



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JUNE 2021

The GT conservation team received 230 new cases for England in June, 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, 51 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
ENGLAND					
Leigh Court	Avon	E21/0358	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 15no. homes for affordable rent and associated works to form access and landscape. Land Adjacent To Chapel Pill Lane Pill	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to the proposed development site at Chapel Pill Lane which lies within the Ham Green unregistered historic park and garden. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Avon Gardens Trust (AGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The proposed development site is in the heart of the North Somerset Green Belt, and immediately within the vicinity of three listed buildings that contribute to the history of the area. The site faces two registered parks and gardens (RPGs) : Leigh Court, Grade II, and to the north, Kings Weston, Grade II. As James Russell, a notable local archaeologist and garden historian, stated in his comprehensive article Mr Bright's Pleasure Ground at Hung Road – The Gardens of Ham Green House, Easton-in-Gordano (published in the AGT Journal, Autumn 1999) ... The history of this area, between the 12th and early 19th centuries was of the low mudstone cliffs overhanging the south bank of the River Avon between Crockerne and Chapel Pills forming the well documented anchorage of Hung Road, where trading ships were moored for considerable periods whilst their cargoes were transferred to

					<p>smaller vessels for carriage into Bristol. Between the early 12th and late 13th centuries Ham Green was the centre of a major pottery industry, giving its name to the adjacent riverside settlement of Crockerne Pill. Ham Green House, in 1806, faced directly on to the Green. The earliest part of the existing building appears to be the five-bay south front, dated between 1710 and 1730, when the property was in the hands of the Meyler family of Bristol merchants. By marrying Sarah Meyler, Henry Bright (1715-77) a banker, MP and West Indian merchant who was involved in the African slave trade, became the owner of Ham House. The site of the house had the useful convenience of being within viewing distance of Hung Road and therefore provided early knowledge of whether his ships and cargo had survived the usually perilous journey, or not.</p> <p>In 1792 Henry Bright's son Richard (1754- 1840) was elected Master of the Society of Merchant Venturers. The fact that such a prominent figure as Richard Bright made Ham Green House his principal residence, is possibly an indication of the importance he attached to Ham Green and Hung Road for the continuance of his business interests and the development of his reputation as patron of the arts, a keen horticulturalist and an amateur 'man of science'.</p> <p>Over time he extended Ham Green House, adding east and north fronts facing on to the gardens. He also greatly expanded his landholdings around the house. The Parliamentary enclosure of common lands in Portbury parish, completed in 1806, provided Bright with considerable opportunities to expand to purchase and enclose Ham Green, along with a large block of land to the west of his house and smaller plots to the south east, alongside the lane leading to Chapel Pill. This process of acquisition continued vigorously in subsequent years, with the result that the Portbury tithe map of 1844 shows Bright's son, Henry, in possession of over 82 acres tithing, in addition to renting 44.5 acres (18 ha) from other landowners. A major feature of the Ham Green landscape is the chain of artificial lakes or fishponds created in the Chapel Pill valley to the SE of the house. These now appear as a single sheet of water, but 19th century maps indicate that there were originally two ponds, separated by a dam. The 1800 Abbots Leigh estate map shows firstly that only the upper pond was then in existence, created by the Miles family, and was part of the Leigh Court estate. Hence the historical link between Ham Green House and the Miles family and Leigh Court. By the end of the 1840's Richard Bright's heirs sold their Ham Green estate to the Miles family and importantly to the local and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>national history, united geographically the Leigh Court estate, with Ham Green House and the important trading anchorage of Hung Road.’</p> <p>The site in this important and dramatic landscape became the proposal for this planning application to build 15 homes for affordable rent, as a result of a consultation process. “Three hundred people responded, 53% objected to the proposals and 45% supported them either fully or partly. Further analysis of this feedback shows respondents liked the proposal to provide affordable housing for local people but would prefer an alternative location to the site at Chapel Pill Lane”. Avon Gardens Trust is in agreement with this aim.</p> <p>The merits of the 9 sites can be read on page 9 of Appendix B.</p> <p>A tenth site, Brookside, was considered but rejected as it lies within the Greenbelt. However;</p> <p>Brookside is situated on the settlement edge, close to the village centre, schools, transport, jobs, facilities and services.</p> <p>The land at Brookside is owned by North Somerset Council but administered by Pill and District Council.</p> <p>The Brookside site is a former school playing field which is unattached to the school and has been made level in the 60’s or 70’s with much rubble and subsoil. This has now subsided making it dangerous to run on. The Brookside site is approximately twice the area of the Chapel Pill Lane site which is important from a sustainable green energy point of view. The on-site renewables statement says: ‘The development has been considered for appropriate low or zero carbon energy generating technology’. An air-source heat pump is the suggested energy source for the Chapel Pill site, because the site is too small to accommodate more efficient alternative, energy sources. However, ground-source heat pump technology is more efficient than air-source. Brookside has enough land to have 15 homes built on the site, plus enough land to install GSHP system to every home.</p> <p>Policy DM2: The positive implications of the proposal should be factored in, support for local community, the contribution to the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, locally and community ownership benefits. Maximise the opportunities for community-led renewable and low carbon energy production. Economic benefits will be gained through a community led approach.</p> <p>Should photovoltaic panels and/or solar thermal panels, be used as planned on the roofs, the tenants will, at the very least, enjoy low running costs and the whole development will have very low carbon emissions, plus</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the likelihood of selling electricity to the National Grid.</p> <p>Policy DM3: Leaving the land adjacent to Chapel Pill Lane un-built on will secure an essential part of North Somerset’s cultural and local landscape distinctiveness achieved through a legacy of identity with its history and landowners.</p> <p>Policy DM5: Historic Parks and Gardens [both registered and unregistered] are an important part of North Somerset’s heritage. Historic Parks and Gardens are often under threat of unsympathetic development. The council will resist proposals that would harm the character or appearance of these sites, including their setting.</p> <p>Policy DM7: When considering proposals involving non designated heritage assets, the council will take into account their local significance and protect from inappropriate change, including harm to their setting. Ham Green – landscape that is bordered by two registered parks and gardens, makes a valuable contribution to the area’s historic and architectural development, especially social and communal value, sense of place and local distinctiveness.</p> <p>Policy DM12: Development within the green belt. The effect of light pollution at night on the Chapel Pill Lane site will have a spoiling effect when viewing across the valley from the north, Kings Weston and from Leigh Court to the east.</p> <p>Summary : So as to comply with Policy DM5 [Historic Parks and Gardens] of the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan, the GT/AGT object to this application because of the potential impact on the unregistered park and garden of the former Ham Green Hospital, now the Penny Brohn Centre, which would result in moderate harm to its significance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Clevedon Court	Avon	E21/0445	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Permanent retention of existing temporary sales office (as originally permitted under application reference 20/P/0412/FUL) at Court Farm together with proposed single storey extension and associated parking to create a new office</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the vicinity of the Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden of Clevedon Court. 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 note that the proposed development would largely be</p>

				space. Court Farm, All Saints Lane, Clevedon OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	screened from view by the Grade II listed Clevedon Court boundary wall. The previous planning permission decided that the temporary building does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, similarly the single storey extension which forms part of this application, also does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Wrest Park	Bedfordshire	E21/0292	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Application: Erection of up to 3,850 residential units (Use Class C3); up to 30 extra care apartments (Use Class C2); care / nursing home of up to 20 bedrooms (Use Class C2); creation of a new local centre including provision of up to 600 sqm of retail floorspace (Use Class E(a) or E(b)), up to 600 sqm of employment floorspace (Use Class E(c) or E(g(i))), health centre (Use Class E(e)), community building(s) (Use Class F.2(b)) and hotel (Use Class C1); provision of a Nursery, 5FE Primary School, including Reception, and 6FE Secondary School, including Sixth Form facilities (Use Class F.1(a)); provision of landscaped communal amenity space including children's play space and sports facilities; creation of new publicly accessible woodland comprising up to 32 hectares; creation of solar park comprising up to 16 hectares; together with associated highways (including	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.06.2021 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 considered the documentation for this extremely large application and have grave concerns about its irreversible impact upon the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Wrest Park, should it be permitted. The online documentation, whilst extensive, does not make it very clear exactly how visible the various facilities/housing/solar would be on this extremely precious and nationally significant site. As your officers will be aware, Wrest Park still lies within a largely open agricultural landscape which provides its setting, despite the incursion of the A6 on the western side. A housing estate and associated development of this scale would change the character of the setting forever. Within the RPG there are also other highly listed structures, notably The Archer Pavilion (Grade I) and the Mansion itself (also Grade I). A colleague has visited the site on our behalf and we are satisfied that from the west side of the more formal gardens (near the Evergreen garden) there is sufficient tree coverage to shield the development from view. On the eastern side of the perimeter the tall and dense woodland which backs onto the proposed solar park also provides a shield from any visual effects. However, the tree cover from the southern most part of the park which backs onto the development is thinner and lower, as well as being deciduous. It seems likely that buildings from the development would be visible from the main house and the top of the garden all year round, especially in winter, and could be seen in the same view as the Archer Pavilion when viewed from the north. We are also concerned that the taller buildings (some are 11m & 12m tall) as well as others nearest

			<p>dualled section of A6), landscaping, drainage and utilities works; with all matters reserved except for details of access to and from the A6 and Gravenhurst / Barton Road. Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Greenwoods, Land North of Higham Road and East of the A6 Bedford Road, Barton Le Clay, Bedfordshire</p> <p>MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>Barton/Higham Gobion, will be visible as the trees are lower here. We also feel that taller buildings may well be visible from the Old Park to the west adjacent to the A6. None of the viewpoints within the LVIA are taken from either the mansion or from between the mansion and the Archer Pavilion, or the areas we have highlighted above.</p> <p>Only View 14 is taken from within the RPG. We would like to see photomontages and wire frames demonstrating the position, bulk and visibility of the proposed structures taken from other sensitive areas within the RPG and from the upper floor of the mansion, to enable us to gain a clearer idea of just how strong the impact on the setting is likely to be. We therefore disagree with the applicant that there will be no negative impact on the setting or significance of Wrest Park and its listed structures. We also understand that whilst the Local Plan is still only in its emergent state (although approved by the Inspectors) there is (as of 1st Jan 2021) a demonstrable supply of 5.94 years of deliverable housing. It is therefore hard to understand how so many more can be justified in such a sensitive location. We also believe that part of the application site has already been turned down as a suitable housing site in the Call for Sites for the Draft Local Plan. As the site lies within the Green Belt it fails Policy GB1 of the Adopted South Bedfordshire Local Plan (2004) and Policy SP4 (Development within the Green Belt) as set out in the emerging Local Plan 2035, and does not meet any of the Very Special Circumstances required to provide an exemption to this policy.</p> <p>We also feel that the development is contrary to several paragraphs in the NPPF, namely 185c & d, and in particular Para 194. The harm that we feel this proposal would cause is on the highest end of less than substantial harm, and we do not feel that this harm has been sufficiently justified by the applicant, especially since the affected heritage assets are of the highest possible national significance (See Para 196).</p> <p>In our opinion, this development, if permitted would cause an unacceptable, urbanising physical form on the very edge of the RPG, permanently negatively affecting its setting. Your officers will be familiar with the Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council finding that :’ where a proposal would cause harm, the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting, or the character of a conservation area, should not simply be given careful consideration, but should be given “considerable importance and weight” when the decision maker carries out the planning balance.’ You will also be aware of Historic</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views, which has various relevant points relating to this application. In particular (p2) 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.' You might also like to consider (p5) 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary' which we feel is also relevant here. An enormous new conurbation directly outside the RPG will also affect the experience of the assets, (p11): Surrounding landscape or townscape character : 'Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset; Noise, vibration and other nuisances ;Busyness, bustle, movement and activity.'</p> <p>Finally, we would like to draw your officers'/Councillors' attention to wording in relation to conservation areas which has received judicial interpretation by the House of Lords in the case of South Lakeland District Council versus the Secretary of State for the Environment and another as follows: 'The statutorily desirable object of preserving the character or appearance of an area is achieved either by a positive contribution to preservation or by development which leaves the character or appearance unharmed, that is to say, preserved.' In our opinion, this application fails that test as it causes harm.'</p> <p>The Gardens Trust therefore strongly objects to the above application and urges your officers to reject this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Prospect Park	Berkshire	E21/0235	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for new playground with reinstatement of	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2021 We have been looking at both this application 210647 and that for the play area 210644/FUL & 210745/LBC that Claire Ringwood is dealing with. In

				existing playground back to informal parkland at Prospect Park a Grade II Registered Park and Garden PLAY AREA	both cases we feel that improvements to the setting of these facilities would benefit the historic park and therefore it might be beneficial to co-ordinate such improvements. On the Pavilion, we have no objection to the proposed development but we hope RBC would take the opportunity for the road/car park surfaces and surrounds to be improved/repared and the new complex screened appropriately, bearing in mind the small pond and slope beyond the complex. Kind regards Bettina Kirkham Chair, Berkshire Gardens Trust
Prospect Park	Berkshire	E21/0271	II	PLANNING APPLICATION New playground with reinstatement of existing playground back to informal parkland. Prospect Park, Liebenrood Road, Reading. PLAY AREA	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Prospect Park is a Grade II 19th century Registered Park and Garden which forms the setting of the Grade II listed late 18th century Prospect House (now Mansion House). The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.1 One of the key objectives of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance historic designed landscapes within Berkshire. Our activities include research into Berkshire's historic parks and gardens and responding to planning applications which affect these important green lungs.2 As we stated previously in our comments on the pre-application submitted on 22nd October, 2020, one of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. Prospect Park is an important part of the history of Reading's parks and the richness of Reading's history in particular the environment of West Reading. Having now considered the formal planning application, we note in particular that Paragraphs 2.1.22 and 5.2.3/4/5 all emphasise that the main entrance has over time become that from Liebenrood Road to the east, as well as the path from the SW corner up from Bath Road cutting across at an angle where there was historically no path. In addition we acknowledge the point made in Paragraphs 5.2.6 and 5.2.7 and especially in the concluding Section 6, that the proposal effectively clears up and reinstates

					<p>something more akin to the original entrance area from the north whereas the path coming from Tilehurst Road is dominated currently by the playground area. However, while BGT understands why the Council have decided to relocate and update the playground and how this might work for the park as a whole, we reiterate that the proposed playground site is on a major contemporary and historic contemporary approach through open parkland to the Mansion and that every effort should be made to minimize the impact of these changes on the parkland setting and views of this historic Park.</p> <p>Therefore, while we welcome the ‘freeing up’ of - and improvements to - the northern entrance, we have some reservations about references within the document to the “municipal feel” of this part of the park and are concerned about this being reinforced by the proposals. As the proposed relocation of the playground and other proposals associated with the pavilion offer opportunities to improve this part of the historic park, we suggest strongly that the Council needs to ensure that the proposed playground and pavilion works include appropriate enhancements to surroundings of the retained playing courts, car park and pavilion areas, as well as the main pedestrian and vehicular thoroughfare in this area. Attention also needs to be paid to the relationship between open parkland and these areas of more active recreation and steps taken to mitigate the impact of these changes on views across the Park with the inevitable loss of the semi-mature trees in this area which are wholly in keeping with the parkland character, have a long life expectancy and help to mitigate the intrusion of the nearby roads and housing.</p> <p>For example, provision of a better off-road, parallel and smoother green path for pedestrians should be introduced alongside the playing courts, with a long overdue re-surfacing of the route down from the Mansion and also the car-park area by the pavilion. Such improvements, alongside consideration of judicious future tree planting will hopefully reduce the potential safety and unsightly hazards of car parking up on the verge and people seeking a more level terrain than the undulating, rough ground to walk along. Such measures would also help enhance the Grade II landscape surrounding the main surviving routes to and from the Mansion.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham, BGT Planning Advisor.</p>
Prospect Park	Berkshire	E21/0272	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of a play service venue	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2021 We have been looking at both this application 210647 and that for the play

				<p>at the existing park pavilion, converting a disused internal garage into an indoor low ropes activity course, providing an outdoor mini-golf zone, an outdoor enclosed education and learning zone, with a small community cafe to compliment the activities. Prospect Pavilion, Prospect Park, Liebenrood Road, Reading RG30 2ND. PLAY AREA</p>	<p>area 210644/FUL & 210745/LBC that Claire Ringwood is dealing with. In both cases we feel that improvements to the setting of these facilities would benefit the historic park and therefore it might be beneficial to co-ordinate such improvements.</p> <p>On the Pavilion, we have no objection to the proposed development but we hope RBC would take the opportunity for the road/car park surfaces and surrounds to be improved/repared and the new complex screened appropriately, bearing in mind the small pond and slope beyond the complex.</p> <p>Kind regards Bettina Kirkham Chair, Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Stoke Place	Buckinghamshire	E21/0265	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Installation of an England & Wales Cricket Board approved 3-lane system within a safety fenced enclosure and with surrounding security fence. The lanes are 34m in length and the overall footprint of the construction is 36m x 12.95m. The Cricket Club, Stoke Green, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4HT SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Stoke Place, 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 joint response.</p> <p>We have studied both online applications and as they are closely related we would like to stress that both applications on this site should be considered together. The GT/BGT object to both for the reasons set out below:</p> <p>The individual application forms suggest that there are no previous planning applications on this site and yet a search on the planning authority website reveals a number of applications dating back to 1990 and there are two 'live' applications currently being assessed. Furthermore, it is also disappointing that the applicant has gone to the trouble of submitting Heritage Statements but has completed the statements for both applications incorrectly by either stating that there is 'No' heritage asset nearby or that it is 'N/A'. It should be stressed that this site is both within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Stoke Place, a mid-C18 landscape designed by Capability Brown, and a Conservation Area and that an Heritage Impact Appraisal should be carried out to accompany the proposed applications.</p> <p>We will address the individual applications before we make our recommendations :</p> <p>Nets compound PL/21/1480/FA:</p>

					<p>There is remarkably little damaging development in this nationally significant RPG, especially so considering the pressure in this area for development. The historic fabric and character survives largely intact. However, this proposal is adjacent to the most altered area of the RPG and the proposal enlarges the developed area and extends the damage. The proposal contributes to and extends this localised area of damage in the RPG, extending incrementally the piecemeal development in the yard to the west which contains sheds, hard standing and a house.</p> <p>Traditional cricket nets are small scale, recede into the scenery, and are demountable. The structure being proposed here is a permanent structural erection of considerable size and is alien to this setting. It has a solid base and its form and materials are visually damaging to the historic character of the RPG, particularly the security fencing and frame, with foundations for the permanent structure. It also provides a solid structure to which roof awnings could be attached, as well advertising placards or sheets which are more likely to be left in situ due to the permanence of the structure. The multi-coloured playing surface is also damaging.</p> <p>Whilst the character of the RPG has been altered to a degree, the cricket ground remains predominantly grassland and any changes relating to unsympathetic additional structures or parking would damage this. The proposal to screen the structure with nets will only add further change to the setting and therefore is not an appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>This development also sets a precedent for further structures in this area even if they are sporting. It could be the precursor to proposals for permanent structures on the site.</p> <p>The GT/BGT therefore object to the proposed application for a permanent cricket cage and would encourage the LPA to seek a revised application for traditional nets which are small scale, recede into the scenery, and are either demountable or retractable.</p> <p>Storage container proposal PL/21/1928/FA:</p> <p>The proposed storage container appears to be around a third larger than the existing container. It is also unclear from the application as to whether the proposed new container replaces the existing structure and therefore, we assume that this application is for an additional new structure.</p> <p>The proposed new container is also twice the size of the 'mobile home' (app 90/00836/FUL) which we understand to be the structure behind the club house. This therefore is an extremely large structure which we consider to be inappropriate development in this setting.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We also note that the application form states the work has already commenced which is of great concern.</p> <p>The application form states that there is a reduction of 32 parking spaces to include cars, motorcycles, bicycles and disabled spaces. However, there is no clarification of where new parking spaces will be allocated, given this site will clearly require adequate parking.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above we also object to this application.</p> <p>The GT/BGT consider that these applications are both confusing and misleading. We would ask that the Planning Authority request the applicant to provide a masterplan for the site which acknowledges and respects the proximity of the designated heritage site, and also seeks to rationalise the structures on the site rather than introduce a proliferation of inappropriate structures. Otherwise, these individual applications, without reference to the heritage site or to each other, will serve to damage the designated heritage asset through inappropriate and incremental new introductions.</p> <p>In conclusion despite it being a long-standing cricket ground, due to the heritage considerations, a more appropriate and strategic solution is required.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stoke Place	Buckinghamshire	E21/0340	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Installation of a container for storage The Cricket Club, Stoke Green, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4HT MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2021 As per E21/0265</p>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/0411	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration of verandah and alterations to upgrade accommodation: alteration to fenestration; adaptation of lean-to as boiler house; forming opening between kitchen and previous dining room to form</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this response. We have looked at the online documentation, and are supportive of the</p>

				living space; refitting kitchen; alteration to hall to enlarge wc to accommodate shower; planning bathrooms to provide ensuite facilities. Dairy Cottage Queen Street Waddesdon Buckinghamshire HP18 0JW REPAIR/RESTORATION, BUILDING ALTERATION	proposals. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Huntercombe Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/0420	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal 2 non illuminated sign boards and 2 non illuminated flags Land at Huntercombe Park (former Pfizer Pharmaceuticals), Huntercombe Lane South, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL6 0PH ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust who have made a site visit, and have the following comments to make. We have also studied the online documentation. The alien form, height (5m) and strong colours used on the signage are inappropriate in such a sensitive heritage location, in the setting of the Grade II Huntercombe Registered Park and Garden (RPG). The signage is on the public approach to the main entrance of the RPG, a particularly important part of the designed landscape, which consequently significantly damages the experience and setting of the heritage asset. It is also close to the outside of the park boundary, marked by mature trees (see Photo below). It therefore affects the setting of this part of the designed landscape, in a prominent position, creating an inappropriate focal point by its visual dominance and prominence as visitors approach. As your officers are aware, this is something Historic England highlights as being unsatisfactory (p11) in The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. The GT/BGT object to the application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Latimer Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/0464	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Two storey extension including	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory

				front entrance porch Old Rectory, Church Lane, Latimer, Buckinghamshire, HP5 1UA BUILDING ALTERATION	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 and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and consider this to be a positive improvement to the property which will not impact the Grade II registered park and garden at Latimer Park. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Alderley Park	Cheshire	E20/0300	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for residential development (Use Class C3) with associated infrastructure, landscaping and access. Walled Garden and Kitchen Garden, Alderley Park, CONGLETON ROAD, NETHER ALDERLEY, SK10 4TF. WALLED GARDENS, RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and consider this to be a positive improvement to the property which will not impact the Grade II registered park and garden at Latimer Park. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Courtlands	Devon	E21/0189	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Siting of six shepherds huts with external decking, 3 boiler houses/log stores, one with decking area, and associated infrastructure (retrospective application) Lympstone Manor Hotel Courtlands Lane Exmouth EX8 3NZ MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.06.2021 Devon Gardens Trust asks you to consider the following comments on the above retrospective application. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust, and responds to consultations on proposals affecting sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in the County of Devon. The Trust also responds to consultations relating to sites, such as Courtlands/Lympstone Manor, which are of regional and local significance, and which are included on the Devon Gazetteer. We are grateful to the applicant for allowing us to visit the site to assess the impact of the shepherd huts on the historic landscape setting of the Grade II Listed house, and the Lady's Walk, a significant element of the historic designed landscape. We are pleased and encouraged to see the investment which has been made in the landscape setting of the house in

					<p>recent years, and applaud the applicant's work in this regard.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these positive developments in the designed landscape and the placing of the shepherd huts on the outer side of the Lady's Walk where they are partially screened by vegetation, we note, and find ourselves in agreement with, the comments made by your Authority's Conservation Officer with regard to the shepherd huts.</p> <p>The Lady's Walk is an integral element of the historic landscape setting of the Listed house; it contributes to the setting of the heritage asset and has intrinsic historic significance. On balance, we consider that the shepherd huts and associated infrastructure do not accord well with the historic and aesthetic concept of the Lady's Walk; and therefore, they must be considered to cause a degree of harm to the Lady's Walk. Most importantly, they have a negative impact on the way in which the Lady's Walk is experienced by reason of the introduction of activity and noise into an area which has a character of retirement, privacy and reflection.</p> <p>We are concerned that the development, in its present form, causes harm to the designed setting of the Listed heritage asset, and therefore appears to conflict with national planning policy (NPPF paras 193, 194 and 196). We appreciate the applicant's dedication to the site and the high level of investment that has been made in the designed landscape, together with the commercial imperatives at this difficult time; however, we are not convinced that the shepherd huts and associated development in its existing form is appropriate in this location. We would welcome constructive dialogue between the applicant and your Authority to find a positive outcome.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Hillersdon House	Devon	E21/0256	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations and conversion of stable block for domestic use incidental to the main dwelling</p> <p>Stables & The Coach House</p> <p>Hillersdon House Cullompton</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon. In addition, Devon Gardens Trust may comment on proposals affecting</p>

				RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>sites included on the Devon Gazetteer of historic designed landscapes of local and regional significance. The designed landscape associated with Hillersdon House is included on the Gazetteer, and is of interest to the Trust.</p> <p>We have examined the Design, Access and Heritage Statement (April 2021) prepared by Louise Crossman Architects, and conclude that the proposals will not have any impact on the designed landscape at Hillerdon.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Upper, Central and Lower Pleasure Gardens, and Coy Pond Gardens	Dorset	E21/0282	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline submission for demolition of existing buildings and erection of a block of 55 flats with basement parking</p> <p>The Woodrisings, 10 Branksome Wood Road, Bournemouth, BH2 6DB</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.06.2021</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 and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and have no objection to the design and floor plans. There is a very comprehensive set of drawings and information on trees, both in plan form and documentation. As long as these are followed, and robust conditions are imposed to ensure this happens, the impact on the Grade II registered Central Gardens should not be a problem.</p> <p>We would like however, to make a comment the height of the proposed block of flats. From general observation, it would appear that each new development of buildings along Branksome Wood Road tries to be one level higher than its surroundings. In our opinion, this one is effectively one level too high. Figure 4 in the Design & Access Statement (6.13) shows the block of flats to be noticeably higher than either of its neighbours. We would ask your officers to reassure themselves that the intervisibility between the new building and the Grade II RPG is not intrusive.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Athelhampton	Dorset	E21/0357	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of Air Source Heat Pumps to service the house following approval of the</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this application and the LB counterpart. The GT has passed this application to the Dorset Gardens Trust for comment on their behalf.</p>

				Renewable Energy Scheme for the estate. Replacement of existing lift with staircase Athelhampton House Athelhampton Road Athelhampton DT2 7LG ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY, BUILDING ALTERATION	There is no objections to the application, and the applicant is to be commended for changing his proposals in the light of the emerging technology. The use of air-force heat pumps rather than placing the infrastructure in the ground is entirely acceptable and welcome. Christopher Clark Dorset Gardens Trust
Barrington Hall	Essex	E21/0479	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed repair work and restoration to exterior, new entrance gates, security hut and carport. Replacement entrance signage, alterations to secondary driveway, landscaping and associated works. Internal alterations including the installation of a replacement kitchen, reinstatement of link to Coach House, new joinery and upgrades to existing finishes and fixtures. Barrington Hall Dunmow Road Hatfield Broad Oak REPAIR/RESTORATION, BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Barrington Hall is the site of a historic manor, but the house and landscape are now mainly of 19th century origin. It is included in the Essex Gardens Trust's inventory for Uttlesford District. The landscape proposals are sympathetic to the site, but the proposals for lighting are a concern. They include floodlights for the house, and bollard lighting for the drive. None of these lights are shown on plan, nor is there any indication of how and when they might be used. The driveway lighting could be set at ground level. Ideally such lighting should be activated by sensors. We also note there seems to be no drawing of the security hut. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Gunnersbury Park	Greater London	E20/0829	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a part single storey rear extension and a part rear infill extension to the building to allow for the change of use from D2 to A3. Installation of entrance gates in east corner of site and floodlighting over the new Putting Green. BOWLS GREEN AND PAVILION, GUNNERSBURY PARK, POPES LANE, EALING W3	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.06.2021 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 made a site visit to the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Gunnersbury and noted the neglected condition of the bowls green and Clubhouse which lie adjacent to the new Sports Hall. Whilst upgrading the Clubhouse is desirable, we would prefer to see it continue its traditional role alongside a refurbished grassy central bowls lawn, which despite neglect, is in relatively good condition. It is clear from the planting surrounding the grassy central bowls lawn that the borders had been sensitively planted with an interesting mix of mature

				8LQ. SPORT/LEISURE BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>shrubs and herbaceous perennials, which although currently somewhat weedy could easily be brought back into better condition. We have compared this with the landscaping proposals for the pitch and putt course, where unimaginative low maintenance shrubs have been chosen for the proposed landscaping. This is particularly noticeable as elsewhere within Gunnersbury the excellent Head Gardener and his team have put in extremely carefully considered and visually appealing planting schemes. Whilst we appreciate that the anticipated demand (apparently 30,000 visitors pa*) will cause heavy footfall on the course itself and therefore the planting needs to be robust, it is extremely regrettable in our opinion, that in times when we are all only too aware of global warming and the need to encourage nature, reduce hard surfacing in driveways etc, that the bulk of the course is covered with fake grass, block paving and synthetic bunkers. We have looked at images of other courses at Battersea and Acton and a similar scheme seems aesthetically at odds here within such an important historic landscape.</p> <p>We are aware that Gunnersbury is in urgent need of additional funding. Nevertheless, when reaching their decision, your officers will need to bear in mind the effect that these less than sympathetic plans for the pitch and putt, will have on the setting of this extremely important RPG. Should your officers decide that this facility is absolutely necessary, we would suggest that the hedging is continued all around the site to mitigate its overly colourful and garish nature.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Environmental Supplementary Planning Document	Greater London	E21/0373	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2021</p> <p>The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust, trading as the London Gardens Trust (LGT) welcomes the production of the SPD and the opportunity to be transparent to both developers and the wider community on what makes an appropriate development.</p> <p>We believe the rich heritage of the borough's open spaces should be conserved and improved not only for its intrinsic landscape heritage value but also recognising its value for its contribution to the tourism economy, its value to the mental and physical health of residents and employees, its cultural value and for its contribution towards mitigating the impacts of urban warming and flood risk management.</p> <p>The LGT Inventory, identifies over 160 important historic gardens including,</p>

					<p>public parks, churchyards, greens, residential gardens and squares. (See list below). Of these, 23 parks and gardens in Westminster are included in the Historic England Register. Whilst the Royal Parks are registered of special historic interest at Grade I, the Trust believes that all green spaces that are open to the public should be valued as they also provide vital amenity space, essential for wellbeing and sustainable development. Some open spaces are part of the designed historic landscape of residential estates. These too, should be protected from adverse environmental impacts as they serve the same amenity value to their residents as public open spaces for their local communities.</p> <p>Light Pollution The zoning principle is too simplistic and does not recognise specific circumstances eg the need for lighting facilities such as sports facilities & footpaths within Royal Parks; The need to protect biodiversity and provide respite for residents in green spaces even within the central activity zone; Light levels on development adjacent to green spaces should also be controlled to avoid unnecessary lighting of the natural environment. Appropriate lighting should be designed on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Noise and Vibration Tranquil open spaces are not evenly distributed across the Borough, so many residents and businesses do not have access to green space for recuperation and escape from the urban environment. There are only 22 open spaces designated as tranquil open space There are notable omissions of green spaces compared to LGT inventory (see list appended). The text refers to thresholds set out in section 2.3 and 2.4. Where are these sections? There needs to be a review of all open spaces to ensure all parts of the borough have a refuge from noise. We are concerned that the omission of many valued green spaces will result in the deterioration of the unprotected spaces despite their value to residents and workers. There should either be a second category of historic green spaces as featured on our Inventory or be minimum standards for all historic green spaces. The category of tranquil open spaces is bound to be used as a proxy in many future decisions about the development and use of land around and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>within these green spaces. It is important to ensure that the right spaces are protected in the interests of mental and physical wellbeing.</p> <p>Green infrastructure</p> <p>The Wild West End (WWE) Value Matrix</p> <p>We welcome the principle of developing a Westminster specific detailed framework.</p> <p>We welcome the criteria, in particular the recognition of the wellbeing and social criteria. Should heritage be an additional criteria? Is cultural value included in the social value?</p> <p>However, we are concerned that you will be able to defend this approach when faced with a planning application. How will this be enforceable – presumably the London Plan takes precedence and you would be challenged at an inquiry.</p> <p>We think your approach should be presented as a refinement and application of the London-wide standard rather than an alternative.</p> <p>Potential omission</p> <p>Is this SPD the place to cover protected views from within parks and gardens and other designed landscapes looking out?</p> <p>The SPD should address potential conflicts between issues eg SUDS vs Heritage and other climate mitigation measures.</p> <p>LGT sites</p> <p>http://www.londongardensonline.org.uk/ Registered parks and gardens highlighted</p> <p>Abbey Orchard Courtyard Garden</p> <p>Alma Square Garden</p> <p>Ashley Gardens</p> <p>Ashworth Mansions Garden Belgrave Square Gardens * Berkeley Square Gardens *</p> <p>Bessborough Gardens</p> <p>Brown Hart Garden The Brunel Estate *</p> <p>Bryanston Square</p> <p>Buckingham Palace Gardens *</p> <p>Cambridge Square Gardens</p> <p>Carlton House Terrace Gardens, including Waterloo Place East Garden</p> <p>Cavendish Square Gardens</p> <p>Chelsea Bridge Shrubbery</p> <p>Chesham Place Chester Square *</p> <p>Christchurch Gardens Churchill Gardens Estate *</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Cleveland Gardens Cleveland Square Connaught Square Gardens Craven Hill Gardens: Corringham Garden Craven Hill Gardens: Hempel Garden Square The Crescent Garden Crewe House Cundy Street Flats Gardens Dolphin Square Garden * Dorset Square No.10 Downing Street Garden Drury Lane Gardens Eaton Square Gardens * Ebury Square Garden Eccleston Square * Ennismore Gardens Forbes House Gardens Formosa Garden Garden of Rest Marylebone Gloucester Square Gardens Golden Square Garden The Goring Hotel Great Cumberland Place Green Park * Green Street Garden Grosvenor Estate Garden Grosvenor Square Garden * Halkin Street Garden Hallfield Estate and Hallfield School Hanover Square Garden Hanover Terrace Garden Hide Tower Garden Holy Trinity Churchyard Hyde Park, including Hyde Park Corner * Hyde Park Gardens Hyde Park Square Gardens Irving Gardens Kensington Gardens * Kensington Gardens Square Kent Terrace Kildare Gardens Lancaster Gate Lancaster House Leicester Square Gardens
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p> Leinster Square Lillington Gardens Estate and Longmoore Gardens Little Venice Gardens Lower Grosvenor Garden Manchester Square Gardens * Marble Arch Marlborough House Gardens Millbank Estate including Millbank Gardens Millbank Tower Gardens Montagu Square Montpelier Square Mount Street Gardens Norfolk Crescent Gardens Norfolk Square Garden North Row Buildings Orme Square Oxford Square Gardens Paddington Green Paddington Recreation Ground Paddington Street Gardens North and South The Palace of Westminster: Abingdon Street Gardens, Jewel Tower and Old Palace Yard The Palace of Westminster: New Palace Yard and Black Rod's Garden Park Lane Gardens Park Crescent * Park Square * Parliament Square Garden * Pimlico Gardens * Porchester Square Gardens Nos.3 & 5 Porchester Terrace Portman Square * Prince's Gardens No.107 Prince's Gate Prince's Square Gardens Queen's Gardens Queen's Walk Gardens, Green Park Quintin Kynaston School Randolph Gardens, including St Augustine's Church Regency Place Regent's College Garden * Regent's Park, including Queen Mary's Gardens * Rembrandt Gardens Richmond Terrace Garden </p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Riverside Walk Garden Rutland Gate South Garden and Upper Garden St Anne's Churchyard St Clement Danes Churchyard St George's Fields St George's Square * St James's Churchyard, Piccadilly St James's Palace and Clarence House Gardens St James's Park, including Queen Victoria Memorial Gardens * St James's Square * St John's, Smith Square St John's Gardens St John's Lodge Gardens * St John's Wood Church Grounds St Margaret Westminster Churchyard St Martin-in-the-Fields Churchyard St Mary's Church Grounds St Mary's Churchyard St Marylebone Parish Church Grounds St Paul's Churchyard, Covent Garden St Stephen's Garden Open Space Savoy Churchyard Soho Square Garden South Street Garden Spencer House Garden Sussex Gardens Sussex Gardens Open Space Sussex Square Gardens Tachbrook Estate Talbot Square Gardens Tate Britain Gardens The House of St Barnabas-in-Soho Trafalgar Square * Trevor Square Triangle Garden Upper Grosvenor Garden Victoria Embankment Gardens: Main Garden, Whitehall Garden, Temple Gardens, Ministry of Defence * Victoria Square Victoria Tower Gardens *
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Victoria Tower Gardens South Vincent Square Violet Hill Gardens Warwick Square * The Water Gardens * Wellington Barracks Westbourne Gardens Westbourne Terrace Westminster Abbey Precincts - Chapter House Garden / The Close Westminster Abbey Precincts / Westminster School - Dean's Yard Westminster Abbey Precincts - Great Cloister Garden, Little Cloister Garden Westminster Abbey Precincts - St Catherine's Garden Westminster Abbey Precincts - The College Garden Westminster Cathedral Piazza Wilton Crescent Garden * Wool House Garden York Terrace West Tranquil Open Spaces in Westminster Ebury Square Edbrooke Road Gardens Golden Square Green Park Hyde Park Kensington Gardens Paddington Recreation Ground Porchester Square Queens Park Gardens Regent's Park St Anne's Churchyard St George's Square St James's Park St Mary's Churchyard Inigo Jones Gardens St Stephen's Gardens Shrewsbury Road Soho Square Temple Gardens Victoria Tower Gardens Violet Hill Gardens Westbourne Gardens Helen Monger, Director
--	--	--	--	--	--

					On behalf of: Planning and Conservation Working Group London Parks and Gardens Trust
Bordesley Hall	Hereford and Worcester	E21/0405	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid application consisting of a full application for the demolition of employment buildings and the conversion of Bordesley Hall into 3 apartments and an outline application (with all matters reserved with the exception of access) for the construction of up to 46 dwellings and all associated works. Bordesley Hall The Holloway Alvechurch Birmingham Worcestershire B48 7QA DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.06.2021 This comment is on behalf of the Hereford & Worcester Gardens Trust. We note that the site area does not impinge on the historically important Bordesley Park. We welcome the removal of previous development and the change of use of Bordesley Hall to residential. We do not object to the development of housing as indicated on the Illustrative Layout. We welcome the protection of trees as indicated on the Illustrative Layout and the Arboricultural Report. We recommend that, if permission is granted, a Condition is imposed requiring the suitable repair and preservation of the kitchen garden wall.
Stansted Bury Briggens	Hertfords hire	E19/0328	II II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning with all matters reserved apart from external vehicular access for the redevelopment of the site through the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a residential led mixed use development comprising up to 8,500 residential homes including market and affordable homes; retirement homes and extra care facilities; a range of community uses including primary and secondary schools, health centres and nursery facilities; retail and related uses; leisure facilities; business and commercial uses; open space and public realm; sustainable urban drainage	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2021 The Gardens Trust, statutory consultees, and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust have objected both to this proposal (letter dated 2nd July 2019) and to application 3/19/2124/OUT for Village 7 (letter dated 17 February 2021) of this development. Like other consultees on heritage, we are concerned by the loss of heritage assets, and the opportunities which will be missed for identification and assessment of these assets in the light of ongoing research, and by the way the two developments seem to be progressing separately with little integration. We have commented that the plans so far have taken little notice of both the designated and undesignated heritage assets and have been dismayed at the restricted scope of the Heritage Impact Assessments and similar supplied with the applications. A robust heritage assessment, together with an impact assessment and possible measures for mitigation of harm, for all heritage assets and their settings should be provided before this application can be considered. We have now seen the Donald Insall assessment for Villages 1-6 and their proposals for a development plan resulting in less loss of heritage assets and settings of heritage assets. The Gardens Trust has been involved

				<p>systems; utility and energy facilities and infrastructure; waste management facilities; vehicular bridge links; creation of new vehicular and pedestrian accesses into the site, and creation of a new vehicular, pedestrian and cycle network within the site; improvements to the existing highway and local road network; undergrounding and diversion of power lines; lighting; engineering works, infrastructure and associated facilities; together with temporary works or structures required by the development. Land North of the Stort Valley and the A414, Gilston, Hertfordshire. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>on other sites such as Bramshill in Hampshire where initial plans, which would have resulted in considerable heritage loss, have been amended. The opportunity to amend the plans to provide a more integrated scheme which conserves and enhances as many heritage assets and settings as possible, would help reduce the considerable harm caused by the whole development.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned at the loss of undesignated landscape heritage assets. Considerable work has been done on the Medieval and Tudor Parks of the area (now published) and the 18th and 19th century parklands, some of which are on the Historic England Register. Recent research has discovered the significance of the substantial remains of Henry VIII's Renaissance ponds at Hunsdon which have now been Scheduled. Further research on the significant landscapes in this area will result in more known heritage assets which may well become nationally designated. Many of the known undesignated historic landscapes are not included in the HIA, so have not been given due consideration in the planning proposals.</p> <p>We have serious concerns on heritage grounds to this proposal, and therefore STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposals submitted in this application, particularly as alternative options have not been considered.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust: Conservation & Planning</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0329	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of an external swimming pool. Just House Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NJ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. It would appear from the plans submitted that some trees would be affected by the construction of the pool and a number, marked T1 to T6, are marked on plan AR-A3-004. As there is no accompanying arboricultural or landscape plan for the proposals, it is unclear what species these trees are, what their condition is and whether they are to be removed. There is no detail of any protection measures for any remaining trees during construction .</p> <p>We are therefore concerned that there may be overall loss of tree cover and perhaps of some significant trees although we are not aware of any with a TPO in this location. If further details become available we will be able to make an informed comment.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

Youngsbury	Hertfords hire	E21/0342	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single and two-storey side extensions, erection of canopy, alterations to fenestration to include reinstatement of windows and doors and insertion of roof lights. Erection of outbuilding with room over, external staircase and log store, parking area, sewage treatment plant, insertion of pedestrian gateway and associated landscaping works.</p> <p>Gardeners Cottage Youngsbury Wadesmill Hertfordshire SG12 OTZ</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Gardener's Cottage has recently (January 2020) been added to the HE List as part of a review of the heritage assets at Youngsbury and forms part of the walled garden complex which is an integral part of the Youngsbury historic estate where the mansion and grounds are being restored to their original design intent.</p> <p>The cottage was chosen for listing because of its simple plan and historic features still mean that its historic intent and use can be read.</p> <p>The changes to the plan and the historic fabric in this proposal will cause substantial harm to the historic fabric of the cottage and to the surroundings which include the listed walled garden, the listed mansion and the Capability Brown designed Registered parkland in which this property is situated,.</p> <p>The listing entry for the cottage and garden walls states this group value 'together with the Grade II* registered park and numerous listed buildings on the estate- particularly the 18th century walled garden' to be 'an ensemble of historical significance that aptly demonstrates the continuing development of an historic estate'.</p> <p>To destroy this clearly hierarchical set of nationally designated buildings and landscape is contrary to the NPPF: Para 194 requires clear and convincing justification for the loss of significance; this is not supplied: para 195 requires that substantial public benefits outweigh this harm or loss. There are none. It is also contrary to EHDC Policy HA1, HA7, HA8.</p> <p>This cottage is a survival and part of the assemblage of buildings on an historic estate. The proposed changes would substantially harm not only the cottage but harm the other designated assets.</p> <p>We therefore object to this proposal on heritage grounds.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0346	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single storey rear extension.</p> <p>49 Great North Road Brookmans Park AL9 6LB</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 02.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. 49 Great North Road adjoins both the Registered parkland of Gobions and the Green Belt and is thus in the setting of a heritage asset. On the basis of the information in this application we consider that glare and reflection from the large amount of extra glazing would not cause significant harm to the setting of the parkland as there is screening in the form of trees and shrubs.</p>

					Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens
3 Ashley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/0418	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Norway Maple, remove low limb over driveway on 1 x Oak tree 3 Ashley Close Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LH TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.06.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that no expert arboricultural advice has been sought on the proposed works from either a private company or the council. As these trees are part of the street character of Ashley Close, we would welcome professional advice on whether the felling of the Maple is necessary before any decision is made. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/0423	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing house and outbuilding and erection of four, three bedroom semi detached dwellings with private amenity space and associated hard and soft landscaping works 25 North Cottages Napsbury St Albans Hertfordshire AL2 1Ap DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2021 Thank you for consulting The gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. 25 North Cottages, Napsbury is the former North Lodge of the Napsbury Hopsital and was first planned along with the initial hospital designs in 1898 to act as an entrance and as part of the deliberate 'country estate' aesthetic required for this therapeutic facility. The style of the lodge, in an Arts & Crafts idiom, contributes to the character of the area. The Lodge still fulfils its role as a marker at the northern edge of the drive and lies entirely within the Registered Landscape of Napsbury Hospital, one of the first of this type of landscape recognised by English Heritage in 1998. The site also lies in the Green Belt adjoining the southern boundaries of St Albans city. The demolition of this property is contrary to the NPPF which encourages the 'sustaining and enhancing of the significance of heritage assets'. The loss of this significant element of the designed Registered landscape and the significant harm it would do to the reading of this landscape, would need substantial justification in terms of special circumstances and public benefits. There are no special circumstances submitted nor any public benefit. Further, the crowding of four houses onto the area occupied by this lodge is overdevelopment in the Green Belt and within this area of the historic parkland. We therefore object to this proposal Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

Garden Cottage Danesbury Park Road, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E21/0427	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of one bedroom annex and erection of replacement one bedroom residential annex. Partial demolition of stables building, removal of shipping containers, builders yard, equipment and materials, and reduction in area of hard standing.</p> <p>Garden Cottage Danesbury Park Road Welwyn AL6 9SE</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.21</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The partial demolition of the stables and the demolition of the existing annex are to be welcomed in reducing clutter on this site which is situated in the Green Belt and within the Locally Listed Danesbury parkland, adjacent to the historic walled gardens and part of the setting and therefore significance of the Listed (Grade II) Danesbury mansion. Very special circumstances are required by the NPPF (para 143) for new development in the Green Belt, although with certain exceptions. We are concerned that the proposed replacement annex is more substantial than the previous one which amounts to a substantial building and has a large amount of windows overlooking the parkland to the southeast, which could cause reflection and glare.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/0480	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a single storey mono pitch extension, following demolition of existing structure.</p> <p>28 Lemsford Village Welwyn Garden City AL8 7TN</p> <p>DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies just to the southeast of the Historic England Registered landscape of Brocket Park, although no mention is made of that in the application, nor of the property contributing to the setting and therefore the significance of this designated heritage asset. The rear wall is part of the historic parkland and a heritage asset in its own right. It is unclear from the drawings submitted as to whether the historic wall would be affected by the proposals and be further harmed, as we note from the photographs supplied that sections have been demolished in the past to provide access. Clarification on the effect this proposal would have on the wall should be obtained before this application is determined, as any further harm to it would be contrary to the NPPF, Chapter 16.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Amwell Grove and Amwell Pool	Hertfords hire	E21/0494	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing garage and construction of new garden studio</p> <p>River Cottage Lower Road Great Amwell Ware Hertfordshire SG12 9SU</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28 06 2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in these documents and our knowledge of the area, we have no objection to these proposals. We applaud the good practice of photographs at all seasons and from several directions and the care taken in the design to prevent glare from the proposed glass on the northern elevation.</p>

				GARDEN BUILDING, DEMOLITION	Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0504	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration including the installation of a juliet balcony and amendments to an existing side elevation, revised porch layout. 5 Great North Road, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, AL9 6LB BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 2.06.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We consider that glare from the extra glazing on the rear elevation from enlarged windows and glazed roof lanterns could affect Gobions Registered landscape. However, this could be mitigated by adequate tree and shrub screening in the garden. There is some screening visible on arial maps, which should be augmented if necessary. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/0508	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey front porch extension, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and alterations to openings. 3 Lovett Road London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1Ue. BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the porch as proposed. We do note, however, that the replacement of garage doors with larger windows will cause some harm to the visual unity of the houses on this part of Lovett Road, but consider it would not cause harm to the registered landscape of Napsbury Hospital. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Thwaite Hall	Humbersi de	E18/1666	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Residential Development for 95 dwellings comprising the conversion of existing buildings into 34 flats and 27 town houses and erection of new buildings to provide 9 flats and 25 town houses following demolition of ancillary buildings. University Of Hull, Thwaite Hall, Thwaite Street, Cottingham, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU16 4RE. RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2021 Thank you for reconsulting 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 – Thwaite Hall, Registered 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. We ask that you please refer to the detail in our letter of 19th March 2019 and won’t repeat it all here. As you know Thwaite Hall (formerly Thwaite House) is important as a rare survival of an impressive 19th century villa garden in an urban setting at Cottingham, and is recognised as such by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (NHLE: 1000137). In the mid- 20th century (c,1948), the hall was extended and the gardens developed as botanic and experimental gardens by the University of Hull. Since our response to the application in 2019 we understand that the

					<p>woodland and the buildings have considerably deteriorated and in principle we support their repair and restoration. We note that the outline plan of the buildings has been amended to retain the original frontage on the north (garden) side replacing the planned projection. The hall and woodlands make up 17 acres with the botanic gardens being separate. These are just 2 acres and are fenced off from the woodland. The Friends of Thwaite Gardens do not have access to the lake and woodland but the botanic gardens are well maintained by the volunteers, though the university is responsible for cutting the grass and maintaining the greenhouses and associated buildings.</p> <p>There are no permanent staff based at the botanic gardens and currently they are only open to The Friends on Friday mornings and Tuesday afternoons.</p> <p>We have the following comments:</p> <p>Although we understand the need for increased parking areas and are pleased that they will not impact on the main registered historic park and garden area we are concerned about the impact on the character of the garden and open setting of Thwaite Hall and its related impact on the Cottingham Conservation Area. We consider that further landscaping options should be considered to mitigate the impact of the parking such as parking mesh which allows grass to grow through and further shrub or tree planting to break up the visual impact of a mass of vehicles. Such a review could also be carried out in conjunction with further consideration of the approach to the whole registered site by a historic designed landscape specialist as we suggested in our letter of 19th March 2019. See comments below.</p> <p>Heritage Impact Assessment May 2021 p38</p> <p>We note that for the gardens: 'The overall landscape design approach ensures that there will be minimal design intervention to the area of the listed garden. The objective in this area will be to restore, conserve and enhance the habitat areas and to maintain the inherent characteristics of the landscape. Meadow grassland and wildflower seeding will be introduced in the grassland areas of the listed garden, selected in collaboration with the project Ecologist. The selected seed mixes will be introduced in the following areas: general meadow and wildflower seeding to the area of open lawn, specially selected woodland seed mixes that will tolerate shady areas of the site and wetland seed mixes to the peripheral area of the lake. New tree planting will be native species, with selected</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>fruit and nut bearing trees to support wildlife.’</p> <p>Whilst we of course support biodiversity, a significant aspect of Thwaite Hall Registered Historic Park and Garden is the ornamental planting. In our previous letter we wrote:</p> <p>Whilst the GT and YGT consider this to be a commendable aim we consider that due to Thwaite’s history and design, that any new tree planting priority should not be native species but also include ornamental species as the original design intention and continued during the ownership of the University of Hull. Many non-native ornamental trees and shrubs give valuable food and excellent wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Landscape Strategy and Maintenance May 2021:</p> <p>At 1.2 ‘It is important to conserve the existing habitats, such as the woodland area and the lake found at the northern margin of the site, whilst also looking for the opportunities to create new habitat. This would be achieved by working with the nature of the site to create new habitat areas where feasible, such as creating a wetland habitat in the peripheral areas of the site that are prone to seasonal flooding.’</p> <p>And at 2.1</p> <p>‘The overall landscape design approach ensures that there will be minimal design intervention to the area of the listed garden. The objective in this area will be to restore, conserve and enhance the habitat areas and to maintain the inherent characteristics of the landscape. Meadow grassland and wildflower seeding will be introduced in the grassland areas of the listed garden, selected in collaboration with the project Ecologist. The selected seed mixes will be introduced in the following areas: general meadow and wildflower seeding to the area of open lawn, specially selected woodland seed mixes that will tolerate shady areas of the site and wetland seed mixes to the peripheral area of the lake. New tree planting will be native species, with selected fruit and nut bearing trees to support wildlife. The planting design has been developed to respond to the site context and the overall selection of plants favours native species.’</p> <p>To re-iterate, we support the proposed minimal design intervention to the area of the listed garden and biodiversity and the possible creation of wetland in the peripheral areas prone to seasonal flooding, but this needs to be done in conjunction with the, in our view, over-riding ornamental aspects of the landscape and a specialist would be able to seek a balance. We agree with the comments from the Conservation Officer and support some increased public access on agreed public open days that would</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>enable the major portion of this historic designed landscape to be seen as a whole.</p> <p>In conclusion it seems that the documents do not properly recognise the botanical and arboricultural value of Thwaite Hall Gardens and we consider that such a landscape strategy although helpful is not adequate for a registered historic park and garden. Thwaite Hall and its historic designed landscape is a rare survival of a large 19th century villa garden in a built-up area much appreciated by the local community and we support its repair and careful re-use with our suggested caveats.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Prestwold Hall	Leicestershire	E21/0384	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline application for residential development of 56 dwellings, public open space and associated works (all matters reserved except for access).</p> <p>Loughborough Road, Burton On The Wolds, Leicestershire</p> <p>MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.06.2021</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 not been able to make a site visit and our comments are based on an appraisal of the online documentation and liaison with colleagues in Leicestershire Gardens Trust.</p> <p>The application site lies on ground which would appear to be approximately 10-15m higher than the area immediately around the Grade I listed Prestwold Hall and its surrounding Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) which directly abuts the application site. The Design and Access (D&A) statement tells us (p 19) that 'the site location poses no harm to the setting of the Park and garden with a clear sense of separation between Burton on the Wolds and the park and garden maintained.' This would appear to be borne out by the thick bank of woodland which separates the RPG from the application site. However, none of the views shown in the D&A are directed either from within the RPG or from the application site into the RPG, so we cannot be certain whether the tree cover is tall and thick enough to prevent views of the application site from either higher rooms within the house, or from parts of the RPG. The LVIA also seeks to reassure us (3.11 E12) that the development will 'safeguard views across the front of Prestwold Hall and pastureland.' We are pleased to note that all the housing is to be kept to a maximum of 2 storeys high. As we have not been able to personally verify the assertions contained in the documentation, we would ask that your officers reassure themselves that the development will not adversely affect the setting or significance of</p>

					<p>the RPG or Prestwold Hall before coming to your decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
North Walsham West Local Plan	Norfolk	E21/0356	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed North Walsham West Local Plan at this early stage of development. The Norfolk Gardens Trust has reviewed the plan and I am writing on its behalf to place our comments on the record.</p> <p>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 note that at this stage you are looking for views on the main principles which should inform the preparation of a development brief for the site, and that discussions have already taken place with a number of key stakeholders.</p> <p>As far as we can determine, the proposed development does not impact any heritage parks and gardens. The Westwick estate lies to the south and south west and is not immediately adjacent. There are other non-designated heritage gardens in North Walsham but these too are outside the area of the development.</p> <p>We welcome the emphasis placed on a development that reflects “the defining and distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape, its characteristics and valued features”. Also, the fact that the development is envisaged “with parks, green corridors and areas of open space as a core principle of placemaking and urban design” ... providing “new open spaces ... including new allotments and a cemetery”.</p> <p>When formal public consultation on the draft development brief is opened in September/October this year, we look forward to the opportunity to comment further.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Keri Williams Norfolk Gardens Trust Planning Officer</p>
Hilborough Hall	Norfolk	E21/0378	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline for 4 No. 5-Bed Luxury dwellings	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.06.2021</p> <p>The Norfolk Gardens Trust objects to this proposal. The site lies within the parkland surrounding Hilborough Hall. As a Grade II* listed building, the</p>

				Land at Hilborough Hall Brandon Road IP26 5BW RESIDENTIAL	<p>Hall is a designated heritage asset. The parkland provides the setting for the Hall. While it is not on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest it is nevertheless an important non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>This is an outline application with all details reserved. The development is described as "4, 5-bed luxury dwellings". The site is extensive. It is to the north-west of the Hall, closely related to it and to buildings around the Hall. The development would amount to a substantial intrusion into the parkland. It would erode the openness of the parkland, resulting in harm to the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>In addition, the Trust does not consider an outline planning application, from which essential detail is absent, to be appropriate in this sensitive setting. A thorough Heritage Assessment is needed and is not provided with this application. Nor have any public benefits been identified which might be considered to outweigh the harm to the heritage assets.</p> <p>Keri Williams Norfolk Gardens Trust</p>
Godwick Hall	Norfolk	E21/0395	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of 3 x Shepherd's Huts for holiday accommodation (Retrospective) Godwick Hall Mill Road HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2021</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Heritage Assessment concludes that the proposed development 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 shepherds huts are well separated from the designated heritage assets. They benefit to some extent from tree screening, which could be enhanced. Nevertheless, the huts extend the footprint of development within the setting of Godwick Hall. 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 include its contribution to business viability.</p> <p>Kate Harwood</p>

					Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
The Hall	Norfolk	E21/0425	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 of 2020/0885 - to revise design of venue Stable Block At The Hall Mill Lane Shotesham Norfolk MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. The Trust works closely with the Norfolk Gardens Trust in formulating its comments. The proposed single storey building would be low and of a recessive design. It would be closely grouped with the existing buildings and shielded by trees and shrubs in views from the hall.given the location, scale and existing trees it is unlikely to be prominent in views into the parkland. The Trust does not object subject to a landscaping condition to ensure the development integrates well with the wider site. Keri Williams Norfolk Gardens Trust
The Hall	Norfolk	E21/0426	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 of 2020/0886 - to revise design of venue Stable Block At The Hall Mill Lane Shotesham Norfolk MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. The Trust works closely with the Norfolk Gardens Trust in formulating its comments. The proposed single storey building would be low and of a recessive design. It would be closely grouped with the existing buildings and shielded by trees and shrubs in views from the hall given the location, scale and existing trees it is unlikely to be prominent in views into the parkland. The Trust does not object subject to a landscaping condition to ensure the development integrates well with the wider site. Keri Williams Norfolk Gardens Trust
Elmham House	Norfolk	E21/0434	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a 5m x 4m, 6 posted, decked pergola with a maximum height of 2.5m. Grey Gables Pump Street GARDEN BUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2021 No objection
Boughton House	Northamp tonshire	E21/0368	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission: Demolition of the existing house and outbuildings, erection of a new house and garage and associated works to include photovoltaic panels and ground source heat pump to landscaping	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2021 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 on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and our colleagues in the NGT's Council of Management have also visited the area close to the

				<p>Boughton Wood Lodge, Boughton Wood Lodge Road, Geddington DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, SOLAR</p>	<p>proposed development (there are no public Rights of Way to the site, so it was viewed as far as possible from the public highway along the Grafton to Geddington road).</p> <p>Boughton Wood forms part of the nationally important landscape of Boughton House, Grade I Listed on The Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (Historic England, List Entry 1000375). From the late 17th century onwards this was conceived as a grandiose, formalised landscape which extended far beyond the house and park (and registered area), throughout large tracts of the former Rockingham Forest within the north-east of the county. On several historic county maps (eg. Thomas Eyre's 18th century survey) this landscaping is clearly visible as a prominent feature comprising a complex of countryside rides defined mostly by avenues of trees and linear clearings cut through woodland; these are significant contributions to the historic landscape character of this area of the county.</p> <p>Maps and satellite imagery along with evidence from viewing the site visit all suggest that the proposed development should have minimal impact on the primary element of the designed landscape of Boughton House; land form and existing tree cover indicate that it should not be visible to or from the main parkland and is unlikely even to be visible from the Grafton to Geddington road.</p> <p>GT/NGT are pleased to note that the resubmitted new build proposals have substantially taken on board previous design comments submitted by Historic England. The building design is largely in keeping with other estate properties.</p> <p>With the above in mind the GT/NGT have no objection to the proposed development in principle, but with recommendations to ensure that the integrity of this important historic landscape is reinforced.</p> <p>Whilst the existing lodge building has outlived its purpose, it is nonetheless part of the post 1720s fabric of this highly significant county estate, so we recommend that full historic building recording is carried out prior to its demolition, along with any significant ancillary buildings. Additionally, whilst it is understood that the site of the original (pre-1720s) lodge was located immediately to the south of the current building and the new build proposal, maintaining an archaeological watching brief during demolition and groundworks may cast further light on the development of this historic landscape.</p> <p>The GT/NGT are particularly pleased by the proposal to reinstate part of</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>the lost avenue of trees along the former ride running south from Boughton Wood. We would however appreciate consideration of the planting of the full avenue of trees (ie. both sides of the alignment of the former ride) as a further pro-active gesture towards restoration of the former grandeur of the historic landscape. The GT/NGT applaud the many efforts the Boughton Estate has made over the past decade or so to reinstate its magnificent historic features and this would seem to represent an ideal opportunity to accomplish another such reinstatement. Furthermore, the GT/NGT are keen to encourage the creation of new and well-designed gardens in the county and will be very interested in the development of a new walled garden as part of the proposals at Boughton Wood Lodge.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mulgrave Castle	North Yorkshire	E20/1449	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Upgrade of existing junction onto A174 and widening of access road, installation at footpath and pedestrian footbridge. Existing Junction Onto A174 And Access Road/track At East Row, Sandsend. ROAD</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-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 – Mulgrave Castle 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. We refer you to our letter of 26th January and have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
University of York Campus West designed landscape	North Yorkshire	E21/0137	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of all-weather surface with underground anchors to enable erection of a marquee within part of the Vanbrugh Bowl and associated land regrading and access paths Vanbrugh College University Of York University Road Heslington York</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-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. 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. We refer you to our letter of 21st May. The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly objects to this</p>

				MISCELLANEOUS	application. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Broughton Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/0293	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge conditions 3 (external materials) and 4 (window drawings) of 2020/22299/FUL The Manse, Broughton, Skipton, BD23 3AE MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.06.2021 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 the park and garden at Broughton Hall is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We refer you to our letter of 19th February 2021 re applications 2020/22299/FUL and 2020/22300/LBC and have no further comments. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Broughton Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/0294	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Discharge conditions 3 (external materials), 4 (window drawings), 5 (secondary glazing), 6 (ventilation details) and 7 (re-use of door and architrave) of 2020/22300/LBC The Manse, Broughton, Skipton, BD23 3AE MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.06.2021 As per E21/0293
Mulgrave Castle	North Yorkshire	E21/0316	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Application for change of use of sawmill timber yard to visitor car park with associated works including surfacing, installation of associated infrastructure (pay stations, cctv poles, cycle stands/lockers, electric vehicle charging points, boundary treatment and signage)	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.06.2021 Thank you for re-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 – Mulgrave Castle 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. We refer you to our letter of 26th January and have no further comments to make.

				construction of vehicle bridge and creation of section of footpath at Former Saw Mill Timber Yard, East Row, Sandsend CHANGE OF USE	Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E21/0343	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of three art installations within Studley Royal Gardens including associated groundworks for a temporary period not exceeding 7 months. Fountains Abbey And Studley Royal Water Garden Fountains North Yorkshire SCULPTURE/MONUMENT	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, at grade I as per the above application. The Gardens Trust has liaised with the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) and YGT is responding on behalf of both Trusts. We would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. As you know Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey was designated as a World Heritage Site (WHS) in 1986 due to its world importance, combining the ruins of a monastic site with an early water garden and designed ornamental pleasure grounds. The site has been described as 'one of the most spectacular scenic compositions in England' (Hussey, 1967) and the 'finest formal water-garden in the country' (Jellicoe et al 1986). The three art installations are the latest in a programme of art works to stimulate public audiences and encourage new visitors to enjoy Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey. Temporary planning permission was granted in January 2020 for a period not exceeding 10 months, but due to the pandemic the installations were not put in place. There has been a minor change to the position of the 'bridged' structure from that considered in 2020, which has altered to move the structure further away from tree roots. The installation of the Spiked and Drift features do not present too many intrusions into the fabric of the landscape. The Bridged installation is much more demanding and intrusive in terms of its construction and its position right on the banks of the Skell, and we note the concern regarding the white clawed crayfish and steps taken to reduce any impact on them. However, the small scale and temporary nature of the proposals are unlikely to cause significant harm to the heritage assets and the proposed Bridge requires a minimal foundation that will be monitored by the National Trust Archaeologist. We assume that possible flooding of the Skell has been taken into account; nowadays this can occur in any season. The

					<p>Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this application and hope the installations will be much enjoyed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ebberston Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/0376	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 1no. two storey three bedroom dwelling with garaging, parking area, associated access track, hard and soft landscaping and planting Land North Of High Street Ebberston Scarborough RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2021</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 – Ebberston Hall at grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Ebberston Hall has integral gardens with early water features of c.1718. There are views of the wider landscape particularly to the south and a park that extends from the A170 road at the south, and through to the east and north; the whole site is c.21ha. The land encompasses two narrow valleys called Kirkdale, also known as Cherrygarth Slack and Beech Slack which run approximately parallel to one another from north to south; Cherrygarth Slack forming the valley of the water gardens and Beech Slack nearer the proposed development site. The historic gardens and landscape are Registered at grade II* indicating their particular national significance. For clarity it would have been very helpful to have the Registered Historic Park and Garden boundary marked on the maps with this application. Low Park Farm lies within the Registered boundary at the southern part of Beech Slack and the access road to the development site extend northwards from the Farm along an existing track in Beech Slack with an extension further north to provide additional road to the proposed site, all within the Registered Historic Park and Garden boundary. The southern boundary of the proposed house site is contiguous with part of the northern boundary of the Registered Park.</p> <p>We have been unable to visit Ebberston Hall and are unsure as to the visibility of the proposal from the south including the main part of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. We note that there is a Public Right of Way nearby and that the proposal is for new build in open countryside on the edge of the North York Moors National Park. Whilst we think that overall, the impact of the proposal will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Registered Historic Park and Garden, we defer to</p>

					<p>the expertise of your authority's conservation officer.</p> <p>If your authority is minded to approve the scheme, we advise that the new access road is completed in as sympathetic a manner as possible to sit comfortably within the landscape – we note that informal gravel is proposed which should be as low-key as possible. We also advise that further trees could be planted at intervals in addition to the hedgerow.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E21/0437	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolish existing rear porch adjacent to the kitchen. Erect new single storey rear extension to create utility/W.C. Renew all external doors/windows to existing property. Remove existing open porch to front elevation & fit new canopy with gallow brackets.</p> <p>2 Rough Lodge Cottages Nuneham Park Nuneham Courtenay OX44 9PN</p> <p>DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2021</p> <p>Erect new single storey rear extension to create utility/W.C. Renew all external doors/windows to existing property. Remove existing open porch to front elevation & fit new canopy with gallow brackets. 2 Rough Lodge Cottages, Nuneham Park, Nuneham Courtenay, OX44 9PN</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>This is part of a semi-detached group of two cottages which form one of the entrances to the Grade I listed park. Although the buildings have been altered from their original appearance, they still retain their character as estate buildings. We do not object to the proposed rear extension but consider that the proposed door hood is of an alien form which would detract from the vernacular character of the building and that uPVC doors and windows are unacceptable in a conservation area and an historic park and garden. We hope that these elements of the proposal will be modified before the application is determined.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Chetwynd Park	Shropshire	E20/1934	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of 1no. detached oak framed car port and open porch to front elevation of dwelling Meese View, 7 Chetwynd Park, Chetwynd, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8AE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2021</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 the Shropshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this response. Whilst we had no comments to make on the original application, the</p>

				BUILDING ALTERATION planning@apt-group.co.uk	amendments now show a substantial new garage building, almost 20 feet long by 18' wide and over 15 feet tall, which lies just outside the boundary, but within the setting of the Grade II registered park and garden of Chetwynd Park. We have looked at the site from Google Earth and it is apparent that the other neighbours are all content to park their cars on hardstanding and do not need a dominating structure of this type. We would prefer it if the applicant put down some hardstanding and retained the conifer hedge to screen any cars parked there. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Ammerdown House	Somerset	E20/1740	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed conversion of outbuilding to form single dwelling house. Ammerdown House Radstock Lodges To Ammerdown House Kilmersdon Frome Radstock BUILDING ALTERATION, CHANGE OF USE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation and the red-line annotated drawing seems to indicate that the car parking area has been moved to the existing car parking which we are supportive of. However, the documentation still shows the red line of the previous car parking areas on the approach road. We would like to have confirmation that this will no longer be used for car parking. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Marston House	Somerset	E21/0454	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to create 2no travellers pitches. Land At 376979 145064 Bulls Quarries Road Tytherington Frome CHANGE OF USE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2021 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 pre-application. I very much appreciate you sending me the available information regarding the change of use to create 2 x Travellers pitches within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) Marston. The submitted documentation provides almost no information on which to base a response. It is totally inadequate for an RPG of national importance. We note the apparent deficit of travellers' pitches within the Mendip DC area, and the difficulties faced by Ms/Mrs(?) Barney and her two children at their current location, although the needs of Mr Pitman are not

					<p>explained. What is entirely lacking in the provided documentation is any indication as to what kind of accommodation is planned within the site, especially given that it lies within the RPG. In order to respond appropriately we would need to know the type, height and design of the planned accommodation, whether this would be visible from within the RPG, what provision has been made for other domestic paraphernalia such as bins, car parking etc, and what mitigation measures are proposed by the applicants should their proposals negatively affect the setting of the RPG. We note the mention of Policy DP15 from Part I of the Local Plan, in particular paragraph e (see para 3.14 of the Pre-App statement) which states that any development should 'not have any significant adverse impact on the landscape character, built heritage and appearance of the surrounding area.' As we have not been given any details of what is proposed, we are unable to judge whether Paragraph e has been complied with.</p> <p>We would therefore like to place a holding objection until we receive further details so that we can comment more fully.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Weston Park	South Yorkshire	E21/0416	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of existing roof mounted plant/equipment including 2 fans and associated ductwork for a temporary period to September 2022 University Of Sheffield, Main University Library, Western Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Weston Park, Registered 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. The University of Sheffield's Main University Library (Western Bank Library), a Grade II* Listed Building, lies on the north eastern boundary of Weston Park on land that was originally part of the Park. Weston Park opened in 1875 using the Hall and grounds developed by Thomas Harrison, Sheffield saw-maker (the Harrison Trust) and with the notable landscape designer Robert Marnock, modifying the grounds to form the public park. Much of the original planting and Marnock's system of curvilinear paths survive.</p> <p>This planning application is for a temporary air handling system with roof-top plant for Western Bank Library. It forms an extension to the temporary</p>

					<p>works granted permission on 2nd December 2020 (20/03566/FUL, 20/03567/LBC). We understand that planning permission and listed building consent (21/00133/FUL, 21/00134/LBC), was granted on 16th March 2021, for works that will ultimately form the permanent solution for climate control within Western Bank Library. As far as we are aware we were not consulted on this.</p> <p>We have considered the information provided in support of the application and understand that in views from the park, that there is some existing screening of the roof-top plant and machinery by nearby trees. However, further screening may be desirable for permanent works and to reduce the impact of lighting. We do not have further comments, but emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
Cathedral Close and Linear Park, Lichfield	Staffordshire	E21/0310	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Refurbishment, extension and conversion of Westgate House (Grade II listed) to create 4 no. apartments and 1 no. townhouse, conversion and extension of existing outbuilding to create 1 no. detached dwelling, conversion and extension of Westgate Cottage (Grade II listed) to provide boutique hotel (12 no. guest suites) and spa and 6 no. apartments, erection of detached apartment building to provide 13 no. apartments, erection of 3 no. dwellings and detached garages, erection of garaging and 4 no. apartments over, basement car parking, bridge over Leamonsley Brook, hard and soft landscaping, access and associated works.</p> <p>Land And Buildings At Angel Croft</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting both The Gardens Trust, the national body for county gardens trusts and Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust about this application. I am replying on behalf of both organisations in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the trusts.</p> <p>The application site lies within Lichfield Town centre conservation area. The site is of high conservation significance and sensitivity. It includes within its boundary three listed buildings, Westgate House and Cottage and the grade II* former Angelcroft Hotel and directly abuts Beacon Park a grade II Registered Park and Garden to the west. It forms part of the western foreground setting of Lichfield Cathedral Close, immediately facing grade I listed Darwin House. Historically the two principal frontage buildings formed part of a low density suburban extension away from the town centre along the principal road northwards out of the city. Early OS mapping from 1882 shows the site layout very much open ground as it remains today forming garden land to the two frontage properties and undeveloped open space between around the conduit well head. The garden land associated with Westgate remains well planted with trees and shrubs creating a visual continuity with Beacon Park. Although the garden to the Angelcroft has been disfigured by its recent use as a builders' store a landscape could be reinstated here to help recreate the former open character of this area. The intermediate land between the frontage listed buildings never appears to have been built on. Although used as an</p>

				<p>& Westgate, Beacon Street, Lichfield, Staffordshire</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>unsurfaced car park for many years its undeveloped nature contributes to the low key spaciousness of this part of the city and its openness is important in vistas between Beacon Park and the Cathedral west front. The current application for an intensive redevelopment of this historically open land is strongly opposed by both Trusts. Any development here would cause harm to the historic setting and significance of the adjoining listed buildings but the height, scale and density of the current proposals would magnify this harm substantially. The quantum and intensity of development proposed has more in common with a major inner city area and shows no reflection or understanding of the special character either of Lichfield, this historic suburban area, or the special architectural qualities of the listed buildings on site. Although part of the vista from Beacon Park towards the Cathedral would remain its impact would be significantly diluted by its focus through a narrow corridor between the tall new buildings.</p> <p>In summary The Gardens Trust and Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust consider that these proposals would cause substantial harm to the significance of various heritage assets including Lichfield City Conservation Area, the settings of the Cathedral Close, Beacon Park and the immediately adjoining listed buildings for which no overriding public benefits have been adduced. The Trusts recommend that the application should be refused planning permission.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E21/0097	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Householder Planning Application - Erection of a single storey garage</p> <p>The Lodge, Chilton Grove, Waldingfield Road, Chilton Suffolk CO10 OPR</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We are disappointed that the applicant has revived this application. In our original objection of 30th March 2021, the Gardens Trust stressed the adverse impact of the proposals upon the important heritage assets directly across the road (Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Chilton, the Grade II* Chilton Hall and the Grade II walls of the walled garden). Our objection remains.</p> <p>The revised building is still overly dominant, industrial in style and out of place in a rural setting. We are puzzled as to why the applicant has chosen</p>

					<p>not to build it at the rear of the Lodge where its impact would be lessened. The NPPF (Para 189) makes it clear that an applicant should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. No such document has been submitted; at the very least the previous Planning and Heritage Statement could have been amended and resubmitted. We would also have expected to have seen an options appraisal clarifying why this site was chosen above others, accompanied by a Visual Impact Assessment showing views from strategic places, allowing us to ascertain more clearly what impact the large industrial building would have upon the RPG, the other heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>From photographs online, it is apparent that the applicant has already put in an unauthorised new gateway at the front of his garden to allow access for large vehicles. The removal of trees and vegetation from the road boundary is much to be regretted, and the close boarded fence is, in our opinion, far too suburban in such close proximity to the RPG and its parkland setting. It urbanises the character of this countryside. Drawing 1846/20/01 Existing Site Plan and Location dated Jan 2021, is misleading, as it shows the gateway and a complete planting of 2.1m tall Photinia 'Red Robin' (strongly coloured as its name indicates) inside the close boarded fencing. Neither the gate or the planting existed in January. The Gardeners' World website states that 'Photinia 'Red Robin' has no particularly known value to wildlife in the UK.' We are all aware of how we must consider the environment when making planning decisions, and the choice of such an inappropriate hedge, combined with the hardstanding which will be required to accompany the building, is a very retrograde step environmentally. We very much regret that so much established vegetation/trees along the roadside have already been removed.</p> <p>This application is contrary to Policy CN14 of the Babergh Local Plan 2006 : 'Development in or adjacent to parks and gardens of historic or landscape significance (listed in the National Register of statutorily protected historic parks and gardens) which would lead to the erosion of their character, appearance or setting will be refused'. In our opinion, this application demonstrably fails this policy.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the cumulative impact of the various other housing applications around Chilton, which will affect the aforementioned heritage assets. Of particular relevance to this application, are applications DC/20/04342 & DC/21/00761. Your officers will be familiar with The</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (GPA) which advises officers (p2) that ‘When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.’ This ties in with further advice on p4 ‘Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.’</p> <p>This concentrated pocket of development immediately adjacent to the RPG detracts substantially from its setting of the RPG and the GPA goes on to state (p12) that ‘Cumulative assessment is required under the EU Directive on EIA. Its purpose is to identify impacts that are the result of introducing the development into the view in combination with other existing and proposed developments.’</p> <p>The website contains a long and detailed letter from Lady Hart of Chilton, who enumerates the various national and local policies which this application fails to comply with. We will not repeat them here for brevity, but they are all pertinent to your officers’ considerations when deciding this application.</p> <p>We would urge your officers not to compound this harm by approving this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Brookwood Cemetery	Surrey	E21/0458	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a memorial and associated works including landscaping and engineering operations. Land At Brookwood Cemetery, Cemetery Pales, Brookwood, Woking, Surrey, GU24 0BL SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2021</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 at the Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the submitted documentation for this substantial and very public project. The GT/SGT consider that the proposals are in an area of the extensive grounds where they can make their own contribution to the development of Brookwood Cemetery without physical or visual impact on the historic interest of the Grade I registered park and garden of Brookwood.</p>

					Yours sincerely, 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 02.06.2021 ...I just looked at the amendments and we are happy with the substitution of estate fencing. Thanks and sorry for the delay in getting back to you... Best wishes, Margie Hoffnung
Packington Hall	Warwicks hire	E20/1272	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed ha ha and crossings. Packington Hall, Packington Park, Meriden CV7 7HF. BOUNDARY, LANDSCAPE	-
Brockhurst	West Sussex	E21/0355	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION (Amended plans and documents received 12.05.2021) Proposed 2 storey extension to side elevation. Proposed 2/3 storey extension to side/rear elevation and patio area to the rear. Rustlewood Lewes Road East Grinstead West Sussex BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2021 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 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The GT/SGT are concerned that the proposed extension may result in harm to the significance of the Rock Garden in the neighbouring property, Barton Pines. A site visit has not been possible. The Heritage Statement dated May 2020, as well as the other documents submitted with the application, do not provide evidence to clarify this point. We are unable to ascertain whether the bulk and height of the building will have an adverse impact upon the significance of the Rock Garden. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Leonardslee	West Sussex	E21/0389	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a sculpture to the side of the main dwelling on a temporary basis, for a maximum	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2021 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

				<p>period of 12 months from the date of its completed installation. Leonardslee House Brighton Road Lower Beeding Horsham SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Sussex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation, and in our opinion the Heritage Statement does not give a very thorough appraisal of the impact of this very large statue upon the registered park and garden. The GT/SGT are not objecting to the application solely because the approval sought is only for a year; if a subsequent application were to be submitted for a longer period we would like a more thorough appraisal of the impact on the significance of this Grade I site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
AHarewood House	West Yorkshire	E21/0370	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to enable the additional use as a wedding venue, along with the existing consent for mixed food and drink, educational use The Hovells Weardley Lane Harewood Estate CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.06.2021 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 – Harewood House Registered Grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The site currently known as The Hovels lies within the Grade I Registered Park and Garden surrounding Harewood House and thus lies within a landscape considered to be of international importance.</p> <p>The proposed change of use to enable the additional use as a wedding venue (along with the existing consent for mixed food and drink and educational use) requires no alterations or additions to the current building and facilities, the details of which were approved under applications 18/07108/FU and 18/07109/LI. We have no objection to this aspect of the application.</p> <p>However, we do have concerns about the car parking provision. The drawing No 2017-154_C105 indicates 16 car parking spaces, 2 disabled spaces, 2 motorcycles and provision for cycles. Drawing No 2017-154_C103 indicates 17 car parking spaces plus 2 disabled spaces. But we understand that the wedding venue plans could include a maximum of 115 guests and we are unaware of any extra parking provision. Will guests arrive in a bus or walk or cycle from holiday cottages elsewhere on the estate? And have plans been made to prevent further damage to the landscape, prevent</p>

					<p>additional pollution and for extra vehicular movement on the access roads? We trust that our queries above will be addressed. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E21/0394	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building application for Dismantling and reconstruction of the bothy wall and for the construction of wall opening piers in stone rather than brick. Ledston Hall Hall Lane Ledston MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.06.2021 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 the park and garden at Ledston Hall is registered grade II* with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Our apologies for being late with our response and trust that this has not caused any inconvenience. Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The Park has 17C origins and the walled gardens and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with later additions/changes. The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest. The planning application is for the careful dismantling and rebuilding of a section of the Bothy/Kitchen Garden wall, using lime mortar, that is first shown on one of the Settrington paintings for Ledston c.1732. The garden wall is in poor condition and incapable of being underpinned safely to accommodate the nearby Energy Centre and Maintenance Store that has received permission. The gate piers are to be inserted in the north wall that is, as you might expect, built of stone on the northern side with brick on the southern side to absorb heat from the sun creating a better environment for wall fruit etc. We agree that it is more appropriate to build the piers of stone rather than brick particularly as they are near the new northern entrance driveway to the restored house. We have no objection to this planning application. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>