



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES MAY 2021

The GT conservation team received 230 new cases for England in May, 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, 71 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Kings Weston House	Avon	E21/0258	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Description Removal, restoration, and replacement of Grade II Listed iron bridge and the erection of protective height restrictors. Footway Bridge Over Kings Weston Road Bristol MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development which would affect the immediate setting of four Grade II and one Grade I Listed Heritage Assets within the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden setting of Kings Weston House. The Gardens Trust [GT] is a Statutory Consultee with regards to such developments. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust welcomes this planning application to restore the iron bridge following the detailed stages as set out in the 'Restoration and Conservation' section of the heritage statement. The bridge is of great technical interest and associations with John McAdam and an attribution to the Coalbrookdale foundries, places it within a national context of early castiron structures. The setting of the bridge includes the lane accessing it and ascending from the south and north adjacent to the cutting parapet.

					<p>These lanes open out at the bridge to a relatively flat area, which this restoration will preserve, allowing the inn facade, attributed to Sir John Vanbrugh, to be fully appreciated.</p> <p>Height restrictors, in the form of two galvanised steel gantrys, will be unsightly in the conservation area, but the visual harm is thought to be proportionate when considering the protection of the grade II listed bridge. An additional form of warning could possibly be incorporated into the 'satellite navigation' system used by drivers of high sided vehicles.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust supports this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust considers the proposed restoration of the cast iron bridge within Kings Weston registered park and garden, is compliant with the Bristol Development Framework Core strategy BC22. It will safeguard and enhance the heritage asset and registered park and garden setting. The installation of the two steel height restrictors, which will not be visible from the iron bridge, will hopefully prevent any further damage to the Grade II listed structure.</p>
Warmley House	Avon	E21/0336	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Remove current stables that are rotten with asbestos and rebuild. Would like to rebuild and clad so all fits in with the wooden area. 98, Mulberry House, Tower Road North, Warmley, BS30 8XN</p> <p>DEMOLITION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the curtilage of a Grade II listed building, Warmley House, built for William Champion [1709-89], a Quaker Industrialist who had moved his brassworks [founded 1742] from Old Market, in the centre of Bristol, to Warmley in 1746. The gardens feature earlier industrial works and are registered Grade II on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest. The site is also recorded in the Avon Gardens Trust Gazetteer for South Gloucestershire. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that has been provided concerning this application and would like to express our concern over the proposal set out within the Design and Access Statement to continue growing the recently planted laurel hedge in order to conceal the proposed construction. The hedge itself has been planted directly onto part of the historic 18th century leat which fed the Echo Pond; illegal</p>

					<p>extension of this property and some of the neighbouring properties over a period of 20 or so years has encroached into the leat unchecked. There is a danger that the recently planted hedge, if allowed to grow higher, may disturb the historic stonework of the raised 18th century Elm Walk created by William Champion. Surviving remains of the leat can be seen immediately to the east of the entrance gates to the Elm Walk, where a large culverted opening was constructed to allow the water to pass through to Echo Pond, indicating the volume of water which flowed in the 18th century.</p> <p>We feel there is a real danger of the laurel becoming overwhelming if left to grow higher, as proposed. In fact we strongly feel the laurel is not an appropriate hedging plant for this woodland setting at all. Until the 1970s and Dutch Elm disease, Elm trees lined this historic raised walk that ran between the Summerhouse and the Echo Pond, separated on one side by the leat and Champion's 13 acre lake on the other side. Both Lime and Black Poplar trees remain along the walk and we feel therefore that hornbeam or even a mixed native hedge would be a more appropriate choice to enhance the historic Elm Walk within this historic Grade II registered garden [Historic England List Entry: 1000356] and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Summary: Avon Gardens Trust, therefore, objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Wycombe Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E21/0010	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of existing lighting columns at the Lime Avenue Car Park Wycombe Abbey School Abbey Way High Wycombe Buckinghamshire HP11 1PE MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2021</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and are happy to support the replacement of the existing lighting columns at the Lime Avenue Car Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E21/0069	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>First floor extension with hipped roof, new replacement porch, new "Regency" canopy and new porch canopy</p> <p>Vancouver Lodge High Street Dadford Buckinghamshire MK18 5JX</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the sparse online documentation and cannot find any indication of the visual impact that this may have upon impact on the wider landscape of Grade I Registered Park & Garden (RPG) of Stowe, which is our major concern. A particular issue is the effect of the materials to be used for the various extensions to porches, etc including aluminium glazed columns and a glazed canopy roof in one case. We are concerned as to the level of their visual effect on the wider landscape, if any. We ask that the Council ensures that there is no significant visual impact on the wider RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Langley Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/0237	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposal Listed building consent demolition of temporary security reception hut and erection a new security building</p> <p>The Langley, Uxbridge Road, George Green, Wexham, Buckinghamshire, SL3 6DU</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2021</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation. The existing security hut is an unattractive timber cabin and the proposed replacement is a welcome improvement, modelled on the main house but very small and resting on sleepers so there are no groundworks.</p> <p>The GT/BGT are happy to support this application.</p> <p>We note however, that there are various other applications which affect/ed the same site which we have not been consulted upon (see below). We are not sure how this could have happened, but would be very grateful if you were able to please ensure that in future we are not omitted from any consultations which might affect a registered park and garden in your district.</p> <p>Listed Building Consent for the installation of external lighting and security</p>

					<p>cameras on the main building. Ref. No: PL/19/1127/HB Validated: Mon 01 Apr 2019 Status: Registered</p> <p>Temporary car park for a six-month period in relation to the construction of Langley Park Hotel</p> <p>Land North Of Langley Park House, Avenue Drive, Wexham Buckinghamshire</p> <p>Ref. No: PL/18/4111/FA Validated: Tue 06 Nov 2018 Status: Decided</p> <p>Application for approval of condition 10 of Planning Application 16/02166/RVC- (Variation of Conditions 1 and 5 of planning permission 15/02373/RVC to allow changes to the site wide landscaping scheme and external lighting scheme. Erection of three sub-stations.) The Langley, Uxbridge Road, George Green, Wexham, Buckinghamshire SL3 6DW</p> <p>Ref. No: PL/18/2693/CONDA Validated: Mon 16 Jul 2018 Status: Decided</p> <p>Outbuilding for use as creche and a satellite dish to provide ancillary hotel facilities. Open for comment icon; Land Adjacent To The Orangery, Langley Park, Uxbridge Road, George Green, Wexham, Buckinghamshire SL3 6DW</p> <p>Ref. No: 18/00457/FUL Validated: Wed 04 Apr 2018 Status: Awaiting decision</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/0248	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single-storey (with basement) detached ancillary building incorporating swimming pool, gym, and art studio, following removal of existing tennis court, its surrounding fencing, and existing green house.</p> <p>Mares Hill, 32 Hedgerley Lane, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 7NS</p> <p>GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2021</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 Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have read the online documentation relating to this application. The Design & Access (D&A) statement reveals that the application site lies on higher ground in the part of the garden to the furthest north, away from the applicant's house and the neighbour's house, but abutting the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Bulstrode.</p> <p>The proposed structure has been designed to give the impression that it forms part of the boundary walls. It cannot be sited near the tennis court as it is too close to the neighbours. The proposed structure is very large and takes up the bulk of the rear garden and is only 13 m away from the</p>

					<p>main house. However, much of the structure is subterranean and the parts which are above surface are staggered with the land contours to minimise its impact. It also has a green roof. The D&A informs us that the tennis court is 5m higher than the house and the application site is 4m above that, so it would appear that the very large structure will be 9m above the house, taking up the bulk of the rear garden.</p> <p>We are also concerned by the large amount of glazing on the west elevation, and the roof of the north elevation (art studio) shows the raised lantern poking up over the top of the structure, giving potential for substantial light emittance and reflection, exacerbated by the elevated position, even if there is some daytime screening.</p> <p>The documentation unfortunately lacks a visual impact assessment which we would have expected to see in an application of this nature. This absence crucially means that we are unable to tell whether the structure will be visible from within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Bulstrode, as there are quite a few tree clumps to the north, which may or may not mask the structure. We are therefore submitting a holding objection until the applicant can satisfy us that it will not impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>We would urge your officers to also satisfy themselves that this large structure, surrounded on three sides by the RPG, is not visible from within Bulstrode Park, and if it is, to require the applicants to reduce the glazing and alter the Art Studio roof.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Muncaster Castle	Cumbria	E21/0148	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to entrance and insertion of doors and windows. New decking area Muncaster Castle, Muncaster, Ravenglass, CA18 1RQ BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2021</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*. Unfortunately owing to the curtailed travel restrictions only now being lifted, we have been unable to make a site visit on this occasion. The following comments are therefore based on the information submitted in support of the application.</p> <p>We note that the proposed works are to enhance the existing function and wedding venue space in the Old Laundry by improving access, increasing natural daylight, and creating an external viewing terrace across the</p>

					<p>gardens to the north of the castle. We understand that some public benefit also is anticipated through the use of this area in offering additional seating for the adjacent café, when not in use for functions.</p> <p>In terms of the Grade II* landscape, the south-east elevation of the Old Laundry Stable Yard building appears as an unbroken masonry structure topped by crenellations, dating from the 18th-19th century. The elevation forms a distinctive backdrop to The Ghyll, a steep-sided valley with ornamental shrub planting and is also visible from the rear (north-west) elevation of Muncaster Castle, Grade I Listed. In its elevated position the Old Laundry is included in many of the views across the designed landscape immediately north of the castle.</p> <p>The introduction of three glazed apertures into this elevation will inevitably create a visible and intrusive element, changing the character of the gardens in this area. We cannot agree with the assessment in the Design and Access Statement that 'the retained landscape will also screen the development from different viewpoints within the grounds'. In its elevated position and with the large unbroken areas of glazing proposed, there will be considerable glare and reflection from this south-east orientation, particularly in the morning. Therefore, whilst we have no objections to alterations to the Old Laundry building on its north-west elevation, amending the opening from the courtyard, we do object to the to the insertion of the new door and windows into the south-east wall, considering it will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of Muncaster Castle, a Grade II* Garden of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>In terms of the public benefit likely to be created by this proposal through increased seating space for the café, we leave it to Lake District National Park Planning Authority to decide whether this is sufficient to balance the harm caused by the proposal, in line with National Policy Planning Framework paragraphs 194 and 196.</p> <p>To summarise: the Gardens Trust OBJECTS to this application</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Lowther Castle	Cumbria	E21/0200	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Temporary change of use of land from agriculture to a touring caravan site, for a maximum 14 days and limited to the periods:</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Lowther Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic</p>

			<p>1. 28 July 2021 to 3 August 2021, and 2. 27 July 2022 to 2 August 2022 Newtown Paddocks, New Road, Lowther, CA10 2HG CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>Interest at Grade II. We appreciate that the caravan site is temporary for two short periods of time in 2021 and 2022 but as an application has been submitted, assume Lake District National Park Planning Authority consider that planning permission is required for the development. We are therefore surprised that the Heritage, Design and Access statement accompanying the application concentrates only on potential impact of the caravan site on the medieval settlement of Lowther, with no mention of the Grade II Park and Garden Heritage Asset. Given the site's position in the parkland of Lowther Castle we normally expect both an appropriate Heritage Statement and a Visual Impact Assessment to comply with NPPF paragraph's 189 and 190. In the absence of the documentation, the Gardens Trust would like to lodge a holding objection until such time they can be submitted to allow a reasoned assessment of the application, or the position regarding the requirements for this temporary development clarified. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2021 Thank you for forwarding the additional information, namely a copy of the entry of Lowther Castle on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest referenced from a slightly amended Heritage Impact Assessment. However there remains little assessment of potential impact of the proposals on this heritage asset, nor any visual analysis to allow more detailed consideration of the application. We retain concerns about the application, particularly its location in the Grade II Lowther Castle parklands but accept that use as a touring caravan site is to be restricted to fourteen days over two years. We would therefore advise that, should planning permission be granted, a condition is attached that this time period is not to be extended, nor increased to accommodate any additional events. On this basis we are prepared to lift our holding objection and have no further comment to make on the proposals at this stage Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
St Giles' House	Dorset	E21/0037	II*	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>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. 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</p>

				<p>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. 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"> > 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. > 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. > the use of part of the lake for activities perhaps raises issues of its own. > 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. > On the non-physical side, it is difficult to believe that there will not be some noise coming from the site, including music. <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 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</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>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>
Clacton Seafront Gardens	Essex	E20/1826	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of Observation Wheel. The Pier Clacton On Sea Essex CO15 1QX MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2021</p> <p>Further to our earlier response of 16th March 2021, the applicant has provided a little more information and some further, and in our opinion, inadequate visualisations of what it might look like. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this second joint response.</p> <p>Having taken this additional information into consideration, we have not changed our position of objection. Particularly as we now appreciate that there could be two ferris wheels, one at Clacton Pavilion and the other at Clacton Pier. The Pavilion has just got one in operation this month. As statutory consultees we were not consulted on this which is regrettable, as you will be aware that it is your obligation under in Article 18/Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 to inform us of any planning application which may</p>

					<p>affect a registered park and garden. We would be grateful if you could please ensure that your database is updated to make sure this does not happen again.</p> <p>The prospect of there being two wheels close to each would certainly have a negative impact on the setting of the Seafrost Gardens, which, as you are aware is a grade II Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Boreham House	Essex	E21/0251	-	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of electric vehicle charging station with 12 charging points and associated ancillary works. Land West Of Paynes Lane And North Of Main Road Boreham Chelmsford Essex</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2021</p> <p>This application was brought to our attention by colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT). As you are aware, the Gardens Trust (GT) is a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We are disappointed that your officers have failed to notify us about 21/00681/FUL as is your obligation under in Article 18/Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. We would be grateful if you could please ensure that your database is updated to make sure this does not happen again. We have liaised with our colleagues in the EGT and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>This application is for an electric vehicle charging station which would be located on a piece of open land or small field on Main Road, Boreham. At present, this area looks rural in character, the Premier Inn and other development associated with the modern A12 being distant from it. On the other side of Main Road, there is a long rectilinear canal leading up to the front of Boreham House, a grade I listed building built by the Hoare banking family in the 1730s. In the 1770s, Richard Hoare engaged the landscape designer Richard Woods to lay out pleasure grounds around it, of which the most conspicuous feature is the canal extending down to Main Road. The canal and the grounds around Boreham House are a grade II registered historic landscape, a fact completely overlooked in the Planning and Design and Access Statement attached to this application. The charging station would change the character of the other side of the road, damaging the setting of the historic landscape. There would be concrete hardstanding, six bays of Y-shaped canopies, with signage, advertising and lighting. The Design and Access Statement claims this would be 'of high architectural quality', and 'has been designed to provide</p>

					<p>a positive relationship with the surrounding context', so that it would not 'harm the amenity or character of the surrounding area'. On our opinion, nothing could be further from the truth: this is a standard forecourt installation which would just be craned into place, and has taken no account of the context. No visualisations have been provided of how it might appear in the wider landscape or any information given on the proposed two replacement hawthorn trees, or any boundary treatment. The GT/EGT do not believe this is the right site for a development of this kind, and object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E21/0174	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for To fit automatic gate closers, electric keeps and keypads to existing pedestrian gates at Cecily Hill, The Old Kennels - Windsor Walk, and Barton Lane. Cirencester Park Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 2BU ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.05.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for development that might have an adverse impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Having looked at these proposals to improve both access and security in the management of Cirencester Park; GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E21/0191	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Installation of 2no. toilet blocks (from converted shipping containers) to comprise eight individual cubicles and one accessible cubicle. Cirencester College Fosse Way Campus Stroud Road Cirencester Gloucestershire MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.05.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Listed landscape, parks and gardens, has referred this Application to The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) for comment. There is little that can be said about this; except recognise that the College has a problem with toilet provision within the context of it's redevelopment proposals. As these shipping containers are hardly objects of beauty, GGLT would suggest that these toilets are given a 3 year temporary consent. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Highnam Court	Gloucestershire	E21/0210	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Partial demolition to facilitate raising floor level and roof. Linton Lodge, Newent Road, Highnam</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.05.2021 The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Registered or Listed parks and gardens, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. I am aware of the flood history of this part of the Highnam Court parkland</p>

				DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION	and the A40. The proposal to raise the building above the flood level in the manner proposed is both logical, and maintains the visual quality of the building and the surrounding parkland. It is noted that the CC flood adviser has commented. However, future housing development in the village of Highnam to the North could aggravate the flooding situation in the future, unless further flood alleviation works are undertaken to divert flood water to the South. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)
Toddington Manor	Gloucestershire	E21/0243	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2No. detached dwellings with associated parking and landscaping. Land Off Olde Lane, Toddington, Cheltenham RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2021 The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for Planning Applications that might have a detrimental impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this planning proposal on its behalf. Olde Lane, Toddington and the developed area leading to the Church has had a rather tortuous planning history over the last decade. This scheme gives an impression of deja vu, and would wish to remind the Planning Committee of GGLT's comments dated 18th October 2015, which were submitted to the Borough Council, and dealt with a very similar Planning Application to the proposal before you now. In summary, regardless of arguments on matters such as housing numbers, architectural design, sustainable transport, flooding, and ecology; it is GGLT'S opinion that: * Primarily, the views of the Church and the Manor have over-riding significance; * That the Registered parkland boundary to associated with Toddington Manor is illogical; * That however one might choose to develop the North side of Olde Lane, the result will block this critical parkland viewpoint. On this basis, it is GGLT's opinion that the Borough Council should maintain its previous stance, and refuse this proposal. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Lamer Park	Hertfordshire	E21/0170	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing single and two storey rear projections. Conversion from four flats to four terraced dwellinghouses with	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.05.2021 Demolition of existing single and two storey rear projections. Conversion from four flats to four terraced dwellinghouses with habitable roofspace following single storey rear extension and alterations to roof with insertion of front, side and rear dormer

				<p>habitable roofspace following single storey rear extension and alterations to roof with insertion of front, side and rear dormer Lamer Park Flats Lamer Lane Wheathampstead Hertfordshire AL4 8RJ</p>	<p>Lamer Park is a park and garden of great historic interest and on the List of Local Parks and Gardens drawn up by HGT and supplied to SADC. The documented history of the landscape includes early 18th century avenues, later English Landscape Park styling by Nathaniel Richmond, an associate of 'Capability' Brown and completion of his plan with some refinements by Humphry Repton in the later 18th century. Further details of these phases can be found in the attached document.</p> <p>Very little of the 18th century fabric survives and of the built environment here the coach house/stable block is of great significance, as not only a utilitarian building but also one designed, possibly by Robert Adam (who worked on the sister property at Shardeloes in Buckinghamshire), to be seen and appreciated in carefully designed views through the landscape. We consider that the section on heritage assets in the Planning, Design and Access Statement (Section 9) included with this application is totally inadequate. There is no consideration of the impact of the proposals on either the landscape or the building itself. We would expect a Heritage Impact Statement given the date of the building and the location within a landscape park designed by major figures of the 18th century. There is also no indication that the Guidance in Historic England The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3,2) has been followed and there are no indications of either the Zones of Visual Influence or Zones of Theoretical Visibility which leads us to question whether they have been considered.</p> <p>Although the building is not listed nationally, and nor is the park on the HE Register, nevertheless both building and park are heritage assets. The NPPF, Section 16, states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. This includes undesignated assets. Section 189 requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected. HGT considers that, although undesignated, this building has rather more significance than that accruing from the historic building itself, due to its place as a feature in Lamer designed landscapes of the 18th century. Consequently, HGT are formally requesting that Historic England consider listing this building nationally. Further details of our reasons for so doing are attached.</p> <p>HGT has grave concerns that the alterations proposed in this application would harm the heritage and thus the significance of both the historic 18th century building and the historic landscape park surrounding it. We therefore object to this application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning: Hertfordshire Gardens Trust Conservation Committee: The Gardens Trust cc The Gardens Trust Enc. Further Details on the significance of the coach house and stables at Lamer
Moor Park	Hertfords hire	E21/0123	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey lower ground floor rear extension, rear raised terrace with lower ground floor level patio, side garage extension, provision of solar panels, alterations to fenestration and associated alterations 1 Temple Gardens Moor Park WD3 1QJ BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Temple Gardens lies within the Grade II* Registered parkland of Moor Park and I temple Gardens lies in close proximity to the pond. This pond was first laid out in the 17th century as part of a formal landscape and altered in the 18th by 'Capability' Brown to a more naturalistic style, and further enhanced in the 19th century. It is a significant part of the designed landscape and the surrounding area is key to its setting. Temple Gardens is also part of the Moor Park Conservation Area and within the Green Belt. We have seen no hydrological study of the pond's water supply or how this will be affected by the excavation of the basement and swimming pool. We have grave concerns about this application on heritage grounds, in that excavation could alter the water levels in the historic pond, that this is further development within a Grade II* landscape which does not conserve and enhance it but further reduces its significance (NPPF Chapter 16). Further, this type of development within the Green Belt is inappropriate as thus is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt (NPPF 143). there is no public benefit to be gained from these proposals but they would cause harm to the significance of the Grade II* landscape, and the Grade I mansion's setting within this landscape and also encroach on the Green Belt. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0187	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of dwelling following demolition of existing 44 Mymms Drive Brookmans Park Hatfield AL9 7AF DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 13.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies within the setting, in in the historic boundaries, of Gobions, a Grade II park laid out by Charles Bridgeman in the early 18th century with designed views from the core gardens along Ray Brook to the perimeter, to Folly Arch and other points, including the northern horizon. Gobions was historically influential and recent research has added to the knowledge .

					<p>The proposed building, according to the applicant's plans and visuals would be a taller building than its neighbours which at present form a fairly coherent roofline on the northern horizon of the RPG. Together with the large amount of glazing on the southern garden elevation, this could cause harm to the setting, and therefore the significance of the RPG, with historic views refocused on the new house. We note that the design for the rear garden does not include details of species proposed: further screening would be required to mitigate harm.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0206	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey rear extension 5 Swanley Bar Lane Little Heath Potters Bar EN6 1NN BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The property, 5 Swanley Bar Lane, is situated in the former Gobions historic park but outside the Registered area, thus contributing to the setting of the historic Registered park. On the basis of the information in this application we do not consider that the proposed extension would cause undue harm to the setting of the park. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0207	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a ground and first floor side extension with internal alterations and new gable over bedroom 4 42 The Grove Hatfield AL9 7RN BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies on the northern edge of the Grade II Registered Park of Gobions, a significant and influential landscape laid out by Bridgeman in the early 18th Century. Views up the hill from the core gardens in the valley to the northern boundary were part of the original design. We have concerns that the large amount of glazing and the glass balustrade proposed would cause glare and a refocussing of views onto this house, causing harm to the setting and significance of the registered landscape, contrary to the NPPF, Section 16. If permission is granted further screening, in the form of trees and shrubs, to prevent intrusion on the Registered Park should be required. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
52 Bridge Road Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/0226	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2 x two-storey detached houses, associated parking and access, on the land to</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The cottages at 52/54 Bridge Road were built by Earl Cowper as estate cottages in 1876 on the edge of historic Sherrards Wood Park, which has</p>

				<p>the rear of 52 & 54 Bridge Road. 52 Bridge Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UR RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>been in existence since at least 1599. Bridge Road is, and has been historically, the southern boundary of this wooded park and the cottages are all that remains from this period in this area. Bridge Road is part of WGC CA and these cottages are noted in that Appraisal. Development on this site as proposed would severely harm the setting of these cottages, both in the approach to it and in the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the historic woodland. The overdevelopment of this site, in contrast to the surrounding dwellings, would also introduce a built element close to the former railway line, now a green walk for the residents of the Gardens City,. We consider this development inappropriate and harmful to heritage assets in this location. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Amwell Grove and Amwell Pool	Hertfords hire	E21/0234	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The erection of pool house building and construction of swimming pool. Amwell Grove Cautherly Lane Great Amwell Ware Hertfordshire SG12 9SP MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Amwell Grove is a Registered garden and Listed mansion both by Robert Mylne in the 18th century, as a Picturesque composition. The garden is thus both a heritage asset itself and acts as the setting for the listed building. The NPPF, paragraph 189, requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. we are therefore very disappointed that no Statement of Significance or Heritage Impact Assessment for either of these national assets is included in this application, thus hindering assessment of possible harm. The views to the west from the house included meadows, now gardens as part of the rural aesthetic. Further views to and from the New River (and New River Path) are screened by trees . however the views from the house, as shown in the 3D mock-up and Images include a large amount of hard landscaping/terracing in a very white shade, as well as a large amount of glass and water which will both cause reflections and glare. There is no justification advanced to justify the harm caused, as required by NPPF paragraph 193. We therefore object to this application on the grounds of possible harm to the historic garden and house, which we cannot assess with the lack of HIA, Statement of Significance or sufficient Justifcation. Kate Harwood</p>

					Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
36 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/0275	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Prune 2 x Himalayan Birch according to reduce crown height and spread by approximately 1- 1.5 metres to enhance natural form and retain size 36 Parkway Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HQ TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the pruning of these 2 trees. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Putteridge Bury	Hertfords hire	E21/0332	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge of Condition 3 (Management and maintenance plan) as attached to Planning Application 19/00204/FP granted on 15.03.2019 Land East Of Hayling Drive, Putteridge Park, Luton, Hertfordshire MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on planning application 21/01603/DOC, land east of Hayling Drive, Putteridge Park. The NHDC planning website pages will not accept comments citing that the date for comments has passed, contrary to your letter of 25 May 2021 which gives a deadline of 17th June. We are disappointed that this area of the agricultural estate of Putteridge Park has been selected for use as a public open space, as stated in our comments to planning application 19/02241/FP of 30 September 2019. We have looked at the documents provided with the current application and have 2 points to make. There is no indication of any landscaping, hard or planted of the boundaries. We would suggest that this point is clarified. Appendix 2 Green space quality manual. This has been developed for the mostly urban spaces in London. The Putteridge site has rural areas adjacent and the management of the site should take the rural nature of the area into account, rather than aim for the aesthetic used in urban parks Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning, Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on behalf of The Gardens Trust
Essendon Place (Eastern Electricity Staff Training College)	Hertfords hire	E21/0343	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a natural pool and enhancements to the existing garden terrace Great Oak House Essendon Place High Road Essendon Hatfield AL9 6GZ	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Essendon House was one of a number of small estates clustered in Essendon on the edges of Hatfield Park. Research has shown that these small landscapes were interlinked affording wider views to the residents. However, these landscapes have been compromised by later development, including Great Oak House, and the interlinking views lost. The area

				MISCELLANEOUS	proposed for the pond was in the former parkland of Essendon Place with no outstanding features. We therefore have no objections on heritage grounds to this proposal. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Grimsthorpe Castle	Lincolnshire	E21/0046	I	PLANNING APPLICATION The installation of a 20m monopole supporting 3 no. antennas, 2 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto including 1 No. GPS module Grass Verge On Main Street(A151)Between Grimsthorpe And Edenham, Grimsthorpe, PE10 0NG COMMUNICATION/CCTV	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.05.2021 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT), a conservation and education charity, considers it necessary and appropriate to comment on this planning application and in addition on behalf of The Gardens Trust. Lincolnshire Gardens Trust would like to comment on RTK's Historic Impact Assessment and Planning Statement. We agree with the report that the garden has neither the age, grandeur nor the historic importance of the main asset but is within the curtilage and is therefore an important historic asset. However, the Trust's research reveals the significance of both the location and the surviving elements of the walled garden. This indicates not only that the hotch-potch of brickwork almost certainly contain elements of the 18C, but more significantly that the site has remained both an orchard and working garden from as early as c1750 – at least 270 years. Moreover, the surviving bothy, fruits stores and Normanton glasshouse, the unusual gateway west (likely prior to WWII), and the veteran espalier trees by the bothy, and many veteran fruit trees in unusual quantity, laden with mistletoe, add much to the heritage of the site and sense of place. Even if planted between the World Wars, many of Grimsthorpe's apple trees, such as these, are likely to be over 100 years old. RTK's conclusion, para 2.7, seems misleading (i.e., that the walled garden was commenced during the late 19C period, was in existence in some form or other by 1889 and repaired extensively during the 1920s, 1960s and more recently.) Therefore, to clarify the details, and underline the significance of the Walled Gardens, LGT are sharing a timeline, surveys and important built features extant within the walled garden (to be sent by email) in the hope that they might assist in better assessing and understanding the site. This proposed restoration of the walling within this Parks and Gardens Register Grade I setting requires careful attention, and, as a conservation charity, the proposal is indeed welcome and worth supporting. Steffie Shields Chairman

Grimsthorpe Castle	Lincolnshire	E21/0083	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extended programme of various (ongoing) masonry repairs to walled garden</p> <p>The Walled Garden , Grimsthorpe Castle, Edenham Road, PE10 0LY</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.05.2021</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT), a conservation and education charity, considers it necessary and appropriate to comment on this planning application and in addition on behalf of The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust would like to comment on RTK's Historic Impact Assessment and Planning Statement. We agree with the report that the garden has neither the age, grandeur nor the historic importance of the main asset but is within the curtilage and is therefore an important historic asset.</p> <p>However, the Trust's research reveals the significance of both the location and the surviving elements of the walled garden. This indicates not only that the hotch-potch of brickwork almost certainly contain elements of the 18C, but more significantly that the site has remained both an orchard and working garden from as early as c1750 – at least 270 years. Moreover, the surviving bothy, fruits stores and Normanton glasshouse, the unusual gateway west (likely prior to WWII), and the veteran espalier trees by the bothy, and many veteran fruit trees in unusual quantity, laden with mistletoe, add much to the heritage of the site and sense of place. Even if planted between the World Wars, many of Grimsthorpe's apple trees, such as these, are likely to be over 100 years old.</p> <p>RTK's conclusion, para 2.7, seems misleading (i.e., that the walled garden was commenced during the late 19C period, was in existence in some form or other by 1889 and repaired extensively during the 1920s, 1960s and more recently.) Therefore, to clarify the details, and underline the significance of the Walled Gardens, LGT are sharing a timeline, surveys and important built features extant within the walled garden (to be sent by email) in the hope that they might assist in better assessing and understanding the site. This proposed restoration of the walling within this Parks and Gardens Register Grade I setting requires careful attention, and, as a conservation charity, the proposal is indeed welcome and worth supporting.</p> <p>Steffie Shields Chairman</p>
Lynford Hall	Norfolk	E21/0146	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of land for the stationing of a mobile catering trailer and erection of single storey toilet and storage building.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the plans for the stationing of a mobile catering trailer and erection of a single storey toilet and storage building at Lynford Gardens, in the curtilage of Lynford Hall, a Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden</p>

				Lynford Gardens Lynford Road Lynford CHANGE OF USE	(List entry 1000224. This is a small-scale development in the north east corner of the Lynford Hall estate. The proposed site is immediately to the east of the arboretum and on the north-west corner of the old kitchen garden and gardener's cottage, which is now in private ownership. The proposed facilities have no detrimental impact on the registered park and garden and will not be visible from the hall. The Gardens Trust has no objection. Yours sincerely Susan Grice Planning Team Norfolk Gardens Trust
Old Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan	Norfolk	E21/0164	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.05.2021 Old Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan submission consultation Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee. We welcome the opportunity to consider the Neighbourhood Plan submission for Old Hunstanton. The Norfolk Gardens Trust has reviewed the plan and I am writing 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 not on the Register but nevertheless considered to be local heritage assets. We are pleased to see that the draft Old Hunstanton Plan focusses on the conservation of the historic character of the village and identifies the importance of conservation of both listed heritage assets and non-designated assets. These policies, and the proposed extension of the conservation area to the whole parish, will help to preserve parks and gardens with heritage value from inappropriate development. In assessing future planning applications for their impact on heritage parks and gardens, The Gardens Trust will find the Old Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan a valuable tool. Sincerely, Susan Grice Norfolk Gardens Trust – Planning team
Kimberley Hall	Norfolk	E21/0167	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to allow basement level of Kimberley Hall to be used as privately hired event space.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as a statutory consultee on this planning application. This response is made on behalf of both the GT and the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT). The application is to

				Minor internal modifications to one wall and addition of fire doors, emergency escape lighting and fire detection. Kimberley Hall Barnham Broom Road Downham NR18 0RT CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION	allow the basement level of the hall to be used as a privately hired event space, together with related internal modifications. The Trusts have no objection to this application. Yours Sincerely Keri Williams Planning Officer, Norfolk Gardens Trust
Intwood Hall	Norfolk	E21/0213	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of memorial Intwood Hall Intwood Road Intwood NR4 6TG SCULPTURE/MONUMENT	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on this application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. There is no objection to this application. Yours Sincerely Keri Williams Planning Officer, Norfolk Gardens Trust
Godwick Hall	Norfolk	E21/0257	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of manager's dwelling and detached carport Godwick Hall Mill Road Godwick RESIDENTIAL, PARKING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2021 Thank you for your consultation on this application. The application is supported by a very thorough Heritage assessment. It explains that Godwick Hall is set in about 100 acres of parkland. Designated heritage assets within the parkland include the deserted village of Godwick, the Great Barn, the remains of Godwick church tower and a range of cattle sheds. There is also the site of the original Godwick Hall and the associated gardens and landscape. The replacement Godwick Hall is deemed an undesignated heritage asset. The Heritage Assessment concludes that the proposed dwelling would result in harm to the designated and undesignated heritage assets within the parkland, that harm being less than substantial. It is acknowledged that the proposed house would be well separated from the designated heritage assets and would benefit from tree screening. Nevertheless the house would be substantial in scale and would be apparent from the proposed access, which would serve as the main approach to the wider site. In addition, the proposed vertical boarding would not be typical of the local vernacular, which is characterised more by horizontal boarding. Having regard to the harm acknowledged in the Heritage Assessment the Gardens Trust objects to this application. It is appreciated that the harm

					identified will need to be balanced against any public benefits arising from the development, which may its contribution to business viability. Norfolk Gardens Trust
Godwick Hall	Norfolk	E21/0260	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of cabin for holiday accommodation. TITTLESHALL: Godwick Hall Mill Road Godwick HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2021 Thank you for your consultation on this application. The application is supported by a very thorough Heritage assessment. It explains that Godwick Hall is set in about 100 acres of parkland. Designated heritage assets within the parkland include the deserted village of Godwick, the Great Barn, the remains of Godwick church tower and a range of cattle sheds. There is also the site of the original Godwick Hall and the associated gardens and landscape. The replacement Godwick Hall is deemed an undesignated heritage asset. The Heritage Assessment concludes that the proposed holiday cabin would result in harm to the designated and undesignated heritage assets within the parkland, that harm being less than substantial. It is acknowledged that the holiday cabin would be well separated from the designated heritage assets. and would benefit from tree screening. Nevertheless, the holiday cabin would extend the footprint of development within the setting of Godwick Hall and would be of a bland design. Having regard to the harm acknowledged in the Heritage Assessment the Norfolk Gardens Trust objects to this application. It is appreciated that the harm identified will need to be balanced against any public benefits arising from the development, which may its contribution to business viability. Norfolk Gardens Trust
The Plantation Garden, Norwich	Norfolk	E21/0264	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of new hazel fence and gate between boundaries of Plantation House and Plantation Gardens. Plantation House 4 Earlham Road Norwich NR2 3DB BOUNDARY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on this application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. There is no objection to this application. Yours Sincerely Keri Williams Planning Officer, Norfolk Gardens Trust
The Plantation Garden, Norwich	Norfolk	E21/0304	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garden room to replace demolished conservatory and previously approved conservatory. Plantation House 4 Earlham Road	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on this application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. There is no objection to this application. Yours Sincerely

				Norwich NR2 3DB GARDEN BUILDING	Keri Williams Planning Officer, Norfolk Gardens Trust
The Plantation Garden, Norwich	Norfolk	E21/0305	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Enlargement of rear dormer. 8 Clarendon Road Norwich NR2 2PW BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on this application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. There is no objection to this application. Yours Sincerely Keri Williams Planning Officer, Norfolk Gardens Trust
Cragside	Northumb erland	E21/0070	I	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	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2021 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. 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. 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 when the Registered P&G was designated in 1985, the registered area wraps around the north and east sides of the site. It seems essential that the impact of the proposed major development of the football field on the Cragside designed landscape is properly

					<p>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> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.05.2021 Thank you for re-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 (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade I. Again, we have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) for their local knowledge and familiarity with this site.</p> <p>We welcome the submission of the revised Heritage Statement, which now acknowledges the Grade I RPG and provides view analysis from a selection of locations within the boundary. Accepting that there is only minimal and distant inter-visibility between points on the carriage drive and the higher walks with the proposed development, we are now happy to lift our holding objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manage</p>
Belford Hall	Northumb erland	E21/0203	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Application (all matters reserved) for the Construction of 11 Dwellings within a Walled Garden; New Extension to Golf Clubhouse; Bowling Green and Play Park; Retail Units and Supermarket/Farm Shop; Football/Multi Sport Pitch; 2 Tennis Courts; 12 Detached Dwelling Houses; 14 Bungalows;</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2021 Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Belford Hall, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The GT and NGT are concerned that the proposed development will have both a direct and an indirect adverse impact on the registered park and garden [RPG] at Belford. The designation of the RPG was presumably intended to acknowledge and defend the parkland setting of Belford Hall</p>

				<p>Golf Driving Range; Micro-Brewery and Holiday Lodges Belford Golf Club And Driving Range South Road Belford Northumberland NE70 7DP RESIDENTIAL, RETAIL, SPORT/LEISURE, ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>(LB, Grade One) and building a housing development and a supermarket within the designated area cannot surely be regarded as appropriate development within the RPG. Beyond the direct impact we are also concerned that the proposed development would affect views from the parkland (beyond the obvious sight line south from the hall). It seems entirely inappropriate to consider a development of this scale and nature, partly within the RPG and entirely within the Belford Conservation Area, and we therefore object to the proposed development.</p> <p>While we acknowledge that the principal view south from the hall towards the development site is filtered to an extent by the existing parkland plantings [Fig 5 in the HIA], we would be concerned that the long view to the south [Fig 6 in the HIA] would be considerably altered by the “walled garden” housing development within the boundary of the RPG and the proposed housing estate to the south of the Belford Burn. The argument given in the HIA that building more appropriate buildings to take the eye away from the distant industrial buildings seems hardly defensible and it seems more likely that the overall effect would be to replace a semi-rural outlook now with a fully urban one.</p> <p>The curious proposal to create a new “walled garden” to partially hide the new housing proposed to be built within the RPG to the north of the Belford Burn, is unlikely to soften the appearance of the new houses greatly, unless the new walls are so high that the residents will have no outlook (presumably the view towards the hall and the parkland would be a major selling point for these houses) and feel imprisoned in their crowded enclave.</p> <p>The proposed developments to the North of the Belford Burn, within the RPG, will presumably require the loss of most, if not all, of the present tree cover to accommodate the new “walled garden” housing, supermarket, farm shop, extended clubhouse and new access roads and parking areas to serve the various new buildings. Available satellite imagery shows that these plantings are significant in screening the present golf club building (and the more distant industrial buildings) from the parkland and Belford Hall and any loss of the existing tree cover here would open up the development site further in views from Hall and parkland.</p> <p>In addition to enhancing the principal view to the south from the Hall it should be remembered that the parkland also provided an approach created to provide a sense of anticipation for the approaching visitor to the hall from the Great North Road. On passing the South Lodge and entering</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>the parkland an immediate change of pace and contrast was intended. This approach is an early C19 alteration from the original more direct approach and was part of Dobson’s alterations to both house and landscape. The impact of the proposed development from the south drive seems to have been little considered in the HIA and a better appreciation of how the parkland was used for quiet enjoyment historically (as it no doubt still is by the residents of Belford Hall) would make it easier to appreciate what the proposed development would be eroding. Were there circuit walks or carriage drives (perhaps by reference to the estate plans of 1754 and c.1818) and did these include features of interest (such as the fish pond shown to the N. of the development?) and designed views to the wider landscape beyond the parkland? Were the parkland plantings intended to enhance walks and drives within the parkland or just to be seen from the south front of the hall and the entrance drive? Did the boundary plantings serve to screen the public road and the edge of Belford?</p> <p>It seems that an improved understanding of the historic development of the parkland and its evolution would enable a better evaluation of the impact of the proposed development and appropriate mitigation measures such as new planting.</p> <p>To summarise: the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Moreby Hall	North Yorkshire	E20/0234	II	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed building consent for conversion and extension of former garage. Moreby Hall, Moreby, Stillingfleet. BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for another re- consultation of The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regards to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens – in this case Moreby Hall registered grade II with the house listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. YGT has liaised with the GT and is authorised by the GT to respond to this re-consultation.</p> <p>On file you will have our responses to the original application documents (our response dated 19th June 2020) and to the amended plans (our response dated 11th September) and again our response of 24th February where we added further comments.</p> <p>We refer you to our comments and concerns in our letter of 24th February.</p>

					<p>We have noted Selby DC Conservation Officers advice of 24th March 2021 regarding the potential impact of having domestic curtilage round a building that is essentially within the park and was not designed or built to be a habitable dwelling. We defer to the expertise and advice of your Authority's Conservation Officer regarding this reconsultation.</p> <p>We request that if permission is granted that there is an agreed landscape plan by a historic specialist for the areas surrounding the development to reduce the impact of the domestic curtilage on the registered historic park and garden. We also request that Selby DC removes permitted development rights, so that residents would need planning permission for those changes that usually fall under permitted development rights.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Norton Conyers	North Yorkshire	E21/0098	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of new doorway connecting the orangery to the bothy, together with removal of partitions in the bothy constructed variously during the 19th and 20th centuries and laying of a new floor Orangery Norton Conyers Hall Norton Conyers North Yorkshire BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The park, pleasure grounds and garden at Norton Conyers is registered grade II. This application relates to the orangery (listed grade II) located in the centre of the walled (kitchen) garden, (walls, gate piers and gate all listed grade II), dating from the late 18th century. The orangery is central in a symmetrical composition with low projecting wings to the west and east; the bothy and forcing house respectively. There are south-facing greenhouses adjoining the bothy and forcing house but the latter, known as the vine house, is currently ruinous and the former was rebuilt possibly in the early 20th century and is now the peach house. The gardens in the walled garden are very attractive – we assume that the photographs in the documents were taken some time ago.</p> <p>This is a detailed and carefully considered planning application that will give the bothy a sustainable new use in connection with the orangery, providing an income-generating venue for weddings, gatherings and events. We understand that the peach house will remain as a working environment with the retained hatchway between the bothy and peach</p>

					<p>house enabling the public to see into the peach house.</p> <p>We have the following comment to make:</p> <p>How will the area north of the orangery be treated to compliment the area for weddings etc? We suggest that a landscaping scheme is devised that will compliment the facilities in the orangery and bothy whilst retaining an area for plant and fruit sales. The latter of course nod to the historic and present function of the walled garden and are a useful resource for garden visitors.</p> <p>We have no objection to this planning application and support the endeavours to generate revenue for the future of Norton Conyers.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
The Long Walk, Knaresborough	North Yorkshire	E21/0110	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective Change of use of agricultural land comp of area of 0.44ha to D2 Outdoor Recreational Use together with the erection of 4 buildings (a summerhouse and 3 seating shelters) and construction of hard standings ancillary to the proposed use, and change of use of agricultural land comprising an area of 0.1072ha to a Sui Generis use of visitor attraction being an extension of Mother Shiptons Park.</p> <p>Mother Shiptons Cave Prophecy Lodge Harrogate Road Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 8DD</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – The Long Walk, Knaresborough, registered Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Long Walk extends for c.1km along the west bank of the gorge carrying the River Nidd. It developed as an 18th C picturesque promenade, (laid out and planted by Sir Henry Slingsby), part of the attractions of Knaresborough as a popular spa town from the late 16th C. The walk was described by Dr Adam Hunter as a ‘beautiful and romantic walk’ in 1807 and it continues to be popular. It is in private ownership. Mother Shipton’s Cave is located towards the southern end of The Walk before pedestrians arrive at Low Bridge.</p> <p>This application is for an area of agricultural land immediately against a section of the western boundary of the Registered Historic Park and Garden; The Long Walk. It is also within the Green Belt, the Knaresborough Conservation Area, and the Harrogate Landscape Character Assessment Area 53 Nidd Gorge (Feb 2004). All these significant designations make it very regrettable that the applicant has seemingly developed the site without advice from the planning authority and that this is a retrospective application.</p> <p>This planning application leads the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens</p>

					<p>Trust to have concerns that the development could continue its expansion towards the agricultural setting and destroy the setting of the treed area that sits between the river and agriculture; an important part of the historic, aesthetic, cultural and community assets of the area. We are uncertain as to the proposals and future for the northern site on this planning application outlined in red; the park extension. Is this for vehicular parking or further development?</p> <p>We underline that we consider that any development should pay heed to the importance of The Long Walk and its qualities and we consider that this is lacking in this application and have the following comments and advice: What are the intentions for the 'park extension'? If it is approved for vehicular parking then the surface treatment needs to be sympathetic to this rural location and not tarmac. We advise that hard landscaping in general in the planning application area is minimal.</p> <p>Although we appreciate that the seating shelters are constructed of wood the aluminium roof is not sympathetic to this historic area and we advise cedar shingles or similar more natural material.</p> <p>We are not aware of the material for the summerhouse roof and again advise a natural material such as cedar shingles.</p> <p>We are concerned about the interface between The Long Walk and this development. There needs to be additional tree planting between the Walk and the development, to focus the vista along the Walk. We strongly advise that there is a landscape management plan for the trees in this area and new tree planting is carried out and monitored.</p> <p>We agree with the Smeeden Foreman report at 6.33 and their 'recommendations for future enhancement to include the protection and repair of the field's western boundary by gapping up and planting a new native hedgerow with additional hedgerow trees. This would be of particular benefit as the existing vegetation along this hedgerow contains mature ash trees (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>). These trees provide a valuable landscape resource, contributing to the Special Landscape Area, but are life limited due to anticipated ash dieback disease.'</p> <p>Overall, we have reservations about this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
University of York Campus West	North Yorkshire	E21/0137	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of all-weather surface	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory

designed landscape				<p>with underground anchors to enable erection of a marquee within part of the Vanbrugh Bowl and associated land regrading and access paths</p> <p>Vanbrugh College University Of York University Road Heslington York</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The application site is situated immediately south of the Sir Jack Lyons Concert Hall and to the north of Campus Lake, in the University of York's Campus West and the Campus West designed landscape, a focal point for the Campus beside the lake. The designed landscape is on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade II and was designed by Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall & Partners (RMJM). It was registered due to its historic and design interest, landscaping, designers, degree of survival and group value of the University buildings.</p> <p>Regarding this planning application the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust would like to underline the following information taken from the Smeeden Foreman, Design, Access and Heritage Statement :</p> <p>P5: Site Description and Use 'The University of York Landscape Management Plan 2019-25[1] on Page 4 writes "The University is renowned for its skilfully designed contemporary landscape. Designed and built in the early 1960's, the landscape has matured and is now accepted as a classic piece of design. In 2018 Historic England visited west campus, following which it decided to list several buildings as examples of 1960's architecture. Additionally, it also listed a significant area of the campus as a grade II Registered Park and Garden".'</p> <p>P9: History and Development of the Site 'The Historic England description explains "To the south-west of the Sir Jack Lyons Concert Hall and Music Research Centre the land gently undulates and in front of the building's south elevation is a naturalistic open-air amphitheatre with sloping rather than tiered sides".'</p> <p>P10: Understanding the Designed Heritage Asset 'In terms of heritage values, The Vanbrugh Bowl has historical value as part of the designed landscape described above, i.e. "it is a physical manifestation of the University of York Development Plan, which was heralded as the beginning of contemporary university planning in Britain". Its aesthetic value is primarily linked to it forming one of many varied open spaces, framed by buildings, local topography and a covered walkway, adjacent to the central lake focal point and allowing views towards the lake</p>
--------------------	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>and vice versa. Communal value is linked to the space being used and enjoyed by many students past and present. These elements combine to create the overall significance of the space.'</p> <p>The Smeeden Foreman, Design, Access and Heritage Statement p11 states: 'The proposed development comprises a permanent high quality coloured asphalt surface in natural gravel colours to enable multi-functional, multi-seasonal and all-weather use of part of the Vanbrugh Bowl open space. Other proposed permanent features include permanent underground anchors (to enable the erection of a marquee for uses including a Covid-secure outdoor events space and graduation ceremonies). The marquee is intended to be used for temporary events only, with the site being available for informal recreational use at other times.'</p> <p>On a recent visit we noted that a marquee is already in place and we understand the current need for temporary covered outside areas because of the pandemic. However, we strongly oppose future use of the Vanbrugh Bowl for a marquee and the associated hard standing, regrading of the designed landscape and anchor points. This is completely contrary to the significance of the University of York's contemporary university design, turning a space for quiet rest (which you come across as a surprise discovery) in a naturalistic environment into a busy, noisy, built space. This proposal will form a complete block to the flow of the grass landscape. The whole design of the campus was of buildings running through space with views of the lake, now obscured. Asphalt hard standing will never look the same as grass and the bowl will be spoilt.</p> <p>Areas of hard landscaping already exist on the west campus that could be used for a marquee; but there is no other space comparable to this one. It is destruction, not creation, and we consider that the arguments in favour are specious and meretricious, based on immediate exigency not long-term impact.</p> <p>We disagree with the Smeeden Foreman, Design, Access and Heritage Statement p13. Contrary to what it suggests the visual and amenity impacts of this proposal will extend well beyond the immediate site. We are not convinced that this proposal is compliant with paragraphs 193 and 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Thirsk Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/0151	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for Change of Use of agricultural land, building and domestic garden to mixed use to allow for the creation of a sculpture park and gallery, along with the continued use of both existing agricultural land for grazing of livestock and private garden.</p> <p>Thirsk Hall Kirkgate Thirsk North Yorkshire</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. 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>Thirsk Hall lies within the conservation area of Thirsk, located on the north western side of the market town and close to the 15th C parish church. The historic park and garden at Thirsk Hall are not currently included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. However, Thirsk Hall dating from 1720 with later work (the two wings) by John Carr of York in 1770, is listed grade II* and within the curtilage of the Hall are six other buildings listed grade II. To the west of the Hall surrounded by high walls are the gardens and parkland including the remains of a large glasshouse/vinery near the northern boundary, further west is the walled kitchen garden and towards the western front of the Hall is a good example of a ha- ha. The whole grounds extend to 9.2ha and the grazing and flower garden areas are attractive.</p> <p>This application is for the conversion of a barn, and the creation of a sculpture park which we understand is intended to eventually extend to the whole of the grounds.</p> <p>The barn conversion is fairly discreet but we have not noted any details of vehicular access for changing exhibitions which will no doubt involve heavy vehicles. We note that there is not to be any visitor's vehicle parking on site.</p> <p>We have no objection to the use of the grounds for exhibiting sculpture but would be concerned about intensive use in a later scheme which could change these areas drastically, compacting the ground, damaging the fine trees etc. It will all need to be well-managed and we advise a landscape management plan. We have not noted a plan for the grounds or a management plan which should form part of the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>

High Wall, Headington	Oxfordshire	E21/0075	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey outbuilding for ancillary use. 2 Pullens Field Oxford OX3 0BU MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2021</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 Oxford Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have read the online documentation and are surprised that there is no mention in the Design and Access Statement (D&A) or elsewhere, that the proposed structure lies immediately on the boundary with the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of High Wall. This property has a formal garden laid out by Harold Peto c1912 with later work by Percy Cane in the 1920s. Some of the gardens and a tennis court near the west boundary have already been lost to development. The register entry states that 'the field adjacent to the south (now built on) appears to have been important in views from the pergola and croquet lawn.' It is possible that this could have included the application site, but nothing in the documentation elucidates us on this point. Percy Cane illustrated parts of the Garden in his book 'Modern Gardens' of 1927.</p> <p>We have been unable to undertake a site visit and our concern therefore is the possibility that the proposed outbuilding will be visible from the terrace of High Wall, whose south front opens onto the croquet lawn via an arched loggia. We can see in a photo attached to the documents that there are dense mature trees behind the existing shed but the new building lies very close to the High Wall boundary. Without a Visual Impact Assessment it is not possible for us to assess whether or not these proposals will have a negative impact upon designed views from High Wall or its setting. Views from within the RPG would have been very helpful to us and your officers in order to understand whether or not these proposals might have a negative impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>We would ask your officers to satisfy yourselves that this application will not have an adverse impact upon the setting and designed views from High Wall. If that is the case, we would object to this proposal, and suggest that the applicant find a less sensitive area within the property to site their new outbuilding.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--------------------------	-------------	----------	----	---	--

Berwick Park	Shropshire	E21/0295	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Shrewsbury North West Relief Road scheme. Comprising - construction of 6.9km single carriageway (7.3m wide) road; severance of local roads and footpaths; provision of combined footway/cycleway; erection of three bridged structures over carriageway; diversion of existing bridleway/footpath via an underpass; climbing lane on westbound approach; 670m long viaduct; bridge over railway; two flood storage areas; provision of two new roundabout junctions and improvements to two existing roundabouts; associated traffic calming measures, landscaping and drainage schemes</p> <p>ROAD</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2021</p> <p>I write with reference to the above proposed major road scheme and its probable effects on both the fabric and the setting of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Berwick Park, Shrewsbury. 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>The historic Berwick Park lies to the north and west of Shrewsbury, beyond and to the east and north of the river Severn. As stated in the National Heritage List Entry (1001706) it is included on the Register of Parks and Gardens for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · it is a representative example of a C18 park, improved in the late C19, which has survived well; · although now overlain by later developments, there is clear documentary evidence of the presence of an early-C18 formal garden, possibly associated with the influential garden designer and writer Stephen Switzer, which substantially increases the park's historic interest; · the Italianate Garden of c.1878 survives well and this alongside other later C19 improvements to the park enhances the interest of the whole; · most phases of development are contemporary with existing buildings, many of which are Listed and as such there is good group value. <p>In addition to the above, Berwick Park is home to and provides the parkland setting for twelve Listed buildings, including Berwick House (Grade II*), Berwick Chapel (Grade II*), The Almshouses (Grade II*), the North Lodge, with its gates and railings (Grade II) and the Eyecatcher (Grade II). All of these contribute to a designed landscape ensemble of great beauty and elevated significance, with a coherence of clear design intention and planting that is still clearly evident today.</p> <p>Of particular design significance is what is now referred to as Willow Pool but which is shown on the 1817-27 Ordnance Survey Drawings as an irregular sinuous lake. This was clearly intended as a significant feature in the designed landscape and was so placed as to be visible within it from Berwick House itself, framed to east and west by adjacent woodlands. Further south, the Laundry Terrace immediately adjacent to the river Severn similarly dates to the same design period and was connected to the north by a path to the pleasure grounds surrounding the house and to the east to Gravel Hill farmhouse.</p>
--------------	------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>Notwithstanding the current boundary of the Registered Park and Garden, it is clear therefore that the later-18th &/or early-19th century designed landscape of Berwick Park as now still survives, however much altered it may be by more recent developments or management, was originally intended to extend at least as far as the river Severn and perhaps beyond, to the outskirts of Shrewsbury.</p> <p>All of this design elegance and historic significance will unfortunately be largely obliterated by the proposed road, which will cut across the southern end of the designed landscape from east to west, severing it from the historic parkland landscape to the north, apart from a narrow 'wildlife culvert' at the southern end of Willow Pool, damaging the historic lake and the nearby Laundry Terrace as well as its historic wooded link to the Berwick House Pleasure Grounds and disrupting the carefully designed views of the landscape south from Berwick House itself and other areas to the north and west. The 'Zone of Theoretical Visibility' (ZTV) published as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment prepared by WSP confirms that hardly any area of Berwick Park will be free of the negative visual impact of the proposed road, which as it crosses the designed landscape will either be in a cutting or elevated on an embankment, where it is not carried on a viaduct.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the magnitude and scale of these effects, the 'Historic Environment' chapter of the EIA prepared by WSP Consultants concludes that the overall effect on this 'heritage asset' would be 'slight adverse'. We do not accept this conclusion, which has been reached firstly by categorising the 'heritage value' of Berwick Park as 'medium', based simply on its Grade II status without any further study or investigation of its origins, history and development or the true extent or quality of its designed landscape.</p> <p>Secondly, it assesses the level of harm as 'minor adverse', equating this with 'less than substantial' but with no justification given for this relationship. Actual loss and damage will be caused to the fabric of the historic designed landscape and consequently to its intended design function - it matters not that these lie outwith the boundary of the Registered Park and Garden area.</p> <p>We agree that the overall harm caused to the significance of Berwick Park will be 'less than substantial' but we disagree strongly about the level of that harm, which for the reasons given above we would categorise as 'significant'. Given the nature of the proposed development, we cannot</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>see how such harm can be mitigated. We therefore object to the proposed development. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Fulwood House Cliffefield Road, Sheffield	South Yorkshire	E21/0073	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of workshop and ancillary office buildings, erection of 12 dwellings with associated parking, access road and landscaping, , The proposed dwellings will be two-storeys with additional accommodation in a 'heightened' roof space and will have resident's only off-street parking located to the rear accessed by a short non-adopted private road. Goodman Sparks Ltd, Fulwood House, Cliffefield Road, Sheffield, S8 9DH DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The site of this planning application lies immediately to the south of Meersbrook Park walled garden where Meersbrook Park Users Trust (MPUT) work in partnership with Heeley City Farm and Sheffield City Council. For the past eighteen years MPUT volunteers have worked to develop the historic walled garden into a unique and beautiful space enjoyed regularly by groups and a wide range of Sheffield's community. Meersbrook Park is a typical Victorian municipal park with commanding views over the City and woodland heights. It was originally the grounds of Meersbrook Hall (Listed Grade II) built in the mid- 18th C for Benjamin Roebuck, a prosperous Sheffield merchant. The Park covers almost eighteen hectares, land gradually acquired by the City from 1886, and is a significant and well-loved park and green space. The Hall is also managed by the Heeley Trust, in partnership with the Friends of Meersbrook Hall and hosts Sheffield OnLine and various community projects and events. The walled garden lies at the south western corner of the Park. We have no objection in principle to the development of housing on this brownfield site and the scheme will be a continuation of the type of dwellings that already occupy this area. Despite the Design and Access Statement writing that 'There is no over-development of house plots and adequate amenity space per dwelling house is provided', we do have some reservations about the amount of private amenity green space for each property although the close proximity of the Park will be an undoubted asset for residents and their families. We are pleased to note that there will be porous paving and surfacing throughout to reduce rainwater run-off and that the existing road-side</p>

					<p>trees on Cliffe Road will remain unaffected. The latter are an important element and should be protected during the works and any that fail after completion should be replaced.</p> <p>Our other concern is the potential impact of the height of the proposed dwellings in relation to the walled garden and we trust that Meersbrook Park Users Trust, Friends of Meersbrook Hall and the Heeley Trust have been consulted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Chillington	Staffordshire	E21/0238	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 3 No 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 15.05.2021</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>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman</p>
Kentwell Hall Melford Hall Trinity Hospital	Suffolk	E20/1883	II* II* II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Part demolition and replacement of existing logistics space totalling 10144m², new construction of a 1890m² Biomass Boiler Building and bridge link, alterations to existing</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2021</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 Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) whose local knowledge informs this response. Having read the online documentation, the difficulty we have is</p>

				<p>logistics building to accommodate a new chocolate production facility, construction of a new 155m2 Waste Water treatment building, new gatehouse and 2no. weighbridge offices, and other associated works.</p> <p>GCB Factory And Premises, Lower Road, Glemsford, Sudbury Suffolk CO10 7QS</p> <p>DEMOLITION, BIOMASS, MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>ascertaining whether these truly enormous new structures (the largest being almost 130' tall) will be visible from any of the registered parks and gardens (RPG) that this application might possibly effect : Grade II* Kentwell Hall, Grade II* Melford Hall or Grade II Trinity Hospital. The HIA fails completely to mention the Grade II Trinity Hospital RPG in Long Melford, which does not inspire confidence in its conclusions. The chosen view-points are not taken from within any of the RPGs – for example, it is possible that some glimpses may be possible from the Long Drive at Kentwell Hall, and/or visible from listed buildings within the RPG of Melford Hall. It is also unclear what level of light emittance these structures will have at night, compared to the current situation, especially during winter months. The proposed buildings are far taller than trees anyhow - (the current buildings at c12m (39') are diminutive by comparison) so the possible impact is potentially on a completely different scale to that experienced currently.</p> <p>The application site lies within the Dedham Vale AONB Stour Valley Project Area, and as such any proposals will require very careful consideration, as has been pointed out by other online correspondents.</p> <p>Your officers will be aware that HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, makes clear (p2) the 'contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.' It also continues (p2) '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.' Both Kentwell Hall and Melford Hall have Grade II* RPGs, so they are nationally important and not just of local significance, and in our opinion the possible effect on all three RPGs has not been satisfactorily addressed, thereby failing to comply with Para 189 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Without a satisfactory HIA for all the heritage assets, and as far as the GT is concerned, the RPGs, it is not possible for us to ascertain what harm, if any, may be caused to the setting and significance of these sites. Until we are provided with more complete information as to visibility and possible effects upon the setting and significance of the three RPGs of Kentwell Hall, Melford Hall and Trinity Hospital, we wish to submit a holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Packington Hall	Warwicks hire	E20/1271	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and extension of late C18 stable building to provide flexible event and learning spaces, meeting facilities and rentable accommodation. Car park, supporting facilities and landscaping. The Stables, Packington Estate, Meriden, CV7 7HF. HYBRID	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.05.2021 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 the proposals are well conceived and approached with a respect for the heritage value of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Packington, on which Capability Brown advised c1750. The proposed car park is to be located where there are currently miscellaneous outbuildings on existing hardstanding. The game larder is to be demolished but re-erected elsewhere on the estate. The proposed parking area is well screened by trees which are to be retained. We would suggest that there is no throughway between the house and the stable block frontages, which would further break up the large area of tarmac. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office
Garden at 1 Castle Hill (formerly Wantage)	Warwicks hire	E21/0155	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a one bedroom single storey dwelling Land Adjacent to 1, Castle Hill, Kenilworth RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2021 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 studied the online documentation for the new dwelling which lies entirely within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of 1 Castle Hill (formerly known as Wantage). The garden is designated in its own right as it embodies the fundamental Arts & Crafts ideas about garden design, and is a rare, complete survival within a suburban setting, designed specifically to integrate with the house, both by architect Herbert Buckland. Therefore, any application which seeks to build within the RPG must ensure that it causes no harm to the RPG, quite separately to any effect it may have on the setting of the Grade II 1 Castle Hill, whose listing includes the outbuilding immediately to the NNE, boundary wall, and garden walls and features. The HE register entry states that restrictive covenants were placed on the land along Castle Road when sold to the

					<p>Board of Health in 1883 to ensure the consistency of building lines and the quality of any development. We are not sure if these are still extant, but your officers will need to satisfy themselves that the proposals do not breach any of these should they still be relevant.</p> <p>In our opinion, it is very important to maintain the RPG as an entire garden, and not allow its rarity and specialness to be diminished by piecemeal development. The adopted Warwick District Local Plan (2011-2019) aims to protect designated heritage assets. Para 5.169 states ‘Historic Parks and Gardens are an important cultural, historic and environmental asset within the district and the Council wishes to ensure they are protected, maintained and restored. The Plan aims to protect them from development that would harm their character.’ In our opinion, this single sentence sums up why we object to any development within the garden of 1 Castle Hill. The land’s current overgrown state is no justification for development. Any development would cause permanent and irreversible harm to the RPG.</p> <p>The Strategic Policy DSC4 Spatial Strategy in Warwick DC’s Local Plan (2011-2029) particularly mentions (e) that ‘sites that have a detrimental impact upon the significance of Heritage Assets will be avoided unless the public benefits of development outweighs the harm.’ It is hard to find any public benefit in this application. There is no reason why the owner could not clear the site of overgrown vegetation and restore it without the need to build a house there, thereby providing their stated ‘public benefit’ without the need for a house. In addition, Policy DS11 does not allocate the site as one of the small urban sites suitable for strategic housing land.</p> <p>Your officers will be aware of HE’s The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 (SHA) which states on p2 ‘The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.’ It goes on to say it is important to consider the significance of the heritage asset itself and establish the contribution made by its setting. Features of importance include : topography (according to Jekyll who very much favoured a sloping site ‘it is obvious that its chief merit is that it calls for the free use of terracing and steps, and no other two features of garden architecture give so great an opportunity for varied and striking treatment’); formal design eg hierarchy, layout; history and degree of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>change over time (very important here); sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy; rarity of comparable survivals of setting; and cultural associations, all of which are relevant in this instance as the RPG has survived unscathed still attached to the building it was designed to adorn, even if now somewhat untidily, since its creation.</p> <p>The merits of the proposed new building or its visibility from the Grade II listed 1 Castle Hill is not the most relevant factor; the primary question we feel your officers should consider is the impact that this irreversible development would have upon the RPG itself is, bearing in mind the rarity of its survival as a complete garden, demonstrating fundamental Arts & Crafts ideas about garden design, still attached to the house it was designed for.</p> <p>The GT is unable to support any application which irreversibly harms the Grade II RPG and object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Heath Hall	West Yorkshire	E20/1550	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed reinstatement of the carriageway at Sycamore House and on the common. Sycamore House , Heath, Wakefield. REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens (RPG). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The gardens of Sycamore House at Heath are not on the RPG. Sycamore House is a grade II listed building and situated in the historic village of Heath; a conservation area.</p> <p>You will have our letter dated 11th February 2021 and we have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
19 Belle Vue Road, Wakefield	West Yorkshire	E21/0054	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Dwelling 19 Belle Vue Road, Wakefield, WF1 5NF</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) The GT is the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and</p>

				RESIDENTIAL	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. This application to build a four-bed detached house in a garden area to the rear of 19 Belle View Road is not within the setting of a registered historic park and garden and at some distance from Sandal Castle. We refer you to advice within your Authority. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E21/0067	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building application to carryout alterations involving installation of downpipe and glass canopy to front entrance 3 Grassington Mews Clifford Drive Menston BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development potentially affecting High Royds Hospital, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & 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. This is an application to undertake very minor works to one of the dwellings formed from the re-purposed psychiatric hospital. The work consists of the insertion of an additional cast iron rainwater downpipe, and the insertion of a metal framed glass canopy over the recessed front door. Neighbouring properties already have such canopies. We note the consultation from the Leeds Conservation Team and have no further comments to make. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Oulton Hall	West Yorkshire	E21/0099	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Summer house to rear 6 Wakefield Road Oulton Leeds GARDEN BUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.05.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Oulton Hall registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. No 4 and No 6 Wakefield Road is a divided listed grade II building, the

					<p>farmhouse of Oulton Farm/Home Farm, and is located immediately to the east of the eastern registered boundary of Oulton Hall, alongside the central length.</p> <p>The historic designed landscape at Oulton Hall is notable for the park and pleasure grounds being laid out in part to designs by the important landscaper Humphry Repton, 1809-10. As part of the commission, Repton produced one of his signature 'Red Books'. Mid- 19th C additions were made by the later notable designer W.A Nesfield. The Hall is in use as an hotel with the parkland as a golf course.</p> <p>The proposed summer house, of timber construction with a ridge height of 2.33m and a footprint of 3.5m x 4.75m, is to be sited in the rear garden of No 6 Wakefield Road. We do not consider that this will harm the setting of the registered park and garden and have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Lund Park	West Yorkshire	E21/0194	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed front and rear dormer windows 93 Selborne Grove Keighley West Yorkshire BD21 1HP BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens – Lund Park, HE ref. 1001515, registered Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Lund Park was Keighley's second public park, being opened in 1891. The site of over six hectares plus a fund of £6,000 had been donated by James Lund of Malsis Hall. The park is nominally square, with its boundary defined by a low stone wall and mature trees. The boundary is visually porous and the character of the park and the adjacent housing is a mutual one. Park Avenue to the NE is believed to have been designed contemporaneously with the park to provide a formal emphasis leading to the main entrance – and much of the other housing on the boundaries enjoys its adjacent setting to the park with an Arts & Crafts character.</p> <p>93 Selborne Grove shares this mutual role of both benefiting from the park and supporting the character of its setting. It is our opinion that the dormer windows proposed in this application should be designed within the guidelines published by Bradford Council's LDF Householder Supplementary Planning Document Guidance for Rooflights – ideally with</p>

					<p>small pitched roofs but at least with their widths restricted as defined in the Guide. The drawings currently submitted do not appear to meet these guidelines – so therefore we object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E21/0196	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Application for the conversion, extension and refurbishment of the existing brick-built barn to provide a new entrance to the farm with reception and ticket desk, an indoor play area, cafe and shop along with associated ancillary services; Erection of a new substation Temple Newsam Home Farm Templenewsam Road Halton BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Temple Newsam registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The wide extent of the registered landscape at Temple Newsam is significant as the setting to the grade I listed Temple Newsam House and a considerable number of other listed buildings including at Home Farm; the farmhouse and cottage (both listed grade II) and the Great Barn from 1694 (listed grade II), which lie to the north east of the House. Britain's most famous landscape designer, Lancelot 'Capability' Brown made a plan for Temple Newsam in 1762, which was the first for West Yorkshire. This has survived and, in spite of his design not having been fully implemented, it sheds light on the design approach of this foremost landscape designer.</p> <p>The brick-built barn or Cow Byre at Home Farm was designed as a fairly state- of- the- art milking parlour, processing dairy, etc when built in 1922 and the proposed extension is of a contemporary timber-clad design in the space between the cow byre and the College Building. On the eastern side there is a cobbled road/path between the cow byre and the Great Barn. It is intended that the proposals in this planning application will increase the recently diminishing visitor numbers to Home Farm and extend the facilities for families and not be dependent on fair weather. The Heritage Statement notes that the cow byre and its associated buildings are in need of urgent repairs to the roofs, roof-lights and other damage caused by damp penetration. This project will fund these repairs and the restoration of the historical features of the building. The new substation will augment these works.</p>

					<p>It appears that the proposed works will not be seen outside the Home Farm perimeter (and in the case of the substation outside the Stable Courtyard) and will not have any impact on the significance of the wider registered park and garden. We have no objection and trust that the works will assist the enjoyment and appreciation of this special historic place; Temple Newsam.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--