the TPO tree, or its root systems. An Impact Statement and justification addressing these issues should be provided as set out in the NPPF, Chapters 13 and 16. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E20/1952	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of garden room to provide gym and home office. Mandevilles Bonks Hill Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 9HS DEMOLITION, GARDEN BUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Mandevilles lies within the setting of the Registered Park of Pishiobury but is screened from the Registered area at present by woodland. We do not consider that the proposed building would cause harm to the significance of the RPG, provided the same degree of screening is maintained, and therefore have no objections. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
2 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1953	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 2 x Hornbeam by 2m. Fell 1 x Western Red Cedar. 2 Densley Close Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 31.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We note that no justification for the works proposed is included with the application and advice has not been sought beforehand from WJHBC. We are concerned at the loss of trees in this area of Welwyn Garden City and historic Sherrardspark Wood. We would not have objections, especially to the feeling of the cedar, only if WHBC is satisfied that the work is necessary and that felling/ pruning is the only solution. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
113 Oakdale, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E20/1954	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce 1 x Lawson Cypress by 4m 113 Oakdale Welwyn Garden City	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.

				AL8 7QS TREES	On the basis of the information in this application we have no objection to the proposed tree works. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Belvoir Castle	Leicesters hire	E20/1851	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Engineering works required for the safe and effective operation of Knipton Reservoir Knipton Reservoir Branston Lane Knipton HYDRO	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.03.2021 Thank you for sending the Gardens Trust (GT) details of the above application once we realised that you had failed to consult us. The application site lies within the Grade II* Registered Park & Garden (RPG) of Belvoir Castle which was largely laid out to a 1780 plan by Capability Brown. The reservoir, which lies in the southern part of the parkland, was constructed between 1994 and 1797. We have liaised with Steffie Shields, the Capability Brown expert, and our response draws on her extensive knowledge of the site. Whilst the GT fully understand the need for extensive engineering works, we do have real concerns we wish to raise. Firstly, it is our understanding that the work to remove the 16 trees went ahead before the proposals/planning notices were even published, which, together with the 'late in the day' consultation with the GT, is concerning. It has been reported to us that in addition to the specified sycamores, that some old yews were also taken down which would have been specifically planted to provide year-round screening of the reservoir spillway engineering from the ridings. It is hoped that some yews will be included in the appropriate replacement planting once the works have been completed. Arcadis Landscape Report January 2021, Para 3.2.1. states that 'Landscape integration is a key consideration within the design of the scheme.' In our opinion, these proposals are far from subtle and do not sit well with the existing rustic charm of the stone-capped, slightly curving brick bridge over the original spillway. The model drawing, 3D Diagrammatic Model Drawings 10032945-ARC-XX-00-DR-CE-0081-P02 3D Diagrammatic Model of Spillway, shows a mish-mash of materials. Hence, rather than softening the look of the hard-engineering, the timber fencing/ and timber post hand railing looks 'bitty' and inappropriate with the sleek steel railing and 'modern spillway engineering'. Perhaps an extension of the steel railing either side of the bridge instead of the timber fencing, might prove less intrusive and more aesthetically pleasing, especially if accompanied by low-growing shrubs on the slopes either side of the spillway. Therefore, the GT

					<p>would ask the design engineers to look again at the overall design and materials for the re-modelling of the modern spillway.</p> <p>The original spillway bridge</p> <p>We appreciate the safety aspects for the laying of grasscrete at the crossroads north of the original spillway bridge, and that they would prevent churning up by vehicles and heavy equipment. However, once the engineering works have been completed, we would hope that more appropriate re-surfacing could be undertaken, perhaps in conjunction with 'the resurfacing of the Croxton Avenue along the crest of the dam with the use of a 'buff' surface treatment to match in with existing material palette of the park and garden'. As far as is possible this should be restored in keeping with original riding surfaces, especially because at this junction 'the aesthetical and heritage value of the heritage setting is considered to be high.'</p> <p>The original dam engineering was very successfully disguised by its location round the bend of the causeway, and also by dense plantation on the back of the dam which has stood the test of time. It is to be hoped that the landscaping to be done by Belvoir Estate, once the necessary engineering works are completed, will help towards a more subtle integration with the existing bridge and the necessary new structures. In addition to the recommended tree-planting, we would recommend the additional use of yews and shrubs such as Portuguese laurels in particular, either side of the modern spillway and both Drawdown Outfall and Feeder Syphon outfall, (see 10032945-ARC-XX-00-DR-CE-0082-P02 3D Diagrammatic Model of Drawdown Outfall and 10032945-ARC-XX-00-DR-CE-0083-P02 3D Diagrammatic Model of Feeder Syphon Outfall.)</p> <p>Steffie Shields has indicated that she would be happy to meet the Project Manager on site to discuss the T's concerns and to discuss the landscaping.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
South Ormsby Park	Lincolnshire	E20/1723	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration of existing lake, associated landscaping and erection of railings and fencing to a maximum height of 1.2m.</p> <p>ORMSBY HALL, BRINKHILL ROAD, SOUTH ORMSBY, LOUTH, LN11</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. Due to lockdown restrictions we have been unable to undertake a site visit,</p>

				8QS LANDSCAPE	<p>and have therefore had to rely on a desk-based assessment using the documentation provided. We have read the online reports and it is clear the custodians have taken a great deal of care with this planned project, with the best interests of the parkland, lake and listed Hall at heart. Much work needs to be done to undo ill-chosen 'fixes' made in the past, including inappropriate use of concrete. It appears that these anomalies are to be rectified and replaced with more environmentally friendly materials, bringing back the landscape to something far closer to its original design intent.</p> <p>Three trees are to be taken out for legitimate arboricultural reasons, some self-seeded saplings will be removed at the water's edge together with some canopy pruning and some replacement trees will be planted.</p> <p>We are supportive of this remedial work.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E20/1909	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Consent to Display - 4 no. non-illuminated hoarding signs at existing roundabout.</p> <p>JUBILEE CLOCK TOWER, TOWER ESPLANADE, SKEGNESS ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.03.2021</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 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with GT in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. LGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Jubilee Clock Tower in the heart of Skegness is an iconic and memorable feature, built to commemorate Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, and overlooking Tower Gardens, which are Grade II on Historic England's Register of Parks and Gardens. The Register records: 'Throughout this development Jenkins never lost sight of the special importance in the overall scheme of the foreshore of the clock tower. When the pier was finally lost to the sea in 1984 the clock tower assumed an even greater importance. Built in 1899 by Edmund Winter of Liverpool to mark Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, it remains the town's most notable landmark.'</p> <p>Therefore LGT consider any signage on the surrounding roundabout would be inappropriate and a distracting eye-sore – and would be harmful to the views of both the landmark Jubilee Clock Tower and Tower Gardens. Therefore, Lincolnshire Gardens Trust object to this proposal.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Chairman Lincolnshire Gardens Trust
Rackheath Hall	Norfolk	E20/1880	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline permission for up to 43 dwellings and 2) Change of use of land for public open space &amp; connecting cycle/pedestrian routes</p> <p>Land At Home Farm, Rackheath Park, Rackheath, NR13 6LP</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.03.2021</p> <p>Historic England (HE) have drawn our attention to the proposed residential development on land at Home Farm which forms part of Rackheath Park. As the remit of HE does not include non-designated designed landscapes or those not listed at Grade I and Grade II*, it will not comment in this instance.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for Registered parks and gardens at all grades and takes an interest in locally listed or otherwise non-designated designed landscapes. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Rackheath Park, a post medieval designed landscape park which has medieval origins, is a non-designated heritage asset and any further harm to its significance is worthy of some weight. A large portion of the Park is now separated for ever by the new Broadland Northway (NDR) road which opened in 2019. The site of the proposed residential development is predominantly arable land today but retains significant perimeter woodland and until the mid 20th century was parkland.</p> <p>Clearly, the developer has been very thorough in the design, density and placement of this development. We acknowledge the reduction made to the number of proposed dwellings from 92 to 43, the use of traditional design, the retention of woodland, proposed biodiversity enhancements, new hedgerow planting to the east and west boundaries, the addition of new pedestrian and cycle rights of way, and the open space being offered for public use. All these are positive contributions to offsetting the detrimental impact of the development.</p> <p>A careful evaluation of the pros and cons lead us to conclude that the overall impact of the proposed residential development will be detrimental to the integrity and character of Rackheath Park and its wider setting. We offer the following analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development is substantial both in number of homes and the extent of the site. It would detrimentally impact the openness of the parkland.</li> <li>• The development would be apparent from the approach road to the hall and, because of its relatively prominent and elevated position, probably from the Rackheath Hall itself, a Grade II listed building. In this, we</li> </ul>

					<p>question the view expressed in the Heritage Impact Assessment that “views of the site from the Hall and vice versa are not possible due to separation distance and vegetation”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The setting of the proposed site is very sensitive to change as the park lodges and Victorian Golden Gates are located at the northern edge, on the Wroxham Road, close to the new entrance to the proposed site.</li> </ul> <p>We understand that Historic England have had engagement regarding the Greater Norwich Local Plan, and have made clear that land to the west of the A1270 (Broadland Northway or NDR) should only be used for open space to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance the significance of the Grade II Listed Rackheath Hall and Bridge.</p> <p>Broadland Council’s Area Action Plan (AAP) recognises Rackheath Park as an important heritage and landscape asset which contributes to creating a landscape setting to the edge of Norwich. The AAP defines a significant area within the new NDR (including the whole of Rackheath Park) to be preserved to maintain this landscape setting.</p> <p>In our view the proposed residential development would have a significant adverse effect on the function of the area as a landscape setting to the future built edge of Norwich. The benefits offered in terms of improved public access are not sufficient to outweigh the harm.</p> <p>Rackheath Park should be preserved in its entirety for its value as a heritage landscape as well as its important contribution to the landscape buffer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung 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 08.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting the Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens at Scarborough, a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT, and as before, is replying on behalf of both organisations.</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 and we refer you to our letter of 4th February.</p> <p>We have examined the Landscape Plan dated 5th February and have the</p>

					<p>following comments to make:</p> <p>We are unsure as to the usefulness of the 900mm high close boarded timber fence onto Valley Gardens south of the new 3-storey apartment block. It seems an odd height. If a fence is installed, we suggest that the upright supports are hardwood or are treated against rot.</p> <p>The timber decking to the sunken gardens is immediately north/northwest of the former educational building and will get very limited light even in the summer. Timber decking harbours rodents, becomes greasy and slippery, covered in algae and moss and needs regular maintenance. We suggest using 100mm hardcore with 75mm of self-binding gravel to interlock above, in place of decking. This should be a weed-free solution. Or alternatively pavers that mirror those used elsewhere.</p> <p>There are several small, if not tiny, green circles and starbursts suggesting new plantings but we have been unable to find any details on the landscaping plan. It will be most important that the species/varieties chosen are salt and wind hardy (plants of New Zealand origin are generally good) and we suggest using plants that are successfully grown in Scarborough.</p> <p>We are generally concerned about the impermeable nature of the surfaces. Tarmac is NOT permeable and will compromise the health of the park's trees. Given potential issues with the steepness of the valley and the increasing incidence of torrential rainfall, increasing water run-off from this new development would be something to avoid. We advise that the drive/parking areas should be completely permeable eg by using at least 150mm hardcore with 100mm self-binding gravel for vehicle routes including bin, removal lorries and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The Arboricultural Statement notes that tree and shrub planting would mitigate the loss of 8 trees but we have not seen any details. Similarly, we have not noted any details regarding how the trees are to be safeguarded during the building work and advise that root protection areas should be specified prior to any work on site.</p> <p>We also have concerns that the trees within the registered park and garden that overhang the car parking area, may be deemed a nuisance by some residents who may ask for severe pruning or indeed removal. We advise that these trees need to be safeguarded.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					Yorkshire Gardens Trust
Hackfall	North Yorkshire	E20/1761	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Display of 3no. non-illuminated information signs.</p> <p>Car Park At Hackfall Woods Swinton North Yorkshire</p> <p>ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.03.2021</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 – Hackfall at grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden at Hackfall has exceptional heritage significance as an internationally important historic designed landscape. The Hackfall pleasure grounds laid out c. 1749 to 1760’s by William Aislabie is strongly linked with the World Heritage Site and grade I registered historic park and garden, Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey. Hackfall is one of only nine historic park and gardens in the whole of Yorkshire at grade I. Only c.10% of all registered historic parks and gardens are at grade I which is an added measure of Hackfall’s importance.</p> <p>We support public access and enjoyment, and the provision of information and interpretation of such a significant historic park and garden as well as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is important for everyone visiting. We have no objection to the installation of the three non-illuminated information signs.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Bestwood Pumping Station	Nottinghamshire	E20/1728	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retention of external works, including extension to carpark, new fencing within the site, new footpath, new electrical feeder pillars and new external timber ancillary buildings.</p> <p>Lakeside Mansfield Road</p> <p>PARKING, BOUNDARY, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The proposals are for the retention of work and development that has been in part completed. As such the following comments are provided based on demonstrable impacts that have occurred to the designated grade II registered designed gardens of Bestwood Pumping Station. The proposals are accompanied with a ‘Design and Heritage Statement’ prepared by DL Design Studio of Nottingham. This document contains a</p>

					<p>reasonable summary of the significance of the registered parkland, however, it does not include a detailed assessment of the elements of the gardens and parkland that date to the original C19th scheme. There is no tree survey or plant identification, the original paths are not properly described, and generally there is a complete lack of a proper examination of the 'careful design' and 'ornamental effect' that is correctly referred to as contributing to the heritage value.</p> <p>The Design and Heritage Statement attempts to justify the various piecemeal developments (some of which have been partially installed) but does not explain how they are designed to enhance or reveal the original significance of the gardens. In fact, the proposals are mostly undeferential to the Victorian scheme, the planting, layout and hard landscaping. The new insertions pay very little homage to the wonderful C19th garden and parkland. There are one or two aspects that seem to attempt some reference, such as the use of the metalwork design, from the original roof detail, for the steps towards the Santa's Grotto and barriers to the decking. Generally the choice of materials has been made without any attempt to match to the original C19th scheme. The replacement deck material does not appear to be real wood and the Prosecco bar and Santa's Grotto are DIY-store type structures of absolutely no merit in this location. The overall impression of these proposed new elements is not one of careful consideration to enhance the special character of the Victorian scheme. In our opinion, the financial investment represented will erode and cause harm to the special interest of the gardens, when a better designed, more sensitive approach could benefit the designated heritage.</p> <p>We must very strongly object to the proposed fenced wedding garden. Apart from the very significant impact on the setting of the grade II* pumping station, the fencing of this type and scale is a totally inappropriate introduction and will most clearly harm, not enhance the registered parkland. Maybe an area of planting such as a beech hedge or a more decorative Victorian inspired approach would achieve a similar end?</p> <p>The additional carparking to the north is completely unjustified. There is no explanation, business case or attempt to demonstrate the need for more parking. It is absolutely unacceptable that poor schemes of the past (such as the abortive hotel idea) are used as leverage for allowing parking instead. The area in question has been stripped of trees that were part of the original Victorian planting scheme, these should be reinstated and (maybe) some additional parking might be accommodated within that, but</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>it should be an area of trees in the first instance, not a carpark.</p> <p>The whole scheme desperately requires a proper sensitive plantsman lead approach. Focussing on reinstating and celebrating the remaining Victorian scheme. It may be possible, with a carefully considered and extensive planting scheme, that some of the harm caused by the prosecco bar and proposed Santa's Grotto could be mitigated to the point of acceptability. But these types of structure will not, and never could, enhance the heritage interest or significance of the registered parkland.</p> <p>We would be happy to advise further with regards to a better-informed approach to the investments that are being made for the site, but in their present form must raise very serious objections to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Longner Hall	Shropshire	E20/1192	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a two storey rear extension, amendments to fenestration and formation of a parking and turning area</p> <p>Tower House, Berwick Wharf, Uffington, Shrewsbury, Shropshire. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding notice of the above amended proposals for this property.</p> <p>We are pleased that the applicant has responded to earlier comments relating to proposed alterations to this building and has come back with a modified proposal showing a single storey proposed extension to the north and east side of the building. This will likely be an improvement to its exterior elevation in that direction which will modify its impact as seen from the nearby Grade II* Registered Attingham Park and from the Grade II Listed 'Gothic Lodge', also within Attingham Park.</p> <p>While viewing the amended proposals however, we noticed a couple of details which had been missed previously and which we would like now to bring to your attention.</p> <p>Both the original and modified proposals plans include a proposal for an 'Existing Garage building repaired', to the east of the Tower House itself. There is in fact, no such building existing, as visible in Figure 1 below:</p> <p>Figure 1: View from the public road of the driveway to Tower House, showing no existing 'garage' building.</p> <p>Viewing the site on 'Google Earth' shows there was formerly a small 'shed', near to the proposed location (see Figure 2, aerial dated June 2018) but that appears to have been removed some time ago and also it seems to have been too small to have been a 'garage', as there is (helpfully) a car parked next to the building in the aerial photograph, and it doesn't look like it would have fitted easily inside the 'shed'.</p>

					<p>Figure 2: Aerial view (from Google Earth) of the Tower House, dated June 2018. A small 'shed' is visible to the west of the access drive to the Tower House, with appears to have been a brown, single-pitch corrugated iron roof to the north and an area of 'hard standing' to the south. The adjacent car suggests that the building was too small to have been a garage. Note also the former arrangement of the access drive from the road, which has recently been substantially altered.</p> <p>We noticed also some discrepancies between the layout of what is termed 'existing access retained' and both what has actually been done there and what is proposed – again see the images above. We would like to see the layout as shown in Figure 2 above to be reinstated.</p> <p>If indeed it is really necessary to have a garage for the Tower House (given that, in common with so many 'garages', it will in practice never be used for that purpose), we would like to see this located to the north of the building, and thoroughly screened from view.</p> <p>We would also expect in due course to see proposals submitted through the normal planning routes for the scale, location and design of such a proposed building, especially given the enhanced sensitivities of this site. As it stands, we would object to a garage building of the scale proposed in the current location.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Chetwynd Park	Shropshire	E20/1934	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 1no. detached oak framed car port and open porch to front elevation of dwelling Meese View, 7 Chetwynd Park, Chetwynd, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8AE BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Shropshire Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and have no comments regarding the proposed porch.</p> <p>However, the proposal for the car port lies within an area at the very edge of the boundary of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Chetwynd Park, albeit now separated from the park proper, but part of the former Stables complex. Although the proposed development area itself is just outside the RPG boundary it is immediately adjacent and there are a number of listed buildings &amp; structures within the Stables area. The proposed car port is quite big in footprint, especially considering that there</p>

					<p>is already something that looks like a garage associated with the property, nearby. The proposed car port is located within a group of trees and will probably be screened by them. In these circumstances, although the GT/SGT does not actually wish to sustain an objection, we would like some note to be made of the number of Listed Buildings in the area and the possible effects of the development on their Setting. We suggest that a view/opinion/comment is obtained from Historic England regarding this aspect.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Ammerdown House	Somerset	E20/1740	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed conversion of outbuilding to form single dwelling house. Ammerdown House Radstock Lodges To Ammerdown House Kilmersdon Frome Radstock BUILDING ALTERATION, CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.03.2021</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. 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 for the above application. The Heritage Statement would appear to rely solely on the Historic England listing with very little analysis of how the building fits into the wider context of the site. Most of the proposals relate to internal alterations which do not relate directly to the wider landscape. However, we would like to comment on the proposed car parking area. There are already a lot of parking spaces very close to the house, and we would question the need for two further parking slots in an area currently set to lawn and garden. In our opinion adding further car parking spaces would negatively affect the approach to the rear of the house and clutter the spaces adjacent to the proposed building works.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Barnes Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/1778	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of timber framed glasshouse and erection of glasshouse with aluminium frame Barnes Hall , Bracken Hill, Sheffield, S35 1RD</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021</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 included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in</p>

				DEMOLITION, GLASSHOUSE	<p>respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Barnes Hall, Grenoside was recommended for Inclusion in the Local Schedule of Historic Parks and Gardens as part of the UDP Policy Background Paper No 4 1997, Sheffield's Historic Parks and Gardens. The first Barnes Hall, dating from the fifteenth century, was situated south of the present hall which was constructed in 1824 (Listed Grade II) by a William Smith Esq. He created a large residence in a parkland setting with main prospects to the south east and south west. Typical features of the grounds included a ha-ha, walled garden, entrance lodge and driveway, and woodland belts. The hall formed part of a group of buildings including stable block, home farm and outbuildings.</p> <p>We understand that the grounds at Barnes Hall represents one of the best remaining examples of its type in the City of Sheffield, of an early 19th Century designed landscape with typical parkland character. The grounds also form the setting of the listed Hall and other listed buildings such as the dovecote.</p> <p>The existing wooden glasshouse is situated immediately to the west of the Hall facing south west. We note its interesting metal structural supports and brackets, and query whether it may have been constructed by a notable manufacturer such as Richardson of Darlington or Messenger &amp; Co of Loughborough. We are sorry that it is going to be lost. The proposed metal replacement, powder coated green is reasonably faithful in design but we note that the existing glasshouse does not have a dentil ridge. The latter was often a Victorian embellishment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Sheffield General Cemetery	South Yorkshire	E20/1781	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Stabilisation works and repair of stone catacombs, regrading of ground, landscaping works and installation of balustrades</p> <p>The Gatehouse, Sheffield General Cemetery, Cemetery Avenue, Sheffield, S11 8NT</p> <p>CEMETERY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Sheffield General Cemetery, registered at grade II* on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We refer to our letter of 6th January responding to the previous applications: 20/04142/FUL 20/04297/LBC which we strongly support. We commend the heritage statement/documentation with these applications</p>

					and we consider that the proposed work to the cemetery and catacombs will result in minimal harm to their significance. We trust that your Authority's conservation staff will be giving further advice as appropriate. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Cannon Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/1815	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of rear brick section of North Range Glass House into day training room. Installation of two storage tanks and LPG tank in Slip Garden. Installation of external lighting (listed building consent) Cannon Hall Museum, Bark House Lane, Cawthorne, Barnsley, S75 4AT</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.03.2021</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 included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, in this case Cannon 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>John Spencer was responsible for extensive works on the house (listed grade II*) and grounds in the 1760's, which were executed to designs by Richard Woods (1716-93) who produced a map showing his proposals in 1760. The kitchen garden is shown on Wood's plan. The gardener's house (listed grade II) is situated in the south-west corner, and the south wall is listed grade II with the Camellia House. The family were nationally important figures, very notable gardeners and Cannon Hall holds the National Collection of Pears.</p> <p>The North Range Glasshouse was probably built by Walter Spencer Stanhope, John Spencer's nephew and heir. It lies within the north of the walled garden. The walled garden is part of the visitor attraction of Cannon Hall Park, which with the house, now a museum, was sold to Barnsley Council in 1951 and became a community heritage asset and country park. The North Range Glasshouse has been derelict for many years, and is to be brought back into use as a day horticulture and crafts training room in conjunction with replacement glass house approved in a previous consent. (As far as we are aware the Gardens Trust was not notified of this planning application).</p> <p>We have found that the drawings for this planning application do not well explain the context. Nevertheless, we have noted the repair and new use for the rear brick section of the North Range Glasshouse, and note that practically this will entail the removal of the Beeston boiler and associated infrastructure. This is regrettable however we trust that all the structures and their location will be carefully recorded and that as much of the</p>

					<p>elements of the heating installation will be retained as artefacts and for any future exhibition or training purposes.</p> <p>We are concerned about the location of two storage units and LPG tank in the nearby Slip Garden. The Slip Garden is an integral and important part of the whole of the kitchen garden's significance. And this is particularly true at Cannon Hall where, as we have noted, the family were notable gardeners. The fact that the storage units and LPG tank will not be seen by the general public is not a justification for an intrusion in an old walled garden, and there are no drawings to show the area around them. We consider that they could be integrated better with some planting, and maybe reposition the gas tank further from the gate. This whole work is an opportunity to improve the area to enable those using the training room to appreciate that traditionally the Slip Garden was a plant powerhouse for the walled garden and pleasure grounds.</p> <p>We note that the roof to the containers will be modified to provide a parapet within which biodiverse roofs planted with a meadow will be introduced. This will be a mix based on local native flora. We suggest that some maintenance will be required to keep it in good condition. This includes cutting it back in about July, depending on the season, to reduce the vigour of the grasses and allow sufficient light for the flowering plants to compete with the grasses again the following spring.</p> <p>We understand that the lighting will not be intrusive and do not have any comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E20/1368	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Planning Application. Erection of 2no dwellings (consisting of one new dwelling and a revised proposal for plot one of planning permission B/16/01406). Land South Of Chilton Grove, Waldingfield Road, Chilton, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 0PR. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.03.2021</p> <p>Further to our original response to the above application of 2nd December 2020 we would like to concur with your Heritage Officer's subsequent comments about the adverse effect the current development would have upon the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Chilton Hall which lies directly across the road from the application site.</p> <p>I must apologise for inaccurately stating that we were not notified about applications DC/19/03327-31. I have no idea how this oversight occurred. In 2019 I covered the whole of England as the sole conservation officer for the Gardens Trust in two days a week, so they clearly slipped through the net. If I had been aware of these applications the GT would certainly have objected.</p>



					<p>We continue to be extremely concerned about the applicant's disregard of undertakings made particularly in respect of the destruction of the hedgerow and removal of screening trees. We concur with all the comments made by the Chilton Parish Council (CPC) and those of Lady Hart of Chilton. The suburbanisation of the formally rural site, and the fact that Babergh already has (as of November 2020) a current housing land supply of 6.7 years, means we are unable to support the revised proposal for further housing on this unsuitable site.</p> <p>Lady Hart and CPC have enumerated the various NPPF and local plan policies this application contravenes, crucially that the proposal would not meet the requirements of Local Plan policy CN06 as well as policies CN14 and CN06. CN14 is also one of the saved local policies which provides that 'development in or adjacent to registered historic parks or gardens listed in the national register which would lead to the erosion of the character, appearance or setting will be refused.' We therefore maintain our strong objection as laid out in our letter of last December.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E20/1948	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey garage. The Lodge Chilton Grove Waldingfield Road Chilton Sudbury Suffolk CO10 0PR GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.03.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has just been made aware of the above application. It does not appear that Babergh informed the GT, despite our statutory role with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application, and the fact that we have regularly responded to applications affecting the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Chilton Hall. I can see online that although the closing date for responses has passed, the application is not yet decided, so I would be glad if you could please include this letter of objection in your decision process.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and although there is a Planning and Heritage Statement (P&amp;HS) this does not appear to acknowledge that there will be any impact at all upon the adjacent RPG, focussing solely on Grade II* Chilton Hall. The Grade II listed RPG is situated directly across the road from the application site, separated only by the width of the road. The application documents do not provide a statement of significance for the RPG which is required by the NPPF Para 189. The RPG is currently a tranquil place which has already been compromised by the approval of DC/17/04052 and the enormous increase in traffic that will</p>

					<p>bring to Waldingfield Road. The further loss of trees and hedging and increased urbanisation compounds this harm. The GT would urge your local authority to bear in mind the way in which the setting and approach to the RPG currently affects its significance. You will be familiar with Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, (2nd edition, Dec 2017) (SHA) assessment checklist suggests that one considers the significance of the heritage assets : Chilton Park (II RPG), the wall around the walled garden (Grade II) and Chilton Hall (II*) and then establishes the contribution made by their setting. The checklist lists mentions factors such as 'Green space, trees and vegetation; Openness, enclosure and boundaries; Surrounding landscape or townscape character; noise, vibration and other nuisances; tranquility; Accessibility, ... and patterns of movement'. Further urbanisation of Waldingfield Road will negatively affect all these characteristics, and therefore detract from the setting and significance of the RPG. The SHA states (para 35) 'it would be helpful for local planning authorities to consider at an early stage whether development affecting the setting of a heritage asset can be broadly categorised as having the potential to enhance or harm the significance of the asset.' The GT considers that the current proposal is without doubt harmful to the significance of the heritage assets. It is contrary to NPPF Para 192c as this new development does not make 'a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.' We also consider that this application fails NPPF Para 195's public benefit test, as the loss of significance will achieve no public benefit.</p> <p>The P&amp;HS claims (Para 6.7) that the garage is 'subservient in scale to the Lodge'. The accompanying illustration shows a view of the enormous 14m x 7m structure covered in olive green profiled sheeting, to be conspicuously longer than The Lodge, conveniently shown in the same frame, and by an accompanying photograph below. The utilitarian, industrial garage building - Drawing 1846/20/02 dated January 2021 - shows the structure within a newly enlarged fenced garden spilling beyond the current garden into what is currently woodland along the B1115 Waldingfield Road. The existing shed is still in place, so there is no obvious access route for vehicles unless the smaller shed is to be demolished. It is to be greatly regretted that the new consented buildings to the north and east of the site will irrevocably change the setting of the RPG, and this industrial style proposal would in our opinion, compound that harm. We are also puzzled by Para 3.4 which states that the applicant has submitted a private Statement of Need for the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>planning officers when deciding this application. If this building is merely to be a private garage for the occupants of The Lodge it is vastly oversized, and if the Statement of Need indicates a commercial requirement for the building, we would have even greater concerns.</p> <p>Chilton Parish Council and Lady Hart of Chilton have enumerated the many ways in which this application breaches both the NPPF and notably the 'saved' heritage-specific policies of the Local Plan (2006) within Babergh's Development Plan (BDP) in their letters of objection. We concur with their observations. Policy CN06 (BDP) states that proposals for new work within the setting of a listed building should retain a setting which is appropriate to the listed building and the relationship with its surroundings, and should respect those features which contribute positively to the setting of a listed building including space, views to and from the building, and historic layout. Policy CN14 goes on to say that development in or adjacent to parks and gardens of historic or landscape significance (listed in the National Register of statutorily protected historic parks and gardens) which would lead to the erosion of their character, appearance or setting will be refused. Both these policies these are applicable in this instance. We do not feel that the proposals satisfy the criteria of NPPF Para 194 which requires proposed developments to demonstrate clear and convincing justification for the harm caused to designated heritage assets. There is also no obvious public benefit to this proposal so it does not comply with NPPF para 196.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hampton Court	Surrey	E18/1384	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>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</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2021</p> <p>We greatly welcome your recent letter now available on the Elmbridge Council website and it is clear that HRP share our concerns about the visibility of the proposed new buildings. You will almost certainly have read our 2nd recent letter where we also mentioned the health of the horse chestnut trees and what a huge difference it would make should they succumb to disease and open-up the vista from Hampton Court and its surrounding registered park and garden (RPG).</p> <p>We would be very interested to see your landscaping proposals commissioned from Todd Longstaff-Gowan in 2015, although these were prepared before the current higher scheme was submitted, and it is surprising that nothing more seems to have been said about them. We</p>

				<p>Hampton Court Motors. Jolly Boatman and Hampton Court Station Redevelopment Area, Hampton Court Way, East Molesey, Surrey KT8 9AE. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>strongly believe that the current trees in front of the proposed development are inadequate as a screen for it. In addition should this proposal be given planning consent and the horse chestnut trees succumb to disease or become dangerous and need felling, the resultant harm would be enormous and evident for many decades, which would be disastrous for such an internationally important site.</p> <p>We have been more forthright in objecting than HRP, but since your detailed comments relating to the Wire Frame views correspond to what we have also raised, we wondered whether you might be willing to discuss a joint strategy for what I hope you will agree is a very damaging proposal? Throughout this consultation, we have been fortunate enough to be able to liaise directly with Dr Sarah Rutherford who has just completed the attached HIA and knows the site well. I feel sure that HRP would also welcome the expertise she brings to the table. Would it be possible for Dr Rutherford and me to meet you on site in the gardens, particularly the Privy Garden and Pond Garden, to discuss our assessment of the effect on these crucial views and confirm the effect of the likely damage?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2021</p> <p>Further to the Gardens Trust's letters of 11th February 2019 and 22nd January 2021, I am attaching a Historic Impact Assessment for the above planning application, written by Dr Sarah Rutherford. It amplifies and confirms the previous objections set out in these letters. It includes a Statement of Significance for Cigarette Island Park which shows that it is of sufficient importance to be added to the Local List submitted to Elmbridge. Elmbridge has been asked to do this as part of the determination of the planning application (as set out in Local List guidance by Historic England) but has not recognized the urgency of the request.</p> <p>This HIA clearly demonstrates that the proposal will cause substantial harm to the setting of a great number of heritage assets ranging from international to local significance and the application should be refused. We would be very grateful if you could please add this to the statutory consultee comments online for this application and upload evidence that the council has asked the applicants to respond to this objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Hampton Court	Surrey	E20/1915	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Development of part three, part four-storey buildings to create 78 residential units (C3) and ground floor unit (317 sqm) within Building A for offices (B1) with associated car parking, cycle parking and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings. Units 1 &amp; 2 Hampton Court Estate, Summer Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey KT7 ORG RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, PARKING, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2021</p> <p>The above appeal notice has come to the attention of The Gardens Trust (GT) rather late in the day. Despite being statutory consultees with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens, we were not notified of the original application by Elmbridge. The Grade I registered park and garden(RPG) of Hampton Court Palace lie some 3-400m from the application site across the river and the proposals have an effect upon its setting. We would like to offer the following comments to assist the Inspector.</p> <p>In our opinion this appeal should be refused because of the damaging effect of the development on views south from key areas of Hampton Court Palace and its Grade I Registered grounds.</p> <p>In particular we would like to draw the Inspector's attention to information in the following document, the Statement of Case – AVR &amp; CC Views. We consider the accuracy of the wire line visualisations it presents is in considerable doubt and because of this the magnitude of the effects presented are wrong. For example, in view B summer &amp; winter wirelines the placement of the wirelines is apparently too far north (too far right in the image) and they seem to relate to the Unit 3 site adjacent and nearer the station, rather than the appeal site. The wirelines also appear to be placed below the actual level of the true building height thus reducing the magnitude of impact that is presented. We believe that the buildings will rise above the tree canopy which is not the impression given in the visualisations. In addition, wire line visualisations are inadequate in their representation of the full impact of the development which should be shown as block visualisations.</p> <p>Considerable harm will be caused to the setting of Hampton Court RPG by views of the c.200m long frontage (of similar length to south side of the Palace itself) which will face the Palace and grounds. It will affect views from the south side of the Palace grounds along the riverside, from the Privy Garden and associated areas. These are indicated in views A-C and E which will be damaged in winter, and possibly view D. [see attached View B wireline over the Privy Garden], and possibly also when leaves are on the trees. These views are highly vulnerable to partial or full loss of the tree screen. We believe that the trees in front of the proposed development site do not provide an adequate screen. In addition, should this proposal</p>

					<p>be given planning consent Research - Conserve - Campaign and the trees succumb to disease or become dangerous and need felling, the resultant harm would be enormous and evident for many decades, which would be disastrous for such an internationally important site. It is unclear to whom the land on which these trees stand belongs and whether any provision has been made to ensure continuity of replanting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E20/1681	II*	<p>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</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.03.2021</p> <p>Further to your email last week I have been in touch with my colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT). The line you have drawn on the photograph is the same one that the NGT used when checking views etc. As you are aware, we are not yet convinced that the views will be screened by extensive woodland, as most of the areas of woodland shown between the hall and the new building are below the eyeline which rises from the hall (40m OD) up to the new building (65 OD). What we crucially need to ascertain is the height of the trees flanking the Bierley Beck valley, as until we know this none of us will know for sure whether the new building would be visible or not.</p> <p>The only way to ascertain this for certain is to have a survey of tree heights which is then imposed on a landscape section from the Hall to the new building. If it really is impossible to gain access to Wynyard, surely the simplest solution is to take a photo from the opposite direction, from the new building site looking back towards the Hall? If the Hall cannot be seen then it will mean that the lowest 1.8m of the new building (7.5m high) will not be seen, which is some reassurance.</p> <p>Our particular concern is that when surveying the parkland panorama from the terrace at Wynyard, the eye will naturally be drawn to and led up the wooded valley, which may or may not have a new industrial unit as its focal point. I am attaching two images done by NGT. Both show the zone of visibility but the one labelled tgt+ngt Wynyard shows the tree heights lower down the valley. If the applicant were to plant a full 10m L shaped tree belt as we suggested in our earlier response this would be suitable mitigation.</p> <p>Until the suggestions we have made are acted upon, the matter will remain unclear. We would urge the applicant to carry out this work to set everyone's mind at rest, so that officers are able to determine this</p>

					<p>application in full possession of the relevant details. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.03.2021 Further to our original response regarding Wynard on 26th February, Naomi Teasdale of George F White has been corresponding with us and has provided further images in reply to our queries. I have conferred with my colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust, and from the information provided, specifically image 1303, we are satisfied that the Hall is out of sight and the new building will not harm the parkland. We are therefore happy to withdraw our holding objection. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Gibside	Tyne and Wear	E20/1605	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New gravel path between the walled garden and the Grand Walk. Gibside, Hillhead Lane, Gibside, Whickham NE16 6BG. FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.03.2021 Thank you for your email asking whether we have further comments in light of the new information submitted by the applicants in regard to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and if we accept the inevitability of a hard path where none previously existed, we are glad that at least the applicant has provided samples for your officers to consider. We have no further comments to make. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Charlecote Park	Warwicks hire	E20/0947	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application to extend packhouse and cold storage facility. Old Pastures Farm, Stratford Road, Hampton Lucy, CV35 8BQ. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2021 Thank you for sending The Gardens Trust (GT) the revised LVIA and heritage consultant letter relating to the above application. We have looked at the revised LVIA and whilst views A &amp; B are taken from within Charlecote Park, images within the RPG should have been taken much closer to the application site from the other side of the river, from the far western tip of the RPG beyond Half Moon Spinney. We need to see wire frame outlines to illustrate the silhouette of the proposed packhouse and cold storage facility from areas within the RPG not obscured by tree cover. The LVIA para 5.1.7 says that 'These viewpoints are only accessible from</p>

					<p>areas within Charlecote Park that require payment for entry.’ As you will of course be aware, public access is irrelevant when assessing possible harm caused to the setting of heritage assets. The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (SHA) (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 Part I – Settings and Views, points this out on page 2 : ‘The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.’</p> <p>The GT therefore maintains its previous objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E20/1042	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION REPLACEMENT 5 BED DWELLING AND DETACHED REAR OUTBUILDING. 33 SKIP LANE, WALSALL, WS5 3LL. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.03.2021</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (GT) about amendments to the above application. We have read the new Heritage Statement (HS) which refers to the application as an ‘extension’ on the rear of 33 Skip Lane. This is somewhat disingenuous as the new additions more than double the size of the property – adding a third storey as well as a further 8m in length to the rear of the existing house and widening the building by 1m.</p> <p>In addition, the detached rear ‘outbuilding’ is larger than some people’s entire houses, measuring 10.546m long by 5.6m wide. There is still no indication of where this will sit within the garden. The ‘outbuilding’ has large folding doors (presumably glass) on two sides.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the HS’s assurance that the woodland to the south of the garden prevents views towards Merrions Lodge and is a buffer between the application site and the RPG, we still feel that if this application were permitted other houses elsewhere along Skip Lane, perhaps without the mitigating woodland cover, will follow suit and will be difficult to resist. We would then anticipate subsequent similar over-development of properties in the vicinity which will gradually erode the character and setting of both the RPG and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Your officers will be aware of our original comments. In our opinion, this enormous project is over-development of the site and we remain unconvinced that the application is appropriate immediately within the setting of Great Barr RPG and conservation area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>



Shibden Hall	West Yorkshire	E20/1697	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Installation of glazing to the existing housebody window (Listed Building Consent)  Shibden Hall House Shibden Park  Godley Lane Halifax Calderdale  HX3 6XG  BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.03.2021  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.  Shibden Hall House is a 15th Century and later manor house and is listed grade II*. The landscape park is grade II on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and was laid out for the owner Jeremy Lister in the 1830's when the estate was managed by his daughter Anne Lister.  Shibden Hall House is an important building worthy of great care and we trust that Historic England has been consulted for their advice. We have no further comments to make.  Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--------------	-------------------	----------	----	--	---