



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES APRIL 2021

The GT conservation team received 185 new cases for England 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, 63 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
<b>ENGLAND</b>					
Ashton Court RECONSULTATION	Avon	E21/0303	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of the site to provide residential apartments including affordable housing (social rented and shared ownership) across five buildings between 4 - 9 storeys, townhouses, flexible retail/café space, public realm, landscaping including ecological mitigation measures, access and associated groundworks. Former Railway Depot, Clanage Road, Bristol. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2021 We are grateful for the opportunity to comment further on this application, which has been amended in respect of the proposed layout and the heights of some of the proposed blocks. We have reviewed the further visualisations and addendum to the landscape and visual impact assessment submitted by the applicant. The Trust welcomes the reduction in the height of blocks D and E1 which goes some way to reducing the negative impact on views from the Registered Park and Garden of Ashton Court. However, a greater degree of harm to the setting of the Registered Park and Garden is caused by the poor quality of design. This key gateway site to the city of Bristol deserves the highest quality of architectural design. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers the proposed development has the potential to cause harm to the setting of a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Ashton Court Park, and the setting of a local historic park and garden, Bower Ashton. Avon Gardens Trust therefore objects to the proposed development. Please ensure that The Gardens Trust and Avon Gardens Trust are notified

					of the outcome of this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Park Place, and Temple Combe	Berkshire	E20/1951	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full application for the proposed erection of 3No single storey storage buildings for woodland management/forestry use with porous surfaced hardstanding. Following demolition of existing stables and storage buildings and impermeable hardstandings within existing yard area. Retention of subterranean ground strengthening works adjacent to access track for contractors parking and occasional overspill parking in connection with Estate-wide activities.</p> <p>Woodlands House, Stables, Wargrave Road, Remenham, RG9 2LT</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed planning applications affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire1.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on this planning application within the Grade II* Park Place.</p> <p>I have read the comments from Brigitte Crafer Landscape Architect and pleased to see her concerns about the potential impact of the development on the landscape. She does not however refer to the high level status and significance of Park Place as a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (one of only 8 Grade II* parks in Berkshire) which as a highly valued historic landscape should be considered in the light of NPPF 170 and 172 and NPPF 190 to 196; and your own policies TB21 and TB24.</p> <p>The part of the Park within which the development lies is typical of the parkland character as described in Historic England's citation (included in the Heritage Statement) characterised by wooded slopes (some of which are Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland) below which lie extensive areas of pasture which border the Wargrave Road and the River Thames landscape corridor. This provides an important setting to the main assets of the parkland estate and contributes to the Park as a whole.</p> <p>Given the presence of the existing buildings and extant permissions, we do not consider that the proposed development would result in substantial harm to the Park, but the development should ensure that the landscape measures, upgrading of the road access and building materials do not result in a significant change to the character and appearance or significance of the Park.</p> <p>The Park has suffered from erosion in the past due to piecemeal</p>

					<p>development so it therefore all the more important that any new development conserves and enhances the Grade II* Park in its entirety. In conclusion BGT does not object to this development subject to recognition of the high historic value of the Park and the conditions suggested by Brigitte Crafer Landscape Architect.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Shardeloes	Buckinghamshire	E21/0133	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Conversion of an agricultural building into a single dwellinghouse, with addition of basement level and incorporating hardstanding and landscaping Shardeloes Farm, Cherry Lane, Woodrow, Buckinghamshire, HP7 0QF CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2021 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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The GT/BGT are grateful to Buckinghamshire County, Chiltern and South Bucks area for consulting us on the above application, however, regret that we were not consulted initially on application number PL/19/3959/FA when we might have been able to consider the fundamental principle of conversion of this agricultural structure to residential and the associated impact this might make on the agricultural setting. We note that planning consent for PL/19/3959/FA, the conversion of an agricultural building to residential use, has already been granted, and this new planning application relates to alterations to the approved plans to include a basement. Given that planning consent has already been granted, the GT/BGT have no substantive comments to add to this consultation other than to ask the Planning Authority to ensure that the amenity garden area which might be associated with this conversion does not spread into the adjoining agricultural land and woodland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cheadle Royal Hospital	Cheshire	E20/0388	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and the development of a new hospice facility including</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2021 Thank you for providing the requested additional information and for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p>

			<p>access and landscaping; and  Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for a residential development, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.  St Anns Hospice, 20 St Anns Road North, Heald Green, Cheadle, Stockport, SK8 3SZ.  MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response concerning the detailed application for a new hospice facility which has a material impact on the significance of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Cheadle Royal Hospital. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>The Garden Trust has the following comments/observations regarding the updated information:  Letter to Helen Hodgett (Your ref: DC/076341), 16 March 2021 from Avison Young (04B819709)</p> <p>1st Comment/response: 'Information for the current surfacing...' p.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Garden Trust is pleased to see that the Hospice will 'take on responsibility for the appearance and the upkeep of the existing boundaries along the southern edge'</li> <li>• Additionally, that the entrance will be enhanced, and that there will be a re-stocking of the same tree species' and filling in the gaps.</li> <li>• A tree management plan has been submitted which proposes a remedial works as well as a long-term strategy that includes crown lifting, removal of dead wood and poorly structured limbs along with new planting.</li> </ul> <p>The Garden Trust supports the above proposals.</p> <p>2nd Comment/response: 'Resurfacing works...' p.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work will be limited to the junction. Tyler Grange has submitted a drawing/section that indicates how the tree roots will be protected with a cellular confinement system.</li> </ul> <p>The Garden Trust supports the above proposals.</p> <p>3rd Comment/response: 'As was discussed...' p.3</p> <p>The Garden Trust has no further comment.</p> <p>4th Comment/response: 'The applicant has prepared...' p.3</p> <p>The Garden Trust is pleased that a management plan has been produced. The following are responses to GT recommendations:  1st Response: 'Detailed proposals (for entrance) ...' p.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shown in Addendum C with planting species noted on plant list.</li> </ul> <p>The Garden Trust would recommend a more substantial and structured choice of plants at this entrance.</p> <p>2nd Response: 'Alongside the tree management plan...' p.4</p> <p>The Garden Trust supports the more informal approach to planting in this area, although a greater diversity of plants would improve the area both visually and ecologically.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>3rd Response: 'As set out above...' p.4 The Garden Trust has no comment.</p> <p>4th Response: 'A detailed planting plan...' p.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to comments in 2nd response above</li> <li>• Planting within the carpark could be more reflective of the earlier field boundaries by appropriate species selection. The planting selection/lists for D &amp; N (carpark area) could be more reflective of traditional hedgerow species, and provide a strong visual contrast to the more ornamental planting of adjacent areas.</li> </ul> <p>The Garden Trust appreciates the level of information regarding planting; however, the Trust limits its comments to those areas which are historically significant. This is essentially along the southern boundary and the historic field patterns.</p> <p>5th Response: 'Please refer to the following...' p.4 The Garden Trust has no comment.</p> <p>6th Response: 'Please refer to...' p.5 The Garden Trust supports this proposal.</p> <p>7th Response: 'Any decision notice...' p.5 The Garden Trust supports this in that construction access will not be permitted along the Avenue.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust-Spatial Form and Open Space p.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The historic spatial form will be severely compromised as a result of this development, hence the recommendation to reflect the past structure through the use of appropriate materials.</li> </ul> <p>The Garden Trust has commented on the issue of plant selection in the 3rd Response above. We believe that an adjustment to the planting plan can show more clearly the linear and historic forms more clearly. We recommend that the plant selection, particularly within the carpark area, be reconsidered.</p> <p>Summary: The Gardens Trust continues to support the application but recommends some minor amendments to the planting scheme at the entrance to the southern Avenue, the understory planting along the Avenue and within the carpark.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Muncaster Castle	Cumbria	E21/0018	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Solar panels</p> <p>Muncaster Castle, Muncaster, Ravenglass, CA18 1RQ</p> <p>SOLAR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Muncaster Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>We have considered the information provided in support of the application and concur with the assessment in the Heritage Statement. This formerly open and uninterrupted area of the designed landscape has been eroded through the construction of the Meadow Vole Maze display and exhibition centre in 1997, when it was inserted into the Zoo's Bear Pit dating from the 1970s. In addition, further tree and shrub planting has been undertaken between the exhibition centre and the castle. Thus, this area of the landscape has already suffered a certain degree of harm.</p> <p>We consider that the hard geometric form of the solar panels is likely to be slightly more intrusive than the existing camouflaged green roof of the exhibition centre but unlikely to cause any further significant level of harm to the landscape.</p> <p>Accordingly, we have no objections to the application but would advise that, as a condition of granting any planning permission, some additional low-level planting should be undertaken to the north of the Meadow Vole Maze to reduce any further visual impact when viewed from the castle. We would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of this application in due course.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Renishaw Hall APPEAL	Derbyshire	E20/1832	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2021</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 must apologise for the delay in responding but have finally had an opportunity to study the plans for the above conversion and parking arrangements.</p> <p>Due to current Covid restrictions, we have not been able to make a site visit and so our comments are based entirely on desk-based observations. In addition, the GT is solely concerned with the impact of the proposals upon the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Renishaw Hall and</p>

				CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, DEMOLITION	<p>therefore the internal details affecting the listed stable yard buildings lie outside our remit and we are therefore commenting solely upon the new proposals for carparking.</p> <p>It is clear from the online documentation that the existing parking arrangements on grass adversely affect the setting of the Grade I Renishaw Hall, and limits parking to drier months of the year. The modern agricultural buildings which are to be demolished/partly removed, whilst compatible with their usage, do not enhance the setting of the RPG or Renishaw Hall. The proposed parking area which will be available upon their removal, would appear well screened and as such the GT does not have any objections to the re-siting of the car park in this working area of the farm. We are happy to concur with our colleagues in Historic England that the chosen site has the least impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>Without a site visit it is difficult to envisage how the proposed fencing will look in situ, but in general estate fencing would be our preferred solution. If necessary, further screening could be achieved by carefully chosen landscaping.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cadhay RECONSULTATION	Devon	E16/1666	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel, restoration to agricultural land together with temporary change of use of a residential dwelling to a quarry office/welfare facility at Straitgate Farm, Exeter Road, Ottery St Mary EX11 1LG.</p> <p>MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Cadhay, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The designed landscape forms the designed setting of Cadhay House, which is Listed Grade I.</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 responded to your previous consultations on this proposed development and have set out clear objections to the proposal on the grounds of its unacceptable impact upon the various nationally designated heritage assets at Cadhay.</p> <p>We have reviewed the supplementary documents accompanying this application, and particularly the Report on the hydrogeology at Straitgate Farm for DCC on behalf of Mr Rupert Thistlethwayte (May 2020) prepared</p>

					<p>by the internationally respected expert, Prof Rick Brassington, which we commend to the attention of your Authority in the strongest terms. This report supplements the findings of Prof Brassington's previous report (2019) on the hydrogeology of this site. Both reports highlight the impact of the development on the springs which supply the mediaeval ponds at Cadhay, a significant and essential element of the nationally designated designed landscape. We find the arguments advanced compelling, and the long-term threat to the ground water supply identified gravely worrying.</p> <p>We note with concern that the applicant does not appear to have responded to the fundamental issues raised by Prof Brassington in relation to the impact on Cadhay; and we must advise you that we consider the conclusions advanced in Environmental Impact Assessment chapter 7 and chapter 12 para 264 to be unsustainable. We further advise that, especially in the light of Prof Brassington's most recent study, we find that the assessment of the impact of the proposed development on Cadhay set out in EIA chapter 12 paras 261-267 falls significantly short of the level of detail required by the National Planning Policy Framework (para 189).</p> <p>On the basis of the supplementary documents now provided, we conclude that, if implemented, the proposed scheme would cause more than substantial harm to the Grade II designed landscape at Cadhay, which forms the designed setting for the Grade I house. This level of harm to two, inter-related, nationally designated heritage assets, clearly conflicts with Government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (especially paras 193-195), and with local and County planning policy.</p> <p>In these circumstances we urge your Authority to withhold consent for this highly detrimental proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E20/1971	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Request for a scoping opinion for stover lake silt removal Stover Country Park, Stover FLOOD RELIEF/DRAINAGE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.04.2021 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above request for a scoping opinion which affects Stover Park, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory</p>



					<p>Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have considered the information on your website, including the Sediment Removal of Stover Lake SSSI: EIA Scoping Report (February 2021) prepared by Royal Haskoning DHV and the appended Archaeological Desk Based Assessment.</p> <p>We note that the proposed sediment removal accords with the management polices set out in the Stover Park Parkland Plan (2014). We would advise that the submitted Scoping Report appears to be an appropriate framework within which to conduct the required EIA.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E21/0088	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The subdivision and change of use from use Class B2 (general industrial) to create a use Class B8 (storage and distribution) unit with ancillary offices, elevational alterations, external plant, erection of a guard hut and barriers, a cycle shelter, smoking shelter, a waste dock and canopy, and associated works BOVEY TRACEY - Bct Limited , Old Newton Road CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above request for a scoping opinion which affects Stover Park, 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. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have considered the information on your website, including the Built Heritage Statement (March 2021) prepared by RPS Group.</p> <p>In the light of this information, we conclude that the proposed development would have a less than substantial impact on the Grade II designed landscape of Stover Park, and the associated Grade II* Listed Granite Lodges, or the setting of these heritage assets.</p> <p>We therefore do not wish to raise any objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>

Creedy Park	Devon	E21/0120	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a general purpose agricultural building. Land at NGR 282822 101624 (Creedy Park), Crediton, Devon. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2021</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust only became aware of this application late last night, less than twenty-four hours before the expiry of the consultation period. Our attempts to contact you today in order to secure an extension have unfortunately proved fruitless.</p> <p>This application affects Creedy Park, an historic designed landscape which, as you will be aware, is of particular interest to the Trust, and which is included on the Devon Gazetteer of landscapes of local and regional significance. The park forms the designed setting to Creedy Park, which is Listed at Grade II. We therefore take a serious view of your failure to consult us on this application.</p> <p>Sites of local and regional significance (non-designated heritage assets) are considered by the National Planning Policy Framework (para 197), which states: "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application". We note with concern that the applicant in this case has not provided any assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the non-designated heritage asset of Creedy Park: we would advise that without such information, your Authority is not in a position properly to determine this application.</p> <p>Having reviewed the information on your website, we conclude that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact upon the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park by reason of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The visual intrusion of a large agricultural building within the otherwise open parkland landscape, to the detriment and damage of its special historic interest and character;</li> <li>· The permanent fragmentation and sub-division of the parkland by the introduction of a solid barrier in the form of a Devon hedge bank.</li> </ul> <p>We advise that the significantly greater scale of the proposed structure makes any comparison with the existing cricket pavilion inappropriate and misleading in assessing its impact upon the park landscape.</p> <p>We would also advise that any hope that the proposed Devon hedge bank would be effective in screening or mitigating the adverse visual impact of this building is misplaced.</p> <p>We therefore object to the present proposal, and respectfully urge your Authority not to grant consent for a scheme which, for the reasons set out above, we consider would cause significant harm to this locally and regionally significant heritage asset.</p>
-------------	-------	----------	---	--	---

					<p>We would be obliged if you can please ensure that in future any application affecting Creedy Park is notified to us in a timely manner; it appears that previous applications for development in this area may not have been sent to us for consultation, which, as you will understand, is a matter for serious concern. I look forward to receiving reassurance from you on this point.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
St Giles' House	Dorset	E21/0037	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary use of part of the parkland at St Giles House as a Cloud Nine luxury glamping venue for an eight week period in the years 2021 and 2022. ST GILES HOUSE, WIMBORNE ST GILES, WIMBORNE, BH21 5NA CAMPING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.05.2021</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 Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) who will also be responding independently.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and it is apparent that a great deal of thought has gone into the siting of this major event within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG). We also appreciate that with much event revenue being lost over the past year to Covid closures, this event in 2021 and 2022 for 56 days each year, represents a substantial opportunity for the estate to recoup some of its losses. Having run a similar but smaller event last year under Permitted Development Rights (PDR) the applicant has been able to finesse the above application to cope with the anticipated demand. As with PDR, at the end of the temporary 56-day period, full restoration of the land to its former state is required, so there should not be any retention of car park surfacing, toilet block structures or anything else between periods of usage as a campsite, and the site should be restored to its pristine condition.</p> <p>We are also aware that should your officers allow this application, the glamping period could be extended beyond the PDR limit of 56 days. We would suggest that if your officers are minded to approve the application, you condition the permission to a maximum length of 56 days to minimise long term damage to grass, pathways etc.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

					<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Dorset Gardens Trust [DGT] on this application, as well as the national Gardens Trust [TGT]. We are aware of the comment made by TGT but wish to add our own comments on this application.</p> <p>We have met the applicants on the site for an extensive discussion. From this we are content that the proposal has been well thought through, and we have no objection to the principle to the submission. However, there are some points that the Trust wishes to comment on.</p> <p>The application red line is drawn expansively. The plans indicate a much smaller area for actual use, and we are aware from our meeting that there are areas within the red line that will not be available to the applicants anyway because of agricultural uses and also proximity to St Giles House. These areas are marked on the attached plan. Because of this, and the 2-year time-scale of the submission, we ask that a condition be imposed to restrict the use of the site to the layout in the plans, to prevent the re-siting and re-configuration of the uses on the site without further approval.</p> <p>In terms of more specific issues, the Trust notes that the Heritage Statement identifies that there will be some harm to the registered park, although there is no particular commentary on what this harm might be. There are perhaps two elements to this: physical and non-physical. Physical issues will be –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; the damage to the grassland caused by the continued use of land for tents over a 6/8-week period. This will undoubtedly cause damage – perhaps long-term – due to wear and compaction.</li> <li>&gt; the risk of damage to trees, even if there is some form of protection. One activity area is in fact a wood, which will inevitably be ‘tidied up’ for non-arboricultural reasons and health and safety concerns.</li> <li>&gt; the use of part of the lake for activities perhaps raises issues of its own.</li> <li>&gt; a danger of light pollution if the 6 lighting columns do not have strictly downwards-facing illumination to ensure that there is no wider light pollution.</li> <li>&gt; On the non-physical side, it is difficult to believe that there will not be some noise coming from the site, including music.</li> </ul> <p>We ask that the planning authority considers these issues carefully to assess the extent to which conditions might be imposed to limit these impacts.</p> <p>One specific but important element is the car-park area, which is outside</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the tree belt, and thus very prominent in the wide landscape, particularly from the Knowlton Church complex. We are aware of the proposals for a strong perimeter fencing here, but it may be appropriate for the planning authority to see the full detail and height of this, and to condition it accordingly.</p> <p>The Trust notes that in the Design and Access Statement it is proposed that an updated layout plan for the 2022 use might be submitted for approval in the light of the 2021 operation. The Trust welcomes this, as there may well be changes that can be positively made, which might relate to some of the issues raised above. The Trust asks that, if such changes are contemplated, there is an opportunity for the Trust, and perhaps other heritage bodies, to be party to any discussions that take place.</p> <p>We note that the Gardens Trust refers to the issue of PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT. This does not affect this application per se, but some comment is appropriate. In 2021 the relevant element is Part 4 Classes B and BA, with BA being temporary until the end of the year unless renewed. The Trust's point here is these classes, albeit with different but important wording, refer to the issue of curtilage around buildings, with the temporary BA class concerned specifically with listed buildings. What constitutes 'curtilage' is subjective, but it is not necessarily constrained by inter-visibility. There is a case to say that the proposed site is within the curtilage of St Giles House. We are aware that a smaller glamping operation took place in 2020 on land much closer to the House, but that this site is now part of the area not to be used within the red line because of its proximity to the House.</p> <p>The Trust suggests that it may be useful for the planning authority to consider this issue for present and future reference, and hopes that the perhaps exceptional circumstances of 2020 will not be used as a precedent.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Christopher Clarke for the Dorset Gardens Trust</p>
Syon Park	Greater London	E20/1974	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of seven blocks of three and four storeys to provide 80 residential dwellings and basement, concierge building, car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated works; and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2021 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 read the online documentation and it is apparent that the Park Road allotments are not designated for any kind of development in the</p>

			<p>infrastructure and other structures associated with allotment use.</p> <p>Park Road Allotments, Park Road, Isleworth, Middx TW8 8JF</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>emerging London Borough of Hounslow (LBH) Local Plan. They are designated as Local Open Space within the current Local Plan (to 2030) [Policy GB2]. In addition, the allotments are situated within the Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area (IRCA) with the cemetery to the north currently being recommended for inclusion within the Conservation Area. The 'Guiding Principles' contained within Policy CC4 (ICRA) states that 'development within ICA could have an effect on setting of Syon House. And infills should be carefully designed to minimise bulk and mass . . . in proximity to smaller buildings [Snowy Fielder Way adjacent to proposed blocks is 2 storey houses and care home]. The current application for 3 and 4 storey buildings within the conservation area therefore does not comply with these guiding principles. Hounslow is able to demonstrate a 10-year supply of deliverable housing, so the Park Road proposals are superfluous to requirements.</p> <p>At present there is only low-rise development on either end of Park Road which does not impinge on the Grade I registered park of Syon (RPG). The development will in our opinion, result in an urbanising, physical form at the edge of the Grade I registered park at Syon (RPG), including the Grade II listed perimeter wall of the park, which can still be appreciated as a parkland feature rather than part of an urban development. This development, even if filtered by trees to some degree, will in our opinion, negatively affect the significance of the RPG and its Grade II wall. The new walling shown within the plans around the proposed flats would also make it harder to read the Grade II perimeter wall as a parkland feature and would therefore reduce its significance, increasing the feeling of urbanisation. The tall new buildings would have a negative impact upon the setting of this heritage asset, as well as the Grade II* tower of All Saints Church just to the south of the allotments, which is currently not overshadowed by any building of comparable size or massing to the proposed development.</p> <p>The Park Road allotments and the cemetery provide a buffer from development keeping the south western edge of the RPG free from development. West Middlesex University Hospital is sufficiently distant not to harm the Grade I RPG. The online documentation shows that blocks G1, G2 and G3 will contain 'London Living Rent' (LLR) and London Affordable Rent' (LAR) housing. However, it is very noticeable that these blocks contain no full priced flats and are completely separated from the other part of the development by Church Walk. There are no LLR or LAR</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>apartments at all within the main block of the development which would seem to introduce a level of discrimination into the whole proposal. Your officers will also be aware of 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). There are two statements on p2 of this document which are directly relevant : ‘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 addition ‘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.’ The heritage assets affected here are the Grade I RPG, the Grade II* tower of All Saints Church as well as the Grade II perimeter wall – the first two in particular being especially significant. As you will also be aware, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, (both of which are relevant here), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66(1)). The Courts have interpreted preservation as meaning to keep safe from harm. The statutory duty to have special regard to a listed building means that decision makers should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. The considerable importance and weight applies to all harm, although with greater force the more important the listed building or setting. If harm is identified then there is a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>LBH’s closing statement at appeal for the previous application P/2016/0716 &amp; 00707/E/P111 said that demand for allotments in Isleworth outstripped demand by 1083% (See pages 18-21 on allotments, and pages 21-25 on Metropolitan Open Land). We are also led to believe that there are currently 42 people on the waiting list for an allotment. This is supported by an extract from the Appeal Decision about vacant plots (Para 42) which states that the situation of vacant plots ‘is likely to have come about because of the short duration of the new licenses granted to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>incumbent plot holders and ... because of the uncertainty surrounding the site's future arising from this development proposal as acknowledged by the appellant.' Given the statement above from the Appeal Decision we feel the applicant's claims that many of the plots within the current allotments are vacant or uncultivated, (p62 and p82 of the Design and Access statement) is disingenuous. The 37 current plots have an average plot size of 250 m sq within 1.17ha. The proposed allotments (38) are only 60 m sq each, so approximately a quarter of the size of the current ones. In addition, it is clear that at least four or five of these new, smaller plots will be overshadowed by existing trees, making their cultivation far more difficult with roots and shade. This represents a significant loss of designated open space, contrary to the principles of the IRCA, and will also impinge upon the wider Thameside area. During the pandemic, it has been widely accepted that open space has been crucial to maintaining people's mental health and there has been an enormous resurgence of interest in vegetable growing and gardening in general. With the pandemic still very much to the forefront of everyone's minds, it would seem a very retrograde step to build over a large portion of a much used and long-standing allotment area.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust objects to the above proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Vauxhall Park	Greater London	E21/0082	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed telecommunications installation of 20m post at Fentiman Road, Vauxhall, London, SW8 1QY COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2021</p> <p>I write on behalf of the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust, (trading as the London Gardens Trust - LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. 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.</p> <p>It has come to our attention that there are proposals to erect a 20m high G5 telecommunications mast on Fentiman Road, right on the boundary of Vauxhall Park.</p> <p>This park is on our Inventory due to the site's historic and community significance -</p>



				<p>more details here:  <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=LAM059&amp;sitename=Vauxhall+Park">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=LAM059&amp;sitename=Vauxhall+Park</a>  This park has won a Green Flag for numerous years and has recently undergone a welcome major refurbishment supported by Lambeth Council. It is also included on the Local Heritage List as a designated space of historic interest within the Vauxhall Conservation Area.  We disagree with the developers claim this is permitted development. Regards PART 24, DEVELOPMENT BY TELECOMMUNICATIONS CODE SYSTEM OPERATORS, development is not permitted under Class A part A.1(a) if the installation is 15m above ground level or on a listed building or scheduled monument. As a designated asset within a Conservation Area it is on a par with a listed building. We understand there to be adequate case law which has tested the limits of these rights and that they do not override all other material considerations – heritage protection being such. Neither we, nor the Gardens Trust as Statutory Consultees, were informed by Lambeth or the developers of this proposal. Although you may not consider there is a need for planning permission, The London Gardens Trust does have a case for being consulted on all plans and proposals which potentially impact on the historic landscape or public accessibility in relation to designated parks and gardens and we appreciate your responding with full information by return.  Parks are places of leisure and relaxation – they have provided a vital resource for maintaining wellbeing during the pandemic. Indeed, the park was historically conceived as a place for Lambeth residents to have the opportunity to get away from the then impacts of industrial London. The Trust would like to draw attention to Lambeth Council’s own Local Plan Policy Q23 which expects applicants to retain, preserve, protect, safeguard and where desirable enhance locally listed assets when developing proposals that affect them. The installation of this 5G Mast clearly does not meet this policy and is an inappropriate intrusion into the setting of this heritage asset.  In reference to Vauxhall Park, the Vauxhall Conservation Area Statement (2016) refers to the park as:  “Late 19th century public park, subdivided into a variety of character areas. It has numerous mature trees, a formal garden, lavender garden, children’s playground, tennis courts. The model village, dating from 1949, is particularly noteworthy. A café, in the south west corner is houses in a</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>utilitarian structure (formerly public toilets).”</p> <p>The placement of the mast on Fentiman Road is likely to be highly visible from the model village – the main noteworthy feature of the park and so will also be a detriment to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The LGT therefore OBJECTS to this proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 5G Mast is placed in an inappropriate setting by reason of its height, visual intrusion and detracting from the local character of this significant local public park within a Conservation Area.</li> </ul> <p>Please inform us of your decision once available.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Helen Monger Director London Gardens Trust</p>
Dogmersfield Park	Hampshire	E20/1876	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a single storey commercial building (with part mezzanine) for glass processing and storage and distribution as a mix of Use Class E(g) and Use Class B8 and associated parking and access from the shared existing access off Farnham Road with associated detailed landscape.</p> <p>Fermoy Farnham Road Odiham Hook Hampshire RG29 1HS</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2021</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 read the online documentation and the rationale for refusal of application 20/02410/FUL, the previous application for a commercial building on this site. This was refused amongst other reasons (Design &amp; Access Statement (D&amp;A) Para 3.10) because ‘the previous ‘ad-hoc’ commercial uses referred to ... appear to have been unauthorised.’ This seems to be corroborated by statements within a letter from a neighbour Mr James Todd (JT), who points out that the ‘buildings’ supposed demolished on the site, were in fact unauthorised containers and that the application site had been a belt of woodland on the southern boundary of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Dogmersfield Park, until tree felling by the previous owner. The situation is unchanged. The site is therefore a greenfield site, within the Grade II RPG and consequently requires extremely careful consideration before any further urbanisation of this heritage asset is permitted.</p> <p>There is already a business park immediately to the east of the entrance drive to Fermoy which negatively impacts upon the setting of the RPG. Your officers will be aware of Historic England’s The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3</p>

					<p>(Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 (SHA) where it states on page 2 that :  ‘When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change’ and continues on Page 4 ‘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.’ We would suggest that both are relevant in this instance.</p> <p>The proposed industrial unit has the same footprint as the previous iteration (25m (82’) x 9m (29’6”)) and the only difference is a slight reduction in height (now 5.2m (17’) tall as opposed to 6.45m). This is approximately twice the height of a standard 8’6” shipping container, and it is an extremely large building. Much of the understorey facing the road would appear to have been thinned and this is apparent in the photograph Plate 2 on page 6 of the Heritage Statement (22-33) so despite the applicant’s comments that it will be barely visible, this seems unlikely.</p> <p>The GT/HGT have serious reservations about this proposal and we would suggest that the applicant concentrate their search for alternative premises nearer to Basingstoke where it is apparent that their greatest client base is concentrated (see JT letter).</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Hackwood Park	Hampshire	E20/1912	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Erection of single storey rear extension  The Old Stables Hackwood Lane  Hackwood Park Basingstoke RG25 2JZ  BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2021</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 (LGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and whilst it does not appear that this single storey extension will impact upon the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Hackwood, the applicant has not complied with the requirement to produce a statement of significance or an impact assessment as per the NPPF paras 189 &amp; 190. The Heritage Statement is a misnomer as it contains none of this required information. The dining room within the extension seems very curiously located, as to reach it from the kitchen you have to go down almost the whole long building, past two</p>

					<p>other bedrooms, and walk right through bedroom 1 and the snug before finally arriving in the Dining Room.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hackwood Park	Hampshire	E20/1913	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a shepherds hut for use as home office following demolition of existing shed The Old Stables Hackwood Lane Hackwood Park Basingstoke RG25 2JZ DEMOLITION, GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2021</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 just responded to the applicant's other planning application 20/03436/HSE for a single storey extension to their house, and it would appear that the shepherd's hut is tucked into the gap between the end of the existing house and a hedge, behind the proposed extension with the window of the shepherd's hut facing and close up to the wall of the house. Whilst we have no objection to the installation of a shepherd's hut as a garden office, this does seem rather a curious and claustrophobic place to site it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hackwood Park	Hampshire	E21/0001	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two gates and a post and wire fence Sawmill Yard Hackwood Park Basingstoke Hampshire RG25 2JZ ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2021</p> <p>I am writing further on behalf of Hampshire Gardens Trust to object strongly to these proposals to enclose a substantial portion of land in Hackwood Park which is listed Grade 1 by Historic England. The Gardens Trust has also objected strongly to this application (letter 8 January) although that letter has not yet been added to the record – an omission that has been drawn to your attention by Margie Hoffnung, Conservation Officer of the Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Both the Gardens Trust and Hampshire Gardens Trust noted that the application contained no Heritage Statement. The document subsequently provided by the applicant, dated 22 January, does not address the negative impact of the proposed work on the setting of the Grade 1 listed landscape of Hackwood Park. The heritage statement also states that 'English Heritage found that there would be no adverse impact on the significance of the Registered Park and Garden'. This is not strictly correct: the HE statement was: 'we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest</p>

					<p>that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.' As before, we note that the response from Historic England is disappointing, making consultation with the Gardens Trust and Hampshire Gardens Trust especially important.</p> <p>May I again draw to your attention the relevant statements in the NPPF, of which you will be aware:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NPPF para 189: 'Local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.'</li> <li>2. NPPF para 190: 'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.</li> </ol> <p>The significance of the Grade1 listed Hackwood Park landscape has been detailed in the previous letters of objection from the Gardens Trust and Hampshire Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Sally Miller HGT Trustee, Chair of Research Group and member Conservation and Development team</p>
South Worcestershire Development Plan	Hereford and Worcester	E20/1758	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Submission Consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.04.2021</p> <p>General</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hereford &amp; Worcester Gardens Trust (HWGT) are commenting only on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) findings relating to the level of impact on Landscape and Cultural Heritage in relation to the three strategic sites of Rushwick, Throckmorton and Worcester Parkway.</li> <li>2. We are concerned that the SA consistently underestimates the potential negative impact of development on landscape and cultural heritage. In general, the Appraisal regards potential development to have a minor negative impact. This judgement is made whilst also acknowledging the transformation of the landscape from rural to urban. Table 2.4 Guide to scoring significant effects shows that a major negative significant effect would result if development were to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanently degrade, diminish or destroy the integrity of a quality receptor, such as a feature of international, national or regional importance</li> <li>• Cause a very high quality receptor to be permanently diminished</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be unable to be entirely mitigated</li> <li>• Be discordant with the existing setting and/or</li> <li>• Contribute to a significant cumulative effect</li> </ul> <p>We would argue that the transformation of the rural landscape to urban development would satisfy all of the above criteria and result in a major negative effect. It appears nonsensical to consider large areas of urban development in a rural setting as a minor impact on the landscape and its associated views.</p> <p>3. The SA considers heritage assets only in terms of designated sites. In relation to parks and gardens, this only addresses those Registered sites of national importance. However, there are a number of non-designated parks and gardens that are of local importance, that will be impacted by the development proposals and are included in the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record. These should be considered. In Appendix C, page 11, SWDPR 5 Historic Environment, Bi recognises non-designated heritage assets alongside the designated assets.</p> <p>Strategic Location Assessments</p> <p>1. B6 Rushwick.</p> <p>SA Objective 4 – Landscape &amp; Townscape</p> <p>The Appraisal acknowledges that development here would alter the character of the landscape and contradict the landscape guidelines. It also acknowledges that development would significantly effect rural views, urbanise the countryside and lead to coalescence between the existing settlements. It then goes on to say that “due to the large scale of development proposed ..... there would be an overall minor negative impact on the landscape.” We would strongly argue that the greater the size of development, the greater would be the impact on the landscape as stated in 2.5.1 and Table 2.3 where the total loss or major alteration to a receptor would result in a high impact magnitude. Surely this development would result in a major negative impact on the landscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 9 – Cultural Heritage</p> <p>There is no mention of the non-designated historic garden at Wick Episcopi whose setting will be partially compromised by the development proposals.</p> <p>2. B8 Throckmorton Airfield</p> <p>SA Objective 4 – Landscape &amp; Townscape</p> <p>The Appraisal states that development here would significantly alter the character of the area, contradict the LCA guidelines and significantly alter</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the rural views. It then goes on to say that “due to the large scale of development proposed ..... there would be an overall minor negative impact on the landscape.” We strongly argue that a large development would result in a major negative impact on the landscape.</p> <p>3. B9 Worcestershire Parkway</p> <p>SA Objective 4 – Landscape &amp; Townscape</p> <p>The Appraisal follows the same pattern of statements as Throckmorton and Rushwick, stating that development on this site will alter the character of the area, contradict the landscape guidelines and significantly alter the rural views. It then goes on to say that the large scale of the development will only have a minor negative impact on the landscape. This is particularly concerning on this site which is extremely large and consequently where development will have far reaching impacts on the surrounding rural landscape.</p> <p>SA Objective 9 – Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Although the Appraisal mentions the Registered parks and gardens at Spetchley and Pirton it gives no indication of the impact of such a large development on these nationally important assets. Spetchley Park in particular, is extremely vulnerable to the impact of development so close to its boundary. Only two fields separate it from the development area. This is a nationally significant designed park that has already been partially compromised by the M5 motorway. There is visual intrusion from moving vehicles but, more significantly the tranquillity of the park has been undermined by constant traffic noise. We are concerned that the setting of the park will be further compromised by noise and visual intrusion from urban development. We strongly recommend that the extent of the proposed area is reduced to the north and that a substantial area of heavily planted green open space is established along the northern edge to act as a buffer between the new settlement and the Registered park and its setting. The effect of urban development on the setting of Spetchley Park should be regarded as a major negative impact.</p> <p>The Appraisal does not recognise the locally important non-designated historic parks and gardens at Wood Hall, Wolverton Hall and Caldwell. There will be significant impact on Wood Hall which is within the new settlement area and on Caldwell and Wolverton Hall which lie adjacent to the area. These are all historic parks and gardens of local importance that should be considered for protection in future development plans. The settings of and views from these locally important sites should equally be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>addressed. We believe that the effect of urban development on the settings of these historic designed parks and gardens should be altered to a major negative impact.</p> <p>Summary  HWGT consider that this Sustainability Appraisal is fundamentally flawed with regard to the impact assessments of urban development on the landscape character and the settings of historic designed landscapes. The assumption that because the developments are large scale at Rushwick, Throckmorton and Worcestershire Parkway they will lead to a minor negative impact flies in the face of common sense. The total transformation of the landscape from rural to urban, along with the concurrent impacts of traffic, air pollution, noise, household pets etc will have profound impacts on the surrounding landscape and the settings of the historic parks and gardens mentioned above. Wherever the Appraisal assumes a minor negative impact on the landscape or cultural heritage, we would argue that this be revised to a major negative impact.</p> <p>Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2021  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT). Our colleagues in the Hereford &amp; Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&amp;WGT) have responded to the Sustainability Appraisal consultation (SA) in detail. Their comments relate only to the level of impact upon Landscape and Cultural Heritage on the strategic sites of Rushwick, Throckmorton and Worcester Parkway. The Gardens Trust is not commenting separately but wish to put on record that we entirely endorse the comments made by our colleagues in the H&amp;WGT, and concur with their assessment that the SA is fundamentally flawed with regard to the impact that developments will have upon Rushwick, Throckmorton and Worcester Parkway. They will change the landscape from rural to urban and have a major negative impact upon these heritage assets.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Napsbury Hospital RECONSULTATION	Hertfords hire	E20/1980	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion, insertion of bi-folding doors at rear, replacement	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.04.2021  Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the additional document, proposed elevations. As noted in our comment on this application made on 16/3/21, we are concerned that the replacement of the garage doors with</p>



				windows, alterations to openings and removal of silver birch. 6 Farm Crescent London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1UQ BUILDING ALTERATION	fenestration similar to that on the other side of the front door will harm the coherence of the street facade with the garage door fenestration and the living accommodation fenestration forming a regular streetscape. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E20/1966	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing loft with installation of three front roof lights and three rear roof lights 1 Boyes Crescent London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1U BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.04.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, who have authorised HGT to respond on their behalf to planning issues in Hertfordshire. Boyes Crescent is situated in the Napsbury Conservation Area and the Registered landscape of Napsbury Park. The central block of the Crescent is part of the former East Wing of Napsbury Mental Hospital and the flanking dwellings have been designed to respect the historic fabric by providing a coherent street facade and roofscape. We are concerned that the proposed rooflights on the front roof, on this one building, will harm the coherence of this block and thus its significance as a heritage asset, set within a Registered parkland. We suggest the design is modified to retain the front roof as it was built. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0019	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of existing outbuilding 54 Mymms Drive Brookmans Park Hatfield AL9 7AF MISCELLANEOUS OUTCOME 07.05.2021 Approved	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 08.04.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Mymms Drive forms part of the setting of the Registered Park of Gobions, and was part of the original parkland. the properties on the southern side of the road back on to the Registered site and any alterations to the gardens of these properties could have an adverse effect on the setting of the Registered park. The outbuilding to which this application pertains appears to take the building line further south than the general run of houses and is this more of an intrusion into the landscape. At present there is some degree of screening from trees and shrubs which we consider should be augmented if permission is granted. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E21/0045	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing house and construction of one 2 storey detached house with basement, loft bedrooms, two balconies to	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 14.04.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comment to make on the design of the replacement dwelling. We are, however, concerned that the front garden space is largely hard landscaping, as driveway and parking. This reduction of greenspace along

				rear first floor; detached garage and front entrance gates. 7 Pishiobury Drive Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 0AD DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	Pishiobury Drive will adversely the character of this main approach to the Registered park and Listed mansion of Pishiobury which would cause harm to the setting and thus the significance of these heritage assets contrary to NPPF and to EHDC Policies HA1 and HA8. A more modest provision for cars and a substantial increase in greenspace between the front of the property and Pishiobury Drive would reduce the harm caused. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Westbrook Hay	Hertfords hire	E21/0081	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey side and rea extension and rear dormers 28 Box Lane, Hemel Hampstead. Hertfordshire HP3 0DJ BUILDING ALTERATION.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE: 15.04.2021 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust. 28 Box Lane lies within the setting of Westbrook Hay, an historic park and garden of Local Interest. The rear of the property is separated by a substantial belt of trees from the main parkland. Although there may be some glare from the proposed extra windows in the rear dormers, we consider that, due to the screening offered by the tree belt, this would not cause harm to the wider historic landscape. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hunsdon Area Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E21/0108	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2021 Thank you for sending this through, together with comments from Historic England, and apologies for the delay in responding. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, and has been authorised to respond on their behalf to planning issues regarding sites in Hertfordshire. Our comments, therefore, are purely to do with historic parks and gardens within the Hunsdon Neighbourhood Plan area. Section 8. Heritage and Conservation. The introductory sentence mentions only built environment. The area to the north of the river Stort contained, at various times, 13 important designed parks, from hunting parks to ornamental grounds. Only Briggens is designated but the others are of equal historic importance. One of these, Hunsdon you mention but not the recently Scheduled Ponds along the brook. We would welcome some reference to the historic designed landscapes of the area as there are many landscape features (see Rowe Anne, Medieval Parks and Hertfordshire and Tudor & Early Stuart Parks in Hertfordshire for details) which are worthy of

				<p>consideration in planning decisions. In particular, the Hunsdon Brook Ponds are part of Henry VIII's park which was not only for hunting but also for ostentatious display being very similar to Italian Renaissance pond chains, especially Pratolino laid out by the Medici. These ponds would have been visible from the roof of Hunsdon House, a favourite stand to observe the chase (now hidden by woodland) We know there were other parkland features, such as the hunting lodge depicted in the portrait of Edward VI. Further investigation may uncover more remains worthy of national designation.</p> <p>In Section 8.18 you discuss Briggens House estate. Bridgeman was the King's Gardener and thus his landscapes were of the highest quality but nowadays neglect and ignorance can cause loss of significance due to lack of appreciation of his precise engineering of the topography, Briggens also has another garden era of great significance, uncovered since the HE listing which is way out of date (2009). This is at the time of Lord Aldenham. The Arts and Crafts Gardens were laid out to the south east of the house, both formal sunk garden and shrub beds as well as terracing. These are exactly comparable, as confirmed by an HR inspector (formerly at Tyntesfield) with Tyntesfield (Grade II*) and Aldenham House (Grade II) both by members of the Gibbs family using same soft and hard landscaping palettes.</p> <p>Hunsdon House</p> <p>There are still remnants of the Tudor building at Hunsdon House and the views across the historic Hunsdon Park from the roof remain</p> <p>Olive's Farm</p> <p>This has a number of springs in it which led to Henry VIII's purchase of the land to protect the water supply to the Ponds in the valley below</p> <p>Policy HHC1</p> <p>Section IV talks about Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monument but mentions Historic Parks &amp; Gardens without mentioning whether Registered or not. Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens should be covered along with other designated assets, similar protection should be afforded to undesignated assets which form the majority of the heritage with the area . these are mentioned in policy HHC2 so clarification of Registered in HHC1 would be useful</p> <p>Section V. Hunsdon Brook Ponds should be added to the list as these were Scheduled in 2018</p> <p>Policy HHC2 We consider that Hunsdon Park should also be identified as an undesignated heritage asset. The Hunsdon Brook Ponds have been</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Scheduled but further features (such as Hunting Lodge footings) may also be uncovered and it contains a series of designed views to take in Hunsdon House and church.</p> <p>Policy HE3 Views There are a number of historic views from Briggens along the canal, to the Temple at Roydon, and back to the church spire at St Dunstons as well as from Briggens House across to Stanstead Bury. Views within Hunsdon Park include the one from the pond toward the church and towards Hunsdon House with reciprocal views of the ponds with the great terrace.</p> <p>Policy HHD3 We welcome the inclusion of a Green Gap to prevent coalescence of the two settlements. You may be interested in the work of the Central Herts Green Corridor group which defined the attributes of a Green Gap or corridor, for Green Belt reasons, wildlife/Biodiversity and public access. I can let you have something on that if you would like to see it.</p> <p>We have read the rest of the document and welcome the measures to conserve and enhance the vernacular character of the area's buildings and to allow well-designed infill development in specific areas. We have no further comments to make on the plan and hope, that with modification suggested, you can take it forward to the next stage.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Wormleybury	Hertfords hire	E21/0129	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to allotment gardens with associated new access, parking areas and landscaping. Land West of Wormley Playing Fields, Church Lane, Wormley, Hertfordshire EN10 7QE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.04.2021 HGT is a member of The Gardens Trust, Statutory Consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens and authorised by them to respond to planning issues in Hertfordshire on their behalf. Wormleybury is an 18th century/early 19th century landscape park developed by the Sir Abraham Humes and their renowned gardener, James Mean and at the forefront of the introduction from the East Indies and elsewhere of new plants during this period. The existing formal landscape was remodelled to a more naturalistic style and the grazed landscape surrounding the core exotics collection was important to the whole design. The importance of the wider landscape as a setting for the listed Robert Mylne mansion continued long after the fashion for exotics faded and is still important today as evidenced by inclusion on the Historic England Register.</p>

					<p>We are therefore disappointed that there is no Heritage Impact Statement on the effect the allotment proposals would have on the Registered landscape. The HE Register entry does not address this, but an HIA is an important part of any application for any development affecting heritage assets.</p> <p>On the 23 July 2019 we responded to a pre-application consultation for these allotments and objected on heritage grounds. Our concerns expressed then have not been addressed in this current application.</p> <p>We note that the Local Plan (adopted 2020) not only recognises that the proposed allotment site is within the Registered Area but also within the Green Belt. We have not seen any justification for allotments on this site: the relocation of the Halfhide Lane allotments in Policy BR3(a) should be adjacent to Brookfield Garden Village, not to here. We also understand that there is ample allotment provision within Broxbourne area.</p> <p>We are concerned that this lack of consideration for the sole Registered historic park and garden in the Borough, in contravention of the NPPF which requires conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings, will result in the loss of significance both of the Registered parkland and of the Listed Wormleybury mansion.</p> <p>The change from grazing to allotments with the divisions of the ground, sheds, greenhouses etc together with the parking area off Church Lane will cause serious harm to these designated heritage assets. The parkland has already been substantially harmed by the intrusion of the A10 and the building to the east on former parkland.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust have serious concerns about this application on heritage grounds, have not seen convincing justification for allotments here and consider that the harm to this designated heritage asset would outweigh any public benefit.</p> <p>We therefore object to this proposal</p> <p>Yours sincerely Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Pendley Manor	Hertfords hire	E21/0213	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing integral garage to Annex and new garage block with change of use from agricultural to residential land	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 29.04.2021 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, which HGT is a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic designed landscape. The Pendley Manor estate is on the List of Historic Parks and Gardens of

				use. Cole House, Pendley Farm, Station Road, Tring, Hertfordshire HP23 5QY	Local Interest and Pendley Farm forms a small development based on the historic farm with former yards and farm buildings still readable as part of the history. The proposed garage would extend outside of this historic area, encroaching into the agricultural land and harming the integrity and thus the significance of this element of the historic parkland. The estate lies within the Green Belt and the AONB where this development would be inappropriate and contrary to both NPPF and Dacorum BC policies in the current and emerging Local Plans. We oppose this development , on heritage grounds, as above. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Knole	Kent	E20.1914	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of missing boundary treatments to perimeter of site West Heath School Ashgrove Road Sevenoaks KENT TN13 1SR BOUNDARY	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2021 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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have considered the online documentation and although we would not object to the erection of a boundary fence around the perimeter of West Heath School, drawing PL 05 submitted in support of the application indicates that the fence is to be green. Planning application SE/19/01347 for a similar fence at Radnor House School was approved on the condition that "the fencing .... shall not be finished other than in black colour". We would wish to see a similar condition imposed on this application, as we understand that black is found to merge better into the surrounding landscape. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan	Norfolk	E20/1871	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee. We welcome the opportunity to consider the Neighbourhood Plan submissions for Hunstanton, Terrington St. John and Heacham. The Norfolk Gardens Trust has reviewed the plans and I am writing on its behalf to place our comments on the record. As you will know, our interest lies both in sites listed by Historic England (HE) on the Register of Parks and Gardens and in other parks and gardens

					<p>not on the Register but nevertheless considered to be local heritage assets. None of the three neighbourhood plans put forward for consultation pose concerns to The Gardens Trust. We did not identify sites of either type in the area covered by the Terrington St John neighbourhood plan; this letter focusses on Heacham and Hunstanton.</p> <p>In Hunstanton, we note that the neighbourhood plan sites several open spaces as having heritage value, namely The Green, Esplanade Gardens, Cliff Parade, Boston Square, Lincoln Square. As these sites are within the Conservation Area they are protected from inappropriate development. The Borough Council maintains these and other open green spaces used by the community and this of course provides further protection. Hunstanton Hall is outside the area of the neighbourhood plan and has the protection of a Grade II listing on the Register of Historic Parks &amp; Gardens. Heacham Hall falls outside the area of that neighbourhood plan and Caley Mill (now Norfolk Lavender) is included in the 24 Grade II Listed buildings included in the plan. From our perspective, both sites are deserving of protection and, as Policy 18 (Heritage Assets) notes, they should be 'sustained and enhanced'. We welcome the statement that developments must not adversely impact the character, integrity or visual amenity of heritage assets or of designated Conservation Areas.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust values the neighbourhood plans as practical tools for the assessment of any potential impact of development proposals on parks and gardens with heritage value (whether Registered or not) and will refer to them in the assessment of future planning applications in the areas concerned.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan Grice Norfolk Gardens Trust – Planning team</p>
Terrington St John Neighbourhood Plan	Norfolk	E20/1872	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2021 As per E20/1871 above
Heacham Neighbourhood Plan	Norfolk	E20/1873	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2021 As per E20/1871 above
Kimberley Hall	Norfolk	E21/0027	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Repairs including part demolition of the brick structure known as The	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.04.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the partial demolition and repair of the Lancelot 'Capability' Brown greenhouse and adjoining stables at Kimberley Park, a Grade II*

				<p>Greenhouse and adjoining stables.  Kimberley Hall Barnham Broom Road Downham NR18 0RT  DEMOLITION,  REPAIRS/RESTORATION</p>	<p>Registered Park and Garden (List entry 1001007). We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We were saddened to hear of the tree damage suffered by Brown’s greenhouse rear wall and the adjoining stable block but are pleased to note that this important structure is going to be carefully demolished and rebuilt to its original design. The Norfolk Gardens Trust Research Group surveyed and recorded this structure in 2015 for their subsequent book <i>Capability Brown in Norfolk</i> and they have submitted the following information:</p> <p>Kimberly Park is the best preserved of Norfolk’s three landscapes designed by Capability Brown. Not only has it survived relatively intact but unusually Brown produced two plans for Kimberley, in 1762 and 1778, for Sir Armine Wodehouse and Sir John Wodehouse (later created 1st Baron Wodehouse of Kimberley) respectively. Both these plans survive, and it is on the second plan, covering the Pleasure Grounds to the east of the House, that this structure is clearly shown, marked with the letter C and described in the plan’s key as ‘The Intended Greenhouse’. John Abercrombie, writing in 1789 describes this greenhouse as having a ‘wall of brickwork behind with an enclosure of glass sashes before, upright five or six feet high in the front, and sloping above.’</p> <p>On Brown’s second plan two service buildings originally stood behind the greenhouse, which were refashioned into the 19th century stables there today. In one of the stalls the remains of a flue were observed which explained the central arch configuration on the greenhouse rear wall – an early example of a heated glasshouse. The hearth behind was kept alight during the colder months and the hollow cavities on either side of the arch allowed the warm air to circulate before escaping through a central opening above, now evidenced only as a patch of render (recent works have covered this). When the later stable modifications took place, the wall was heightened by five brick courses and coping tiles. Brown intended this greenhouse to be the end destination on a circular route through the pleasure grounds, taking</p> <p>in the walled kitchen garden, woodland, shrubberies and enclosed flower garden in front of the greenhouse.</p> <p>We visited the site to inspect the damage on 22 April 2021 and although the majority of this important structure is intact (the stables at the rear took the full force), the eastern corner has suffered structural cracks which</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>will necessitate the careful dismantling of bricks, to the level of the access door lintel, and rebuilding using as many of the original bricks as possible. In our opinion the true significance of this important Brownian structure was not recognised in the 1999 NHLE register entry and we commend the proposals to fully restore it.</p> <p>In summary, the GT/NGT would like to be kept updated with this restoration project and we approve of the proposed intention to reuse as much of the original material as possible and the use of sympathetic repair materials where this is not viable. We suggest that your officers consider applying planning conditions to ensure the maximum use of re-used materials and specify any new materials to be used.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cragside	Northumb erland	E21/0070	I	<p>PLANNING CONSULTATION New club house, parking, accessible paths, practice pitch, flood lighting and outdoor seating Rothbury Football Club Armstrong Park Rothbury Northumberland NE65 7XQ SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Cragside, 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 I. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>The site at Knocklaw was part of the designed landscape developed by Lord Armstrong from farmland as a parkland setting to the south of the formal garden at Cragside in the second half of the nineteenth century. It was given in the 1940's for the use of the village as a football pitch and the site selected for a minimal change of use at that time was close to the village and screened by an existing parkland clump planting to the north from the wider parkland and the formal gardens. Improvements to the playing area and the addition of a modest pavilion in the 1970's with some provision for car parking on match days was a reasonable development of the site during the later twentieth century, with minimal impact on the designed landscape at Cragside and the nearby listed buildings.</p> <p>Given the scale of the proposed development and the site history it is a serious omission that there is no mention of the Cragside designed landscape and its designation as a Grade One Registered Park and Garden in the minimal Heritage Statement provided with the application. Nor is there an acknowledgement of the designed landscape in the Tree report (4.0 Landscape Value). Although the development site itself was excluded</p>

					<p>when the Registered P&amp;G was designated in 1985, the registered area wraps around the north and east sides of the site.</p> <p>It seems essential that the impact of the proposed major development of the football field on the Cragside designed landscape is properly considered, with the potential for intrusion on views from the parkland, the formal garden, the house and the higher walks and drives across the valley taken into account and appropriate mitigation considered and we therefore wish to lodge a HOLDING OBJECTION to the scheme until a proper assessment of impact on the Grade One landscape has been provided by the developer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens RECONSULTATION	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. Yorkshire Coast College, Westwood Annexe, Valley Bridge Parade, Scarborough, North Yorkshire YO11 2PL. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for further 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>We have noted that our previous response dated 8th March does not seem to have been included in the documents on-line, although our first response dated 4th February is present.</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 letters of 4th February and 8th March.</p> <p>We have examined the Landscape Plan dated 5th February, Drawing No 26B and have the following comments to make on this iteration of the Landscape Plan:</p> <p>We are pleased to note that three electric car charging points have been incorporated; will this be sufficient? And a reasonable area of grass within the development.</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</p>

					<p>interlock above, in place of decking. This should be a weed-free solution. Or alternatively pavers that mirror those used elsewhere.</p> <p>We have been unable to find any details of the new planting on the landscaping plan and refer you to our letter of 8th March.</p> <p>We are generally concerned about the impermeable nature of the surfaces. Tarmac is NOT permeable, and generally neither are the pavers unless laid to give some permeability. Given potential issues with the steepness of the valley and the increasing incidence of torrential rainfall, increasing water run-off from this new development should be something to avoid.</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.</p> <p>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>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1976	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Hybrid planning application for proposed employment park seeking:</p> <p>a) Detailed (full) planning permission for erection of two warehouse buildings for B2 (General industrial), B8 (Storage and distribution) and/or Class E (Commercial, business and service E (g) (i)(ii) (iii)) uses, with ancillary offices, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works; and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The land for this employment park is to the south west of Junction 47 of the A1M and within the wider setting of Allerton Park and especially the views from the two elevated buildings within the registered park and garden; Allerton Castle at grade I and the Temple of Victory at grade II*.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the massing, scale and landscape scheme that is proposed in this hybrid application will be damaging to the significance of the heritage assets in what has been until recent times a largely rural</p>

			<p>b) outline planning (all matters reserved with the exception of access) for Class E (Commercial, business and service), B2 (General industrial) and B8 (Storage and distribution) uses, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works, to be implemented in phases. Land Comprising Field At 440633 457078 Allerton Park North Yorkshire MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>setting where the reciprocal views can be widely enjoyed. We have noted in the Design and Access Statement March 2021: O2 Appraising the Context – Involvement: ‘The retention of development parameters...viewing corridor from Allerton Park and the Temple of Victory, is welcomed.’ And: ‘It is recognised that there will be an impact upon designated heritage assets....’ We have not been a party to discussions relating to previous outline stages but we are dismayed that the viewing corridor noted above is narrow, sparsely planted and incomplete and that the impact on the designated heritage assets although recognised, does not appear to have been properly considered in the design and landscape proposals, which in our view are weak. Allerton Park is of national importance and despite the close proximity of the A1M to its western boundary and the relatively recent development to the north, every effort should be made to secure its setting. Existing developments should not be an excuse to continue the ‘death by a thousand cuts’ of this national heritage asset, something that comes to mind in the current context. Allerton Park has high aesthetic, historical and evidential value. It should also be remembered that Allerton Castle is also a business as a wedding and events venue which funds the maintenance of the heritage and makes it available to the public, giving it considerable communal value. Damage to Allerton’s setting could potentially damage its viability as a business. The group value of the heritage assets; The Castle, Temple of Victory and the Parkland contribute to the significance of each other and are often visible in-conjunction with each other in views approaching the site from the south-west including the A59 road. This should be given appropriate weight when assessing significance and impact in addition to the individual significance and impacts. We strongly support the detailed and carefully considered Historic England advice in their letter dated 19th April and for brevity will not repeat it all here. We would like to make the following additional points: We are very concerned about the proposed heights of the units in the south eastern section which at 18m to the eaves will have a considerable impact on Allerton Park. We do not agree with the statement: ‘Area south of the elevated junction 47 has potential for an increased height parameter given the proximity and orientation of the motorway.’ This would be very</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>damaging to the historic designed views particularly from the Temple of Victory built on an elevated site and specifically to take advantage of the views out over the landscape including to the south west and west. The much greater height of the units in the development would form a prominent element in the setting of Allerton Park.</p> <p>The Landscape Masterplan - The developer makes much of the two features, the swale formed by the existing watercourse and the primary viewing corridor.</p> <p>On the former, the buildings (units 1 and 2) are shown encroaching on the swale so that the planting will be interrupted.</p> <p>The “primary viewing corridor” is squeezed between units 7 and 11. We understand that this visual corridor running through the Employment Park, to direct the eye between the Temple and parkland and the vale to the south, was a very important aspect of the design principles and landscape strategy established at the previous outline application stage. It is an important mitigation factor for the setting of Allerton Park in that it is a green corridor to draw the eye beyond the intrusion of the Employment Park to the vale landscape to the south and conversely back to the Temple of Victory. The “primary viewing corridor” in this hybrid application does not fulfil that function; it is not a continuous feature focusing on the Temple and is certainly not an avenue.</p> <p>The structural planting has no detail about the numbers of trees. The planting along the roads is thin and that for the car parks is also inadequate. There needs to be more tree and shrub planting between the carparking spaces and over the site in general. Bold planting is needed to counteract the scale and massing of the buildings.</p> <p>There is no timescale for the structural planting. The planting along the motorway boundary and along the swale could be put in place before building work begins.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the footpaths are to be bound gravel but we have not noted the surface for the car parking areas and we recommend that they are porous – in fact permeability is an important consideration as we experience more and frequent periods of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>The design of the units proposed are urban and do not attempt to have a rural setting/local theme which is to be regretted. The roofs are largely flat and we query why green roofs are not proposed. Not only would green roofs make the development less visually intrusive but would also be better for the environment generally and helpful for climate change</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>mitigation. If that is not to be the case then dark materials for the roofs are essential.</p> <p>The lighting should be carefully designed not to negatively impact on the heritage and the ecology.</p> <p>We consider that this hybrid planning application will impact the setting of the Registered Allerton Park and also two other designated heritage assets; The Mansion and The Temple of Victory. Although we much regret the principle of development at this site, we understand that discussions took place and the applicant went to considerable effort to mitigate the impact on the heritage assets. These do not appear to have been progressed satisfactorily into the current hybrid application and as a result it does not have sufficient regard for the settings of the highly designated heritage assets and the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are not convinced that this hybrid planning application meets the requirements of paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019 nor the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 66 (1).</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register their objection to this application in its present form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ferney Hall RECONSULTATION	Shropshire	E20/1770	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a first floor side extension, single storey garden room following demolition of existing conservatory and single storey porch extension to front (re-submission)</p> <p>Ferney House, Onibury, Craven Arms, Shropshire, SY7 9BJ.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.04.2021</p> <p>This is a joint response on behalf of both the Gardens Trust, which is a Statutory Consultee in matters relating to historic parks and gardens on the National Heritage List, and the Shropshire Parks and Gardens Trust.</p> <p>On the face of it, it does not initially seem unreasonable to propose the extensions and additions to Ferney House described in this application. The Design, Access and Heritage Statement describes the character of Ferney House as ‘...representative of semi-detached properties built in the 1920-30’s era...’. The character of this formerly semi-detached pair of cottages is of great interest and should be protected and maintained through any proposed changes.</p> <p>We are concerned however that bland statements about ‘matching facing bricks’ and ‘matching clay tiles’ disguise a world of difficulties, especially when drawings accompanying the application are so sketchy in appearance. The so-called matching facing bricks’ are not defined and may</p>

					<p>be difficult to source, while matching the weathered effect of the existing roof tiles may be all but impossible &amp;/or take decades to achieve. We suggest that the existing roof tiles be saved for re-use, infilled with as close a match as possible to offset any differences, while the replacement bricks to be used are defined an agreed in advance of the works.</p> <p>We are disappointed to find that the cursory ‘Heritage Assets’ section of the above document, prepared by the applicant’s Agent, seems firstly to mis-understand the concept of ‘Setting’ and is largely devoid of any meaningful assessment of the impact of the proposed additions and alterations to Ferney House, on either the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPAG) of Ferney Hall, or on the nearby non-designated North Lodge to Ferney Hall, referred to in our earlier letter. It describes the house as ‘...detached, located approx. 10m from the highway and...not overlooked by other properties’.</p> <p>Figure 1: View from the north drive to Ferney Hall within the Grade II Registered Park, with Ferney Hall North Lodge to the left and Ferney House to the right of the image. It is clear that any alterations to Ferney House will impact upon the Setting of both the North Lodge and the Registered Park &amp; Garden, as well as by extension also of Ferney Hall, albeit to a lesser extent. It is not known to whom the clutter of shipping containers, caravans and sheds adjacent to Ferney House belong, although it is clear they substantially detract from the setting both of the North Lodge and of Ferney House itself</p> <p>In fact, the house is overlooked by the adjacent North Lodge and both are also clearly visible from the drive to/from Ferney Hall, i.e. within the boundary of the Grade II Registered Park &amp; Garden and hence also within the Setting of Ferney Hall (see Figure 1). Between the North Lodge and Ferney Hall also, is an unsightly jumble of shipping containers, caravans, sheds and skip, which already have a detrimental effect on the Setting of both the Grade II RPAG and the Grade II Ferney Hall.</p> <p>Should Shropshire Council be minded to approve these proposals, we request that strict conditions be imposed on the specification and use of materials as outlined above, with these being agreed in writing, prior to works beginning on site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely  Christopher Gallagher  Vice Chair, Shropshire Parks &amp; Gardens Trust.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Lilleshall Hall	Shropshire	E21/0144	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrofitting of tensile cable balustrade detail to existing external masonry balustrades Lilleshall Hall, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9AS.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2021</p> <p>We have received notification of the above proposal from Shropshire Council on April 27th 2021. This is a joint response on behalf of both the Gardens Trust, which is a Statutory Consultee in matters relating to historic parks and gardens on the National Heritage List, and the Shropshire Parks and Gardens Trust.</p> <p>We believe this to be the third application relating to proposed modifications to the balustrades at Lilleshall Hall, which is a Grade II* Listed Building set within a Grade II Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>The currently proposed interventions we consider to be wholly inappropriate within the context of a Listed Building of such high significance. The so-called 'Heritage Statement' provided by the applicant's agent is similarly inadequate and fails completely either to explain or to justify the rationale and design of the proposed intervention or to assess its likely physical and visual impacts upon the historic fabric and hence the Significance of Lilleshall Hall itself, or the Setting of its RPAG. We therefore object to the proposals contained within this application.</p> <p>We recommend that the applicant should contact Historic England for guidance on an appropriate solution for the perceived difficulties presented by the balustrades at Lilleshall Hall. We also suggest that an experienced Conservation Architect be engaged to advise on the design and implementation of any future proposals in this respect.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Christopher Gallagher Vice Chair, Shropshire Parks &amp; Gardens Trust</p>
Cannon Hall	South Yorkshire	E20/1815	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>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)</p> <p>Cannon Hall Museum, Bark House Lane, Cawthorne, Barnsley, S75 4AT</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us yesterday about the change in this planning application in which the applicant proposes to install an oil tank instead of an LPG tank. The other items in the planning application remaining the same.</p> <p>It was very useful to discuss the changed proposal with you today; thank you.</p> <p>Our comments in our letter of 30th March still stand and we reiterate that the Slip Garden is an integral and important part of the whole of the kitchen garden's significance. This is particularly true at Cannon Hall where, as we have noted, the family were notable gardeners. We appreciate that the oil tank will not require the excavation of the site that would be the case with LPG and that its position has been moved. It will be sited as close</p>



					<p>as practicable to the wall with a 2m high screen fence. We understand that you will be requesting a landscape plan showing planting to integrate the two storage tanks and oil tank into their surroundings, and we advise that the planting should be historically sympathetic, include evergreens and there should be an undertaking to keep the area maintained and the planting suitably pruned. In addition, you propose to also condition that in the future if and when the structures are removed that the area is reinstated and further accumulation of equipment etc in the Slip Garden does not take place without further planning approval.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that 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. We advise that such interpretation is included in the development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Chillington WITHDRAWN	Staffordshire	E21/0044	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 3No Shepherd's Huts for holiday accommodation at the edge of a commercially managed (not ancient) woodland. The application includes the installation of a septic tank and associated drainage as well as upgrading the existing woodland (tractor) track and parking to take up to 3 cars (one per shepherd's hut). Part of the nearby ha ha that has collapsed will be rebuilt re-using the existing bricks supplemented with new matching bricks. The park is listed Grade II*</p> <p>Chillington Hall Chillington Park Chillington WOLVERHAMPTON WV8 1RE HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.04.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust about this application. I am replying on behalf of both The Gardens Trust and Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two Trusts.</p> <p>The application site lies within the grade II* registered historic park at Chillington. The proposed shepherds' huts will be located within The Grove a block of managed woodland of 19th century origin bisected by an open mown strip to the SW of the hall. The huts and associated parking and access drive will be discretely sited within the woodland and are not considered to have any impact on the significance of the historic landscape. The Trusts have no objection to the application.</p> <p>The Trusts are curious to note that the application has been registered as for listed building consent rather than planning permission given that, other than the very minor repairs to the dilapidated ha ha, the proposals will not affect any upstanding structure within the site. This could have implications for the validity of any decision issued.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman Staffordshire Gardens Trust</p>

Great Barr Hall	Staffordshire	E21/0059	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION S73 VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 (PLANS) FOR APPLICATION 18/1288 (REPLACEMENT DWELLING) AND NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT APPLICATION 20/0854. TO INCLUDE AMENDMENTS TO MAIN ROOF PROFILE AND ANGLES, ADDITION OF 2 NO. ROOFLIGHTS, AMENDMENTS TO FIRST FLOOR REAR WINDOWS PLUS AMENDMENTS TO VARIOUS WINDOW FRAMES, REDUCTION IN DEPTH OF FIRST FLOOR FRONT ELEVATION AND REPLACEMENT OF OAK TRANSOM AND MULLION FRONT SUPPORTING STRUCTURE WITH BRICK ENCASED SUPPORTS PLUS AMENDMENTS TO DESIGN OF FRONT DOOR AND REPLACEMENT OF CHIMNEY FLUE WITH CHIMNEY POT. 12, SKIP LANE, WALSALL, WS5 3LL BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.04.2021</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. You will be aware that the GT objected to the previous application 18/1288 on 21st November 2018 due mainly to the greatly increased size and dominant presence of the new building over its neighbours at Nos 10 &amp; 14 Skip Lane, as well as what we perceive to be negative effects upon the registered park and garden of Great Barr. We have not changed our opinion and the sparse online information provided with the current application is insufficient to enable us to compare the amendments with what has already been approved. We would like to see clear comparative plans and elevations with the earlier permitted design to allow a proper comparison and evaluation of impact with what is now proposed. All we have are a block plan of the building and the roof. Without such comparative information it is almost impossible to make a meaningful comment on the amendments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Henham	Suffolk	E20/1916	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Approval of Reserved Matters of DC/20/3627/OUT - Replacement dwelling - Scale, Appearance, Access, Landscaping Ilium House , Henham Park Estate, Henham RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.04.2021</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.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation for the above reserved matters and read the Design and Access (D&amp;A) statement. We concur with Mr Scrimgeour's assessment that this is a good location for the replacement house and feel that making the stables once again ancillary to the main house is a positive move. We are also supportive of the high standard of sustainability of the passive solar technology which is proposed for the replacement dwelling. The D&amp;A states (6.0) that the building has taken its</p>

					<p>inspiration from the Flint House at Waddesden and the materials chosen are those of traditional Suffolk barns. Whilst it is laudable and appropriate that the new house should be contemporary and innovative for a site of such importance, the linear monolith design chosen will perhaps divide opinion as it is an uncompromising statement for such a prominent and sensitive location.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Chilton Hall RECONSULTATION	Suffolk	E20/0087	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved, access to be considered) - Erection of up to 190 residential dwellings, purpose built care home for up to 60 bedrooms, and associated infrastructure including landscaping, public open-space, car parking and means of access off Church Field Road. Land On The North Side Of, Church Field Road, Chilton Industrial Estate, Chilton, Suffolk. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.04.2021</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.</p> <p>The GT submitted a response to the above application on 13th May 2020 (attached), and whilst we note the slight reduction in dwellings, our objection remains and our previous comments are still relevant. We would like to repeat our grave concern that despite many statutory consultees and other relevant bodies, objecting strongly, many on heritage grounds, the applicant continues to maintain that this application will not cause harm to the setting or significance of the various heritage assets it affects. The sensitivity of the site is recognised by the emerging Joint Local Plan (JLP) which proposes to de-allocate the site from its current employment use and also, crucially, due to its heritage sensitivity. This assessment is backed up by the 2019 Strategic Housing &amp; Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), which considers the site under Ref SS0933. It concludes that the site lies 'within an area of high heritage sensitivity' which is why it has been discounted from any development in the emerging JLP. There is also currently a sufficient housing supply within the 5 year housing plan, so this application, especially when taken with the additional housing developments already granted in Chilton : surrounding Chilton hall to the north (see Local plan proposals map for BDC CPO1 illustrating the area of the Chilton woods allocation for 1150 residential units) plus the 130 houses at the Orchard site, also wholly within Chilton parish, takes the housing requirement well over and above the required housing target for Babergh.</p> <p>Our other concern is that that although the number of houses has been reduced by 23, as this is an outline application with the drawings and plans</p>

					<p>being illustrative and not for decision, once the principle of development is established on the site, the applicants can seek to change the layout, including developing the open space currently proposed.</p> <p>We concur with our colleagues in HE that if permitted, the proposal would ‘fundamentally change the character of the site from open rural land to that of a large, built development. It would result in the loss of this field which currently provides a buffer between the northern edge of Sudbury and Chilton Hall. The loss of the field would mean the hall and its landscape were no longer encircled by a rural landscape as it has been throughout its existence.’ We therefore disagree with the statement in the Updated Planning Statement Para 4.57 which says ‘the proposed application site does not materially contribute to the setting or significance of the heritage assets.’ If permitted, we believe that this application would permanently erode the landscape surroundings, causing a substantially damaging the setting of the suite of heritage assets affected.</p> <p>The applicant clearly recognises that this application will cause harm, as in Para 2.8 of the Planning Statement Addendum they justify the reduction in the built footprint to the NE boundary of the site by saying : ‘a larger area of public open space in this location will provide an additional buffer between the development and Chilton Hall, and will also allow additional views from the site to St Mary’s Church.’ The applicant here directly seeks to address heritage concerns raised by various respondents, which seems at odds with their further statement in Para 3.16 that ‘[E]vidence has been included in the Heritage Assessment submitted with the planning application to demonstrate that the proposed development would not harm the significance of the heritage assets and hence all of the Site could be developed.’</p> <p>In our opinion, this application is contrary NPPF Para 192c. In addition, as there is already a significant amount of development around Chilton, we maintain that the application also fails to meet NPPF 194 a &amp; b, as harm to assets of the highest significance should be wholly exceptional, which this development is not. 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 (GPA) where it states (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.’ (As mentioned above, the Chilton Woods allocation is for 1150</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>residential units as well as the 130 houses at the Orchard site.) The GPA also states (p5) that 'The setting of a historic park or garden ... may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary. It can include: land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it.' This is entirely relevant here.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT OBJECTS to the above application as it does not comply with the emerging local plan, nor does it meet the requirements of NPPF 192(c) &amp; 194, and if allowed, would seriously damage the setting of all the assets. The group of assets taken together will no longer be set in a rural landscape for the first time in their entire existence, and the experience of and significance of the RPG in particular, will be significantly adversely affected by the development in the immediately adjoining field.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lord Leycester Hospital	Warwicks hire	E20/1860	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed amendments to the existing layout of the building; including internal and external alterations; alterations to landscaping including the provision of external access ramps; amendments to one dwelling to provide enlarged visitor entrance area; enlargement of the gift store (internally); use of Brethren's kitchen for exhibition purposes; reordering of existing residential accommodation (Master's House) for residential purposes, opening of parts of Master's House to public; sundry like for like and other repairs to historic fabric and sundry alterations to</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.04.2021</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. Much of the application is concerned with work to the fabric of the Masters House and other building work connected to the historic fabric of the buildings. This has been considered in great detail and with much sensitivity. The Gardens Trust's remit however, lies entirely with the effect of the proposals upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG), which is incorrectly stated to be Grade II* in the Design &amp; Access statement (p29). The only changes required are to install some resin bonded ramps for disabled access. The GT/WGT would urge your officers to ensure that the resin bonded material matches the colour of the existing gravel within the historic gardens. We concur with the decision not to have the initial ramp into the garden rising from the parking area, and consider that a series of smaller graded ramps entering the garden via the staff access along the side of the building is more discreet. We would also ask your officers to ensure there is a watching archaeological brief when work is carried out inside the garden.</p>

				<p>improve use as a visitor attraction including improvements to cafe.</p> <p>Lord Leycester Hospital, High Street, Warwick, CV34 4BH</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bilton Grange	Warwicks hire	E20/1938	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a two storey extension and ground floor extension to existing Sports Pavilion</p> <p>RUGBY MONTESSORI SCHOOL,BILTON GRANGE,RUGBY ROAD,DUNCHURCH,RUGBY,CV22 6QU</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.04.2021</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</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and although there is a design and access statement, we were very surprised that the planning documents did not contain either a Heritage Statement or any mention whatsoever that the pavilion site lies in the centre of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Bilton Grange. As you are well aware, Para 189 of the NPPF requires an applicant to describe the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>The sports pavilion is very close to the lime avenue planted prior to 1855 which runs south from North Lodge on an axis to the porte cochere and the front door of the house, and as such is an important part of the setting of both the RPG and the Grade II* listed house. There is nothing in the application documents to reassure us that the applicant has considered the effect that building work may or may not have upon the trees in the vicinity. We would have liked to have seen an arboricultural assessment and see what measures were in place to ensure the long-term health of the trees which play an important role in the setting of the house and RPG as such Para 193 of the NPPF comes into play. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Any tree loss would have an appreciable negative effect upon the setting and we would urge your officers to satisfy themselves that sufficient protection is in place to avoid any damage to these important trees.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Combe Abbey	Warwicks hire	E20/1955	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Operation of miniature electronic vehicles on marked trails in the woodland to the North West of Coombe Abbey adjacent to and beneath the Go Ape High Ropes Course. COOMBE ABBEY COUNTRY PARK, BRINKLOW ROAD, COOMBE FIELDS, COVENTRY, CV3 2AB MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.04.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the online documentation and note that the proposed electric car tracks are within the area already occupied by the Go Ape high ropes course. The attached arboricultural statement reassures us that the tree root zone has been carefully considered and regular attention will be paid to ensure that no damage is caused. The trail will be demarcated by log edging and woodchips where necessary. Historic England has looked at the site and concluded that there will be no additional adverse impact upon the Registered Park and Garden at Coombe Abbey. The GT/WGT have no further comments to make. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Ledston Hall and Park RECONSULTATION	West Yorkshire	E20/1298	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation and operation of a solar park with associated infrastructure and upgraded access. Land Off Barnsdale Road, Allerton Bywater. SOLAR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.04.2021 Thank you for re- consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Ledston Hall is registered grade II* with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. You will have noted our previous comments on this planning application, dated 28th December 2020. As you will know Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The park has 17C origins and the walled gardens and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with the area now called The Grove originally designed by Charles Bridgeman for Lady Betty Hastings c. 1731. The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest. This solar park covers an area of approx. 90ha of arable farmland that was once part of Kippax Park, and lies to the south west of the registered</p>

					<p>historic park and garden and Ledston Hall. In addition to Kippax Park there may have been early settlements in this area. Barnsdale Road which is located on a ridge running north-south separates the site of the proposed solar park from Ledston and could be a Roman route. The grade II listed Low Lodge with associated gate piers and walls and listed barn at Home Farm lie at the access to the proposed solar park.</p> <p>We are concerned about the visual impact of this proposal on the designated heritage assets and agree with the report from Leeds City Council's Senior Conservation Officer. She notes the clear inter-visibility between the proposed site (particularly Area 5) and all the floors to the west elevation northern range of Ledston Hall and the garden terrace. Screening planting is proposed as mitigation and we understand from correspondence from Banks Renewables dated 22nd February, that the proposed heritage mitigation planting around the construction and control building/substation compound has been increased to a 5m tree and shrub planting buffer. We are unsure as to how effective the mitigation planting will be in the short-term and in the winter and defer to the expertise in the Leeds City Council Landscape Team.</p> <p>We have also noted Banks Renewables response to our comments on the 'Glint and Glare Assessment' saying that their '... consultants Pager Power have confirmed that Ledston Hall was not assessed as part of the glint and glare assessment as it is located beyond the 1km buffer and it is considered that at this distance that any reflection will have insignificant impact upon receptors where there is no screening. In this case some screening will block partially (if not fully) views of the proposed Development. As, such no mitigation is considered necessary.' We have understood that the buffer zone for heritage assets is 2km.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---