



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JULY 2021

The GT conservation team received 234 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, 63 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Donnington Grove	Berkshire	E21/0433	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Two storey rear extension and external alterations to existing dwelling; following demolition of existing outbuildings (resubmission of Application No. 20/01193/HOUSE) White Lodge, Donnington Grove, Donnington, Newbury BUILDING ALTERATION, DEMOLITION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.07.2021 Thank you for consulting the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) about this application for an extension to White Lodge. One of the key activities of the BGT is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on this planning application as White Lodge is within the envelope of Donnington Grove, which is Registered by Historic England as Grade II. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. The Gardens Trust (GT) has a role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The BGT 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 note the Western Area Planning Committee's report dated 9th June 2021 which recommends the refusal of planning permission. We support the Conservation and Design Officer's comments outlined in sections 6.5,

					<p>6.6 and 6.10 of this report, particularly the historic role White Lodge plays sitting on the eastern entrance into the park and the importance of keeping the link with the architectural style and size of Pink Lodge. However BGT feel that we should note that in our view, the harm done by the proposed development is mitigated somewhat because there is no longer an entrance to the Grade II registered park and garden from the east. The land belonging to White Lodge effectively blocks this former entrance, and therefore the link to its former role as a modest gate lodge has been partially severed to some extent already. It also was not clear if the extension to the property would harm the views from the main entrance drive, bridge and Donnington Grove Hotel in the winter months when there is no foliage on the trees. It would have been helpful if the applicant had submitted 'Views from the Parkland' in support of this application to address this question.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The key issue from our perspective is the size of the extension which would dwarf the existing modest building and harm its significance within the Donnington Grove Grade II registered park and garden. We support the recommendation to refuse this application. We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, BGT Planning Team</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/0248	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single-storey (with basement) detached ancillary building incorporating swimming pool, gym, and art studio, following removal of existing tennis court, its surrounding fencing, and existing green house.</p> <p>Mares Hill, 32 Hedgerley Lane, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 7NS</p> <p>GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2021</p> <p>Further to our original response to the above application on 21st May, the applicant's architect, Nan Atichatpong, has been in touch with us, and sent two photographs (attached) which he describes as 'photographs taken from location 51.58N, 0.57W or OSGB 499050, 187750 looking SE – from the park looking towards our site. As you can see, not only can we not see our site because of the vegetation and trees, the land slopes upwards such that the top of our building is not going to be at all visible from the park.' As we have not been able to make a site visit to fully understand the application site and its relationship to Bulstrode Park, we are unable to verify that this is indeed the case, and we would ask that your officers request a proper impact assessment : a map with viewpoints and an explanation of what the photos are in relation to the map. Our concerns are as much about light emittance and reflection and not just the projection of new structures.</p> <p>We do not wish to be unnecessarily obstructive, and it may be that our</p>

					<p>concerns are unfounded, but we have raised them so that your officers can be aware of our concerns when deciding this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wycombe Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E21/0614	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a new Energy Centre with four dual fuel boilers located in a purpose built modular building, a containerised Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit in an adjacent compound and a heat pump utilising waste heat and maximising the carbon savings and efficiency of the CHP. An exhaust stack of 17m is proposed as determined by stack height screening. The compound will have permanent fencing installed to denote the boundary and provide a degree of visual screening.</p> <p>Wycombe General Hospital Queen Alexandra Road High Wycombe Buckinghamshire ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and have no concerns about the new building, but the extremely high stack does present a problem. The application acknowledges that there will be an impact on both Wycombe Abbey and Daws Hill but calls this slight/moderate as vegetation will help to mitigate it, and it will be set amongst existing structures (some high). They are also proposing the colour to be matt silver so it will blend into the sky. From the information provided we are still unable to appreciate the full extent of the impact upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG). Until the applicant can demonstrate clearly via a rigorous and objective visual impact assessment that the stack will not have a significant harmful effect upon either Wycombe Abbey or Daws Hill and the listed buildings which contribute to the landscape design, we must object.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shardeloes	Buckinghamshire	E21/0617	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Agricultural track Land Between Shardeloes Lake and A413, Amersham Road, Amersham, Buckinghamshire, , ROAD</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The proposal is to create a new 4 metre wide, hard-surfaced agricultural track in the parkland which enters the park from the eastern part of the A413 and runs parallel to the A413 before dropping into the field. The field</p>

					<p>has previously been in arable use and it is now being turned into permanent pasture and planted with wildflowers. The purpose is to allow vehicles to provide access to the field without causing the crops any damage.</p> <p>Shardeloes is a Grade II* listed 18th century registered park and garden (RPG) and woodland with work by Nathaniel Richmond and Humphry Repton, surrounding an C18 country house, with remains of a formal early C18 layout in park, possibly by Charles Bridgeman. The listing details the landscape as follows: The north park lies to the north of the house, occupying the sides and bottom of the Misbourne valley running from west to east through the landscape. It is dominated by the house at the top of the southern slope and the central lake in the valley. The north park is also divided from west to east by the dual carriageway, originally the Aylesbury to Amersham turnpike which is shown in the 1739 Badeslade and Rocque view. The park south of the A413 and north of house is largely pasture, with clumps and single trees, many of early C18 origin, their arrangement suggesting the naturalised remains of the formal layout". We were extremely surprised that there is no mention of the RPG in the Design and Access Statement (D&A), particularly as the application site is not on its periphery or in a corner but bang in the middle. In order for your officers to fully appreciate the importance and significance of the site, a more thorough documentation of its heritage and significance is vital, and we would ask that you consider requiring the applicants to provide a more satisfactory document.</p> <p>It would appear from looking at Google maps, that there is already a track into the field which vehicles can access if required. This is borne out by comments made by the Amersham Society, Society who know the site better than we do. We quote : "The Design and Access Statement states that: 'The justification for the new track is that there is no current formal access to this part of the farm to manage the newly planted wild flower meadow. This is incorrect. There is a long and established and used track/old A413 route from the field, the subject of this application, that gives perfectly good access to the rest of the Applicant's farm. There was also an access to the field, directly to/and from the A413 near to the Walled Garden, which can be seen on the filed plan. This has recently been blocked by the Applicant (as it is his land) by an embankment of soil etc. At the western boundary of the field, and the termination of the proposed track, there appears to be no access to a public track or road. Therefore,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>this would not provide additional access to the field. The intervening land would not appear to be part of Shardeloes Farm.’</p> <p>Shardeloes Lake and the river Misbourne run along the southern boundary of the application site field and the introduction of a new hardcore track along the northern boundary would, in our opinion, be detrimental to their setting. P2316/F with Historic 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 states on page 4 : ‘Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.’</p> <p>We consider these proposals to be a substantial intrusion into the Bridgeman/Repton designed landscape. If the field is to be used as a wildflower meadow, regular access will not be required and it would be better to use or leave a strip alongside for the occasional need rather than construct a hard structure. Para 194 of the NPPF states that ‘Substantial harm to or total loss of a Grade II registered park or garden should be exceptional and for a Grade II* or I registered park or garden such loss or harm should be wholly exceptional.’ We contend that there is no "wholly exceptional" reason to allow the detriment to the conservation of this heritage asset.</p> <p>We fully support additional comments from the Amersham Society and do not ‘accept that a 4 metre wide fully structured and hard surfaced track is necessary for the management of a wildflower meadow/grass land’ especially as there is already a fully usable access track for this purpose. The benefits of a wildflower meadow are largely negated by the construction of an unnecessary hard surfaced track. Sensitive management of wildflower meadows mainly necessitates a one-off late summer cut for hay, with grazing in the winter months, generally by sheep. An intrusive hard surfaced access track to maintain the celebrated wildflower meadows for example at Highgrove House belonging to HRH the Prince of Wales, would be anathema. Should occasional access be required for agricultural reasons, good farming practice generally leaves an uncultivated strip of headland to avoid the necessity of driving over the main meadow.</p> <p>We strongly object to and question the need for a new access road which would cause more damage to the field, the planting and the biodiversity</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>than accessing it via the existing track. We do not consider that there is any agricultural necessity, or indeed any other reason, for the construction of a hard surfaced track in this sensitive part of the RPG. It will have an adverse impact on the Green Belt, the RPG and urbanise a picturesque meadow, without good or plausible reason.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tabley House	Cheshire	E21/0510	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Crest raising to reservoir and formation of footpath, remedial works to auxiliary spillway and associated temporary works. Land at Tabley Mere, Tabley Inferior, Nr. Knutsford, WA16 0UF. DRAINAGE/FLOOD RELIEF</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2021</p> <p>We have noted this application and are informed that The Gardens Trust (GT) has no record of being notified 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. Tabley House is a registered park and garden Grade II. Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We do not object to this application for "Crest raising to reservoir and formation of footpath, remedial works to auxiliary spillway and associated temporary works", works deemed necessary under the Reservoirs Act, but do have concerns about the impact of the proposed construction, construction routes, compound areas, materials and reinstatement on the significance of the historic landscape.</p> <p>We have knowledge of the site, have visited Tabley Mere in the past and have walked FP8 which passes to the south of the mere and in close proximity to the proposed crest raising work.</p> <p>In brief, the significance of Tabley Park lies in the time depth of the historic landscape, home of the Leicester family for 700 years, site of their medieval moated manor house with island garden, Palladian mansion by John Carr of 1767 (Grade I) and 17th century family chapel (Grade I). The Park is traversed by the route of the historic road to Knutsford as well as a series of later drives and walks for access and pleasure. These are all within a designed landscape laid out in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries which include a moated site with enlarged pool, the mere and extension of the mere by John Webb in 1803. Features such as the Folly Tower (listed Grade II), the roaring bridge, the Gothick boathouse (listed Grade II), as well as a number of lodges (which are also listed Grade II) add to the character and quality of this well documented historic designed landscape,</p>

					<p>recorded by artists such as Anthony Devis and JMW Turner as well as in sketches by members of the Leicester family.</p> <p>Our concerns relating to this application are as follows:</p> <p>Though there is evidence of brine subsidence in the local landscape and in the park, the impact of which is most notable in the condition of the Tabley Old Hall but also evident in trees on the southern bank of the mere, this is not mentioned in the JBA report and we question whether the risk of further brine subsidence should be assessed as part of the proposals.</p> <p>Raising the bank on the southern extension of the mere designed by Webb in order to resolve the risk of flooding will involve the importation of material and result in the steepening of banks close to the park boundary, factors which surely introduce new risks. How are these risks to be managed?</p> <p>One of the proposed construction routes crosses the historic road to Knutsford, a feature which is sometimes slightly raised, where there was evidence of cobble paving and which was, in part, lined by trees. There appear to be no proposals to safeguard this feature.</p> <p>This proposed construction route crosses the Roaring Bridge, which has been identified as requiring reinforcement. It is understood that this is to be the subject of a separate planning application. The listed boat house abuts the “weir bridge and entrance to the boat house is from the bridge” (HE). These structures being contiguous with each other, the integrity and conservation of both elements should be included in proposals. We have concerns about the loading on the bridge caused by construction vehicles.</p> <p>The compound for the Roaring Bridge work is sited on the Tabley House Collection car park but there appears to be no provision for alternative car parking for visitors. This facility is important for visitor access and the sustainability of the Tabley House Collection.</p> <p>We are concerned that reinstatement of all working areas should be carried out in a manner that ensures no permanent change to the historic landscape.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Susan Bartlett Conservation and Planning Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Muncaster Castle	Cumbria	E21/0585	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of ten tents, creation of a hardcore car park and conversion of building to ancillary accommodation</p> <p>Muncaster Castle, Muncaster, Ravenglass, CA18 1RQ</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, PARKING, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Muncaster Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. Please note, we have been unable to make a site visit and the following comments are therefore based on the information submitted in support of the application.</p> <p>We note that the proposed works are to site ten tents over the summer season in woodland around the periphery of the 18th century walled garden approximately 200m north-east of Muncaster Castle, renovation and conversion of the 19th century Apple House to re-purpose as a communal building for campers, and the provision of a parking area to the south of the walled garden.</p> <p>In principle we have no objection to the siting of the tents in this area of the landscape and the renovation of the Apple House but find the application lacking in detail about the proposed parking arrangements. We assume that ten camping units will require the provision of at least ten parking spaces, which is a fairly significant parking area. There currently appear to have been no details submitted of the proposed layout, construction and landscape treatment of the car park and we would advise that these are requested from the applicant to allow a more informed assessment of the impact on the designed landscape. It is anticipated that the hardcore surface of the parking area will suppress the re-emergence of the cleared Bamboo, however this would appear unlikely without initial excavation to remove the roots which is likely to affect the final ground levels and drainage requirements in this area. In addition, we would advise that, in a sensitive Grade II* designed landscape, archaeological advice is sought before any such excavation work proceeds.</p> <p>We would also expect a full survey of the garden walls to be undertaken identifying necessary repair works which should be implemented prior to the development of this area for camping, together with a programme for their on-going maintenance.</p> <p>To summarise: Whilst the Gardens Trust does not object to the principle of a camping facility in this area of the designed landscape, we consider that further information should be sought regarding the parking provision, and repair and maintenance of garden walls to more fully assess the impact on the significance of the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden.</p>
------------------	---------	----------	-----	---	---

					Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Elvaston Castle	Derbyshire	E21/0516	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Request for a Scoping Opinion under Part 2, Section 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 for the Proposed Conversion and Extension of Existing Buildings to Commercial Use, and Construction of Access Drive and Car , Elvaston Castle. Elvaston Castle Country Park, Borrowash Road, Elvaston, DE72 3EP. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.07.2021 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 downloaded the few online documents for the proposed new road, car parking and layout, and whilst these are helpful, should this proceed to a formal planning application, we would need to understand why this solution is the preferred one for Derbyshire CC. For example, we would query the need for an extremely expensive and almost certainly intrusive new road and roundabout running partially through the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) before running parallel to the western edge of the RPG when access is already available to the north leading into the large field and existing caravan park. Is the land earmarked for the new road of any ecological significance? Having made a site visit perhaps 4 years ago we appreciate that the field adjacent to the caravan park can occasionally flood, but we would like to see comparative costings for remedying this as opposed to the cost of road building and a new roundabout cutting through the edge of the historic landscape. The existing accessible area is not at all far from the main core of house and surrounding buildings, and development here may well be far less harmful to the RPG in terms of setting. However, to make sure that this impression is correct, we would need to see clearly where the car parking, housing, road etc lay in relation to the RPG. A historic impact assessment and visual impact assessment with photomontages/wireframes from some of the most important parts of the RPG, from key vistas both from the mansion and also back from the proposed road/car parking into the RPG would help us to understand this. A Heritage Statement with map regression would also be essential for us to understand how the parkland developed and what impact these changes would have upon the RPG. The extensive development within the core area around the Castle itself will unavoidably have a large impact upon the setting and significance of the RPG and in mitigation we would expect to see a phased restoration scheme, where individual projects are completed before further development can proceed.

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Ugbrooke Park	Devon	E21/0455	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey extension, remove existing single storey element and associated works CHUDLEIGH - Lawell Lodge , Chudleigh BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.07.2021 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above planning application which relates to Ugbrooke Park, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website, including the Heritage Impact Design and Access Statement. In the light of this information, we conclude that the proposed development would have a less than substantial impact on the Grade II* designed landscape of Ugbrooke Park or its setting. We therefore do not wish to raise any objection to the proposed development. Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust
Mamhead Park RECONSULTATION	Devon	E21/0558	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land for the siting of 24 luxury holiday lodges and the demolition of glasshouses, the retention of one glasshouse for use as a winter garden, alterations to the access arrangements, construction of internal roads, parking spaces, hard standings, deckings and associated landscaping. Obelisk Gardens, Mamhead, Devon, EX6 8HG. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.07.2021 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above request for a scoping opinion which affects the setting of Mamhead, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website, including the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (March 2021). We would advise that we have concerns over the scope of this document and the analysis of the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Mamhead Park. We

					<p>note that this document assesses the areas of the nationally designated landscape abutting the proposed development site as “forestry” rather than “formal parkland” as found further east. On the basis of our own research and knowledge of the historic designed landscape and its setting, we find this analysis to be overly simplistic and not fit for the purpose of determining this application.</p> <p>We note that historic map evidence shows that the level of tree planting in both the parkland to the east of the proposed development site, and in the Obelisk Plantation to the north, is now significantly more dense than was the case in the nineteenth century; and historic views indicate very clearly that the obelisk was visible as a landmark within and above the trees, which seems no longer to be the case.</p> <p>We are by no means convinced that sufficient evidence has been brought forward by the applicants to demonstrate, beyond doubt, that the development would not be visible from the designed historic walks in Obelisk Plantation; furthermore, we are not convinced that if, in the future, the level of tree cover in the adjoining historic parkland was reduced to its historic density, the development would not be visible from within the Grade II* designated parkland.</p> <p>In these circumstances we advise your Authority that you are not in possession of sufficiently clear and appropriately detailed evidence (as required by the NPPF), properly to determine this application or to assess its impact on the nationally designated heritage assets at Mamhead. In considering the proposed development, we advise that your Authority should satisfy itself, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the development, if implemented, would not have an adverse and harmful impact on the setting of the Grade II* designated landscape at Mamhead, and the designed views, especially from the high ground to the north of the site and the parkland to the east. This assessment should be based upon historic levels of planting and tree cover in order to reach a proper understanding of the likely impact of the development on the significance of the designed landscape at Mamhead.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Creedy Park	Devon	E21/0640	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of additional pavilion,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.07.2021 Once again, Devon Gardens Trust has only become aware of this

				<p>change of use of agricultural land to cricket pitch and associated works to land at Sandford Cricket Club, Creedy Park SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>application late in the consultation process due to the advice of a third party. You will be aware that Creedy Park is included on the Devon Gazetteer of landscapes of local and regional significance. The park forms the designed setting to Creedy Park, which is Listed at Grade II. We have previously advised your Authority of the need to consult Devon Gardens Trust on development proposals affecting sites included on the Devon Gazetteer – most recently on 23rd April 2021. We therefore take a very serious view of your failure to consult us on this application.</p> <p>Sites of local and regional significance (non-designated heritage assets) are considered by the National Planning Policy Framework (para 197), which states: “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application”. We note with concern that the applicant in this case while providing a heritage statement in support of the proposals, has failed to acknowledge that Creedy Park is an historic designed landscape and not, as stated in that document, “open countryside”. The demonstrable lack of understanding of this point has led to the omission of any consideration of the impact of the proposed structure on the historic fabric of the parkland, or any designed views within the park to or from Creedy House (Listed Grade II). We therefore advise that this document does not adequately fulfil the requirements of the NPPF and is not a proper basis on which your Authority should determine this application.</p> <p>Having reviewed the information on your website, we conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park by reason of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The visual intrusion of a new building within the otherwise open parkland landscape, to the detriment and damage of its special historic interest and character; · The intrusion of additional traffic movement, vehicles and parking within the park landscape to the detriment and damage of its special historic interest and character. <p>We therefore object to the present proposal, and respectfully urge your Authority not to grant consent for a scheme which, for the reasons set out above, we consider would cause actual harm to this locally and regionally significant heritage asset.</p> <p>We would be obliged if you can please ensure that in future any application affecting Creedy Park is notified to us in a timely manner; it appears that previous applications for development in this area may not have been sent</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					to us for consultation, which, as you will understand, is a matter for serious concern. I look forward to receiving reassurance from you on this point. Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust
Crichel House	Dorset	E21/0579	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Repair of existing boundary structures and walls to former walled garden. Construction of new pool house and ancillary spaces with formation of new terrace, paths and gate. CRICHEL ESTATES LTD, CRICHEL HOUSE, LONGMANS ROAD, MOOR CRICHEL, WIMBORNE, BH21 5DT MISCELLANEOUS, BOUNDARY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2021 Thank you for consulting the Dorset Gardens Trust on this pair of applications. The site of the new pool house is outside the HE Grade II designated park of Crichel House, but the site will be within the setting of the park. However, the site is not within the major aspects of the parkland from the House, and is within the general run of buildings that are along the road to the north. As such, the Trust has no objection as far as the relationship of the proposal to the designated area is concerned. Chris Clarke for the Dorset Gardens Trust
Alexandra Park	East Sussex	E21/0626	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of galvanised protection barriers to the Archway, Side Steps and lower Bath area. Roman Bath, Summerfields Woods, Bohemia Road, Hastings MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.07.2021 Thank you for very recently consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. The Gardens Trust is the national statutory consultee on matters concerning parks and gardens, and works closely with County Garden Trusts, such as Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT), regarding planning applications and planning policy affecting registered and locally listed Parks and Gardens. We have also learned of the application through other sources. Summary The structures installed without planning permission have undoubtedly caused substantial visual harm to the Grade II 'Roman' bath-house and also to the setting of the locally listed Summerfields Estate (formally known as Bohemia Estate). SGT therefore objects to the application. A Way Forward: Partnership Working Between SGT and HBC SGT and HBC have worked closely together for many years and the dedicated work of our volunteers has helped HBC record and understand the local heritage of local parks. This has resulted in HBC adding a number of sites to its Local List of Heritage Assets (Linton Gardens, Wellington Gardens, White Rock Gardens, and the site of the present planning application, Summerfields Estate (formally known as Bohemia Estate).

					<p>SGT is proud to have worked with HBC on these projects and delighted that the Senior Planning Officer recognised this contribution in a letter dated 2nd August 2016 stating:</p> <p>“The panel considered the heritage significance of this assets to be high and the panel members were united in recommending the asset for listing. I would like to thank SGT for the hard work in this process”.</p> <p>SGT would like to continue to work with HBC and, if the Council is amenable, we could help find better short-term and longer-term solutions to meet health and safety requirements and enhance heritage value. In the short term it may be possible to paint the galvanised structures to make them less visually intrusive. In the longer-term, full restoration is required which could have economic benefits for the town as well as heritage benefits; the early stages may well require a survey and grant application, which SGT may be able to assist with.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>It is unfortunate that maintenance of the ‘Roman’ bath-house over many years has been inadequate and as a result the structure and the protection around it have fallen into disrepair. The health and safety problems encountered could have been anticipated and avoided, indeed SGT has several times advised on this and even offered to fund a small grant to help address the issues.</p> <p>The ‘Roman’ bath-house is a Grade II registered building located within the Summerfields Estate, which is a Locally Listed Heritage Asset. Given these heritage designations, the National Planning Policy Framework imposes statutory requirements on the applicant (HBC) and the Local Planning Authority (also HBC). Planning Approval should have been sought before work was undertaken; when the application was submitted the accompanying Heritage Statement should have included an Assessment of the Significance of the Baths and the effect of the galvanised structures on this Significance. Finally, HE and the Gardens Trust should have been consulted in a timely manner with adequate time to respond before any decision is taken.</p> <p>Attached at the Annex to this letter is the full report prepared by SGT to support the application for Local Listing which fully describes both the ‘Roman’ bath-house and Summerfields Estate.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>SGT finds the utilitarian, brightly coloured galvanised gates and grid entirely unsympathetic to the sandstone ‘Roman’ bath-house and its</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>setting. It is hard to imagine an uglier solution. For this reason, SGT objects to the application being approved.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.</p>
<p>South Lodge Little Hyde Lane, Ingatestone</p>	Essex	E21/0702	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement dwelling South Lodge Little Hyde Lane Ingatestone Essex CM4 0HJ DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This is an application to replace South Lodge, a single storey house located in countryside between Ingatestone and Fryerning, with a contemporary style building. South Lodge takes its name from its association with The Hide, a notable early 18th century house surrounded by gardens and a designed landscape, which is included in the Essex Gardens Trust's Inventory for the Borough of Brentwood. The Hide is of historic importance, not just as a local great house, but also because the Disney family which acquired it in the early 19th century, donated an important collection of antiquities formerly in the house to the Fitzwilliam Museum and endowed the Disney chair of Archaeology at Cambridge. This part of Little Hide Lane is a new road created to divert roads away from the house, and South Lodge was at the main approach and shown on the OS 1874 map. Further up the lane where it turns abruptly is North Lodge, a building similar to South Lodge. The Hide was demolished after a fire in 1965. The coach house was converted to a house and a new house was built in the grounds. The two lodge buildings are important as features of the wider historic landscape, which, as such, would suffer harm through the replacement of South Lodge. In addition, the proposed replacement dwelling would be in a style, and materials, quite at odds with the local character. In view of these considerations, we object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
<p>St Mary's, Painswick</p>	Gloucestershire	E21/0616	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of fence on northern boundary Court House, Hale Lane,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2021</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for development that might impact on the quality and integrity of Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust</p>

				Painswick, Stroud BOUNDARY	<p>(GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>This retrospective application for consent raises a number of difficult issues for such a seemingly minor proposal. The stature of the Heritage Impact Assessment fully explores these aspects, leading to their conclusion that it is just a low key solution to maintaining privacy for the uses adjacent to the boundary.</p> <p>However, St Mary's "Registered Park " as the secular EH would term it, is in fact a nationally significant churchyard. Maintaining its outstanding visual quality and character, GGLT considers to be of overriding importance; and that stance most certainly includes maintaining the historic integrity of its boundary enclosure.</p> <p>The two types of new boundary treatment used in this scheme, to the garden and also behind the garages, both seem unnecessary in terms of their overcoming privacy issues and by creating additional visual confusion to what is in essence a simple historic walled churchyard.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
St Mary's, Painswick	Gloucestershire	E21/0619	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of infill extension, roof repair, installation of widows and dormers on rear elevation.</p> <p>Stocks Cottage, St Marys Street, Painswick, Stroud.</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2021</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might have have adverse impacts on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscape, has notified Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>Stocks Cottage occupies a very significant location in the heritage structure of the centre of Painswick. The site has a long history as outlined in the Application; but importantly it forms a strong visual element that contributes to the character of the Grade 11 Registered St. Mary's churchyard, and is also adjacent to the Court to the South West.</p> <p>The proposals to modernise and restore the cottage are to be carried out in an entirely traditional manner, and therefore its essential visual characteristics will be retained. It will not have any adverse impact on the outstanding quality of St. Mary's churchyard; therefore, GGLT would not wish to raise any points of criticism.</p> <p>Your sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
St Mary's, Painswick	Gloucestershire	E21/0642	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of double oak car port.</p> <p>Court House Hale Lane Painswick</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2021</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee regarding development that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape trust (GGLT) to</p>

				Stroud Gloucestershire GL6 6QE BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>In real terms, this timber framed double garage has limited impact on the Grade II Registered Park (The Churchyard and setting to St Mary's, Painswick) which is the Trust's primary interest..</p> <p>However, within the setting of The Court and the wider Painswick Conservation Area, GGLT might observe that the drawings showing its context with adjacent buildings would indicate that the building is possibly over scaled for its sensitive historic setting. A rather more sympathetic approach might be to move away from its agricultural image, and pick up the stone vernacular of its actual location. A simple cart shed approach on stone piers with a double pitched roof and valley gutter might be a way of reducing its overbearing scale.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
St Mary's, Painswick	Gloucestershire	E21/0695	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of pool house to replace existing structure Court House, Hale Lane, Painswick, Stroud MISCELLANEOUS	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2021</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have adverse impacts on Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes; has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>The removal of the steel structure that encloses the existing pool house is to be welcomed. This proposal to enclose the pool and ancillary uses within a building that merges contemporary construction and forms with a traditional pool volume, provides greater synergy with the main Court House massing. The use of traditional materials and detailing will be critical to a successful outcome</p> <p>On this basis, GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment about this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Bexley Local Plan	Greater London	E21/0375	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.07.2021</p> <p>Bexley draft response following meeting on 6 July 2021</p> <p>Thank you for the meeting on 6 July. We found this a welcome opportunity to discuss planning's role in protecting and enhancing the historic parks in the borough. In fact, it raises issues relevant to all boroughs in the context of planning reforms and the greater reliance on design codes and less detailed local plan policies.</p> <p>We discussed this at our Planning and Conservation Working Group last week and will be using your invitation to contribute to your SPD as a pilot.</p>

					<p>We think this will be a useful piece of work for the future. We will be looking back at our responses to planning applications to identify how development impacts on the parks and open spaces on our inventory. These notes are not a formal response to the Local Plan Reg19 consultation 1 Local List</p> <p>The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust launched the London Inventory of Historic Green Spaces in April 2003. The research was completed over a seven-year period and it continues to be added to and updated. The Inventory is a comprehensive listing of more than 2,500 historic open green spaces - parks, gardens, squares, churchyards, cemeteries, commons and greens - in the Greater London Boroughs, and contains valuable information on each site. We link our information wherever possible with other resources including GoParks London and the Greater London Historic Environment Record to make sure that the vital historic features of London's green spaces is protected within the planning system.</p> <p>The Bexley Local List</p> <p>Detailed information on each of the 62 sites in Bexley can be accessed here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sites-in-borough/?Borough=Bexley</p> <p>Some of these sites of historic interest are associated with buildings or structures which may already be recognised as heritage assets. Our view is that these sites are valuable on their own merits and should be designated as protected landscapes. Their status as a setting of a designated building or structure does not recognise their full heritage and cultural value. The Local List currently does not include any landscapes within the Borough. However, the Local List Nominations Procedure is clear in stating that landscapes can be nominated for inclusion upon the List. https://www.bexley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2020-05/Local-List-Nominations-Procedure.pdf</p> <p>The criteria includes for example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · designed landscape interest: locally important historic designed landscapes, parks and gardens that may relate to their design or social history <p>and also</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · social and communal value: sources of local identity, distinctiveness, social interaction and coherence, including things which contribute to the 'collective memory' of a place
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Because of the current lack of landscapes on the list, the Local List is referred to as a list of buildings and structures.</p> <p>We attach a list of sites which we strongly recommend for inclusion and a second list where further consideration may be required. There may also be sites which we have not yet identified but which the Council would wish to include on our inventory.</p> <p>2 Local Plan</p> <p>We note, the council is relying on NPPF & national guidance and the London Plan for heritage protection through the planning system. Supplementary Planning Documents will provide details to guide development.</p> <p>Policy SP6 Managing Bexley's Heritage Assets)</p> <p>In the case of the grounds of historic houses and sites, where these may be Statutory Listed, or included upon the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, any impacts upon the setting of these assets will be assessed in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. However, this does not cover the grounds of a listed building in a park which has heritage value in its own right.</p> <p>We are not convinced this comes across in the policy or supporting text.</p> <p>DP14 Development affecting a heritage asset</p> <p>Further to the intention to include landscapes on the local list, some minor editing to Policy DP14 & supporting text will be required eg para 4.42, 4.45, 4.46, 4.57 & 4.59. Impacts of development on buildings is discussed in para 4.59. In the case of a landscape, the erosion of character can be as destructive as the demolition of a building.</p> <p>Policy DP14 has clauses for listed buildings, locally listed buildings and conservation areas but not for landscapes. We are concerned that developers on sites outside a landscape with heritage value will fail to recognise the impact of their development on the park design and of the experience of being in the park.</p> <p>Para 4.42 states</p> <p>“ a complete list can be found in the Council's Historic Environment Record (a live document that is updated outside of the Local Plan process).”</p> <p>Please note, there is nothing of this name on the Councils website. Key parts of the Borough's Historic Environment Record are located together on the Council's website here</p> <p>https://www.bexley.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/conservation-heritage-and-biodiversity/policies-and-guidance</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>This link would not be found by a developer following through the explanation in para 4.42. We are pointing this out because we want to make it as easy as possible for developers to submit proposals for good development.</p> <p>Part 2: Residential and Residential-Led Mixed-Use Site Allocations Over 20 sites are identified for development in the Reg 19 Draft Local Plan. We currently do not have the resources to review each of these against the inventory and hope that, following our meeting, you can now assess any potential impacts/opportunities.</p> <p>We are not only about protection, we would like to see the opportunity for green spaces to be improved and integrated into the design of new developments, for development which results in increased footfall to pay for the increase in upkeep; for large scale development to reduce open space deficiency.</p> <p>DP17: Publicly accessible open space DP11 2e is a policy position which should be included in Policy DP17 so that there are hooks for the SPD.</p> <p>3 Design SPD We welcome the preparation of supporting documents and hope drafts will be available at submission stage so that the intention of the higher level Local Plan policies will be clear. We are pleased they will address the heritage assets of parks and green spaces.</p> <p>The Local Characterisation Study is a good opportunity to identify the many ways that green space can influence a neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Design SPD might consider details such as lighting, noise, intrusion, overlooking, overshadowing, change of use, temporary uses/reinstatement. In our experience, these impacts are often not thought of at planning application stage.</p> <p>Criteria should apply not only to development within and immediately adjacent green space but also which potentially impact on designed views into, as well as from, that landscape.</p> <p>We have put a call out for examples of good practice & so far have identified these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Essex Design Guide (https://www.essexdesignguide.co.uk) covers landscape character and historic landscape character · East Suffolk Council have just published an Historic Environment SPD, which provides a more holistic approach to considering the historic environment in planning and includes specific information about the
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>District's historic landscapes and their settings - see https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Planning-Policy-and-Local-Plans/Supplementary-documents/Historic-Environment-SPD/Historic-Environment-SPD-reduced.pdf</p> <p>· Threats to designed landscapes are covered in the Gardens Trust's Vulnerability Brown publication - https://thegardenstrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Vulnerability-Brown-for-website-with-hyperlinks_2Nov17_smaller-file.pdf. Being aware of the threats can inform good design advice. · https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/ (NB predates 2019 updates of NPPF)</p> <p>We hope these notes are useful and look forward to ongoing collaboration</p> <p>Helen Monger</p> <p>London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Parks and open spaces in Bexley worthy of including on Local List in their own right</p> <p>All Saints Churchyard, Foots Cray</p> <p>Barnhurst Golf Course</p> <p>Belvedere Recreation Ground</p> <p>Crossway Park</p> <p>Erith Cemetery including Brook Street Cemetery</p> <p>Franks Park</p> <p>Frognaal House</p> <p>Green, The</p> <p>Hall Place North Field</p> <p>Hollies, The</p> <p>King George's Field</p> <p>Lesnes Abbey</p> <p>Manor House</p> <p>Marten's Grove Park</p> <p>Northumberland Heath Recreation Ground</p> <p>Oval, The</p> <p>Red House</p> <p>Russell Park, Bexleyheath</p> <p>Sidcup Place</p> <p>Southmere Park</p> <p>St James's Churchyard</p> <p>St John the Baptist Church, Erith</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					St John the Evangelist Churchyard St Mary's Churchyard and Burial Ground St Paulinus Church and Burial Ground Styleman Almshouses Vale Mascal and Vale Mascal Bath House Waring Park
Pishiobury RECONSULTATION	Hertfords hire	E21/0045	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing house and construction of one 2 storey detached house with basement, loft bedrooms, two balconies to rear first floor; detached garage and front entrance gates. 7 Pishiobury Drive Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 0AD DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.07.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on amendments to this application. We have nothing to add to our comments submitted on 14 April 2021. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
61 Bridge Road East Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/0529	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site for Class C3 residential units providing a total of 138 residential units (40 no. 1- bedroom units, 91 no. 2-bedroom units and 7 no. 3-bedroom units), with associated car and cycle parking, amenity space and associated works. 61 Bridge Road East Welwyn Garden City AL7 1JR. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The outline landscape plans in this proposal show little consideration of Welwyn Garden City's impressive heritage of tree planting since its inception, nor of the concept of green space for health, both mental and physical which was a key part of Howard's ideas. Flats are a relatively new , and somewhat alien, feature in the town and treatment of the landscape to reflect the existing town should be followed. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
9 Codicote Road, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E21/0582	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to ground floor layout and erection of first floor extension 9 Codicote Road Welwyn AL6 9ND BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The proposed extensions to this house would result in a building which is not in keeping with the scale of neighbouring properties and by virtue of the local topography would cause visual intrusion, not only to houses further down the hill towards Welwyn but also in the views from Welwyn village northwards . Our comments for planning application for a similar proposal

					(6/2021/1134/HOUSE) suggested a more modest extension in keeping with the local area might be acceptable. These comments still stand and we object to the proposal as detailed in this application. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/0671	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of manege riding arena Stables at Hawkshead Road, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, EN6 1NL MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that the Design & Access Statement fails to mention, let alone consider, the adjacent Registered park of Gobions. The views from Gobions towards the boundaries, both south to Hawkshead Road and north towards modern Mymms Drive and The Grove were designed as an important part of the historic landscape. The surfacing of the propose manege is visually intrusive and we would welcome mitigation of this block of hard landscaping in views up from the Gobions historic layout around Ray Brook. A hedge planted on the north side of the proposed manege would help reduce the visual harm caused in the views from the designated heritage landscape. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
22 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/0725	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey side extension, minor alterations to windows and doors, erection of privacy screens to create first floor terraces, part demolition of existing roofed structure adjacent to No 20. 22 Parkway Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HG BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.07.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the proposed single storey extension or the changes to the windows as proposed. We object to the installation of the glazed screens at first floor level which are out of keeping with architecture on the west side of Parkway. These buildings were a carefully considered part of the City Beautiful concept of Louis de Soissons to give a unified effect approaching the Civic Area around the Campus. The corner of Russellcroft Road and Parkway also forms one of the Gateways, designed on the Raymond-Unwin model on the important Howardsgate/Russellcroft Road cross-axis, reflected in the setting back of the Russellcroft Road and Parkway housing at this point and reflected at the Howardsgate/Parkway junction. The key historic designed views (noted in WGC CA appraisal) of the Gateways include those of the of the southern elevation of 22 Parkway which would be harmed by inappropriate glazing.

					Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Thwaite Hall RECONSULTATION	Humberside	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 28.07.2021 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- 20 th 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 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. 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. We have the following comments: 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

					<p>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 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 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>
Stanley Park, Blackpool AMENDED PROPOSAL	Lancashire	E20/1234	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Use of existing basketball court area adjacent existing skate board park as a multi wheeled use track for scooters, skateboards and bicycles. STANLEY PARK, WEST	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and</p>

				<p>PARK DRIVE, BLACKPOOL FY3 9HU. SPORT/LEISURE Mrs Wendy Hoggarth 01253 476226 planning@blackpool.gov.uk</p>	<p>conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Stanley Park is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden and the current proposals involving the refurbishment of the existing skateboard park lie within the Registered Park.</p> <p>LGT welcomes the continuing investment which the Council is bringing forward to enhance the facilities of Stanley Park as a recreational asset for the benefit of the wider community. We note that this application is at outline stage and request that adequate allowance is made to provide and implement a suitable landscape scheme within the current skateboard area to screen the facility without detriment to the original Mawson layout. We trust that this will form part of the full application when this is made.</p> <p>In this instance, LGT supports this application.</p> <p>If any matter within the consultation response above requires clarification please contact LGT at conservation@lancsgt.org.uk in the first instance.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Staunton Harold Hall	Leicestershire	E21/0691	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey side and two-storey rear extensions including demolition of existing side and rear extensions, changes to existing land levels and erection of new retaining walls and terraced area including the demolition of existing outbuilding and existing stone retaining wall The Malthouse Melbourne Road Staunton Harold Ashby De La Zouch DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2021</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 Leicestershire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and whilst we understand and have no objection to the owners of the Malthouse extending their house, and we welcome the re-use of salvaged materials where possible, we would query the choice of Allan Block, Yorkshire Blend for the retaining wall. There may well be technical reasons why this has been chosen for its weightbearing capacity etc, but from an aesthetic standpoint, it does not seem in any way sympathetic with the remainder of this old building. We would suggest that your officers consider asking the applicants to use material which is more in keeping with the other materials present on site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Heigham Park	Norfolk	E18/0516	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 3 all-weather hard tennis courts, with flood lighting on the former grass courts. Heigham Park, Recreation Road, Norwich. SPORT/LEISURE OUTCOME 08.11.2018 Granted	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2021 As you will be aware, the Gardens Trust has objected to this development. I understand that Councillor Stonard has referred to the Council having revised the scheme, taking on board the Trust's concerns. Revisions to the proposals did address concerns about the effect on the pavilion. However, the Trust also objected to the proposed floodlights and to the loss of the grass tennis courts. Those aspects have not changed and I therefore confirm the Trust's continuing objection to the scheme as a whole. I hope the Council will give further consideration to these elements of the proposals. Yours Sincerely Mr Keri Williams Planning Officer Norfolk Gardens Trust.
South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan	Norfolk	E21/0413	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the first draft of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocation Plan (VCHAP). I am responding as a planning officer of the Norfolk Gardens Trust. We have reviewed the proposed site allocations in the 48 village clusters and mapped them against both registered parks and gardens and other non-designated heritage assets of which we are aware. We have no objections to raise regarding the proposed sites. However, as you will be considering further sites as part of this consultation process, we would like to propose the addition of a policy that is a standard requirement "to avoid harm to the character and setting of heritage assets, including designated and non-designated parks and gardens." We look forward to responding to any further consultation as the South Norfolk VCHAP progresses. Sincerely, Susan Grice Norfolk Gardens Trust
Holkham Hall	Norfolk	E21/0553	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of summerhouse. The Arboretum At Holkham Hall, Holkham Estate, Wells-Next-The-Sea, Norfolk, NR23 1AB. GARDEN BUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. The Trust works closely with the Norfolk Gardens Trust in formulating its responses to planning applications. Unfortunately, the Trust is unable to support this application in its current form. Holkham is a Grade I registered landscape and one of the most

					<p>important designed landscapes in Norfolk and in England. Holkham Hall is a Grade I listed building. The proposed summerhouse would be near the edge of the arboretum to the east of the Hall and near to stables buildings, now converted to other uses. It is known that Capability Brown was active in designing the pleasure grounds in the immediate vicinity of the Hall. Despite this very sensitive setting the application is not supported by an adequate assessment of the effect of the proposal, if any, on the historic landscape which forms the setting of the listed building. There is, for example, no description or assessment of the greenhouses which would be replaced. An assessment could also address any effect on significant views. The proposed development is of a modest scale. Nevertheless, in the absence of adequate supporting evidence the Trust is unable to conclude that it would not be harmful. Additional supporting evidence should be sought from the applicant.</p> <p>Norfolk Gardens Trust</p>
Lynford Hall	Norfolk	E21/0589	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Glamping Pod Annex Glebe Cottage West Tofts Road IP26 5ET HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the plans for the proposed glamping pod annex at Glebe Cottage. Glebe Cottage is situated on the west boundary of Lynford Park, a Grade II Registered Park & Garden (Listing No. 1000224).</p> <p>We note that the perimeter of Lynford Park is dominated by woodlands and plantations. In particular, the west side of the park is covered by a large coniferous plantation which was planted in the early 20th century on the site of the C19 woodland garden and pleasure ground. Zigzag Covert, in the south of this plantation, effectively screens Glebe Cottage from the park and hall.</p> <p>As the proposed facility is unlikely to have any detrimental impact on Lynford Hall and its parkland, the Gardens Trust has no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Susan Grice Planning Officer Norfolk Gardens Trust</p>
Aynho Park	Northamptonshire	E21/0496	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement garage and workshop. 16 Roundtown Aynho OX17 3BG MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The proposed replacement garage lies on the edge of the village whose</p>

					<p>historic layout, along the main through street, has been subject to gradual domestic infiltration for some years now. Whilst the proposed replacement building is more aesthetically appealing than its predecessor, we were surprised by its size, being twice as tall and having a footprint six times that of the current building, due to workshop space. The new building will almost definitely be visible from within the Grade II registered park and garden at Aynho.</p> <p>Our comments do not signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
University of York Campus West designed landscape AMENDED APPLICATION RECONSULTATION	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>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for your email of 6 July. I am replying as Chair of Yorkshire Gardens Trust in our role as a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT), and with whom we work in partnership in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites; YGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>YGT's view is that the design and access proposal does not engage closely enough with the English Heritage (EH) list entry, and so misunderstands and understates the significance of the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic interest <p>The proposal acknowledges the landscape as 'a physical manifestation of the University of York Development Plan, which was heralded as the beginning of contemporary university planning in Britain'. However, the proposal changes the appearance and aesthetic of the amphitheatre in such a way that it makes it harder to read from the landscape the original design intention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design interest <p>We contend the proposed change of surface, and of use, compromises the existing design interest (see below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping <p>The EH entry notes that 'the RMJM landscape complements and enhances the C17/C18 designed landscape of Heslington Hall, and combines both hard and soft landscaping to striking effect with formal and informal spaces, water courts, lawned areas, paths with contrasting straight edges and winding lines, and covered walkways, all drawn together by a large sinuous lake that acts as a key focal point within the campus site' (our</p>

					<p>italics). This proposal alters a key part of the original design, removing a lawned area and introducing hard landscaping at a point where it was not intended (hard landscaping being provided nearby).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designers <p>The EH listing specifically values the landscape because it was designed ‘by the distinguished mid-C20 architects Andrew Derbyshire and Maurice Lee of RMJM, with Frank Clark, co-founder of the Garden History Society (now The Gardens Trust), as consultant’. This proposal wishes to overturn a key design decision of a feature not replicated elsewhere on campus (or, as far as we are aware, elsewhere in their work), by this distinguished group of people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of survival <p>This proposal will reduce the overall degree of survival of the original designed landscape. The EH description specifically notes the designers’ use of hard and soft surfaces of many kinds throughout the campus. But it is notable that at this point they chose grass over all other alternatives. This proposal is therefore a key intervention in the original design intention. Further, the EH listing describes this part of the landscape as ‘a naturalistic open-air amphitheatre with sloping rather than tiered sides’; this proposal specifically intends to make the amphitheatre less naturalistic.</p> <p>For these reasons, and further evidence below, YGT believes that, if altered as proposed, this part of the campus landscape will no longer support the current reasons for its listing.</p> <p>The design proposal asserts that ‘the aesthetic value [of the amphitheatre] is primarily linked to it forming one of many varied open spaces, framed by buildings, local topography and a covered walkway, adjacent to the central lake focal point and allowing views towards the lake and vice versa. Communal value is linked to the space being used and enjoyed by many students past and present. These elements combine to create the overall significance of the space’.</p> <p>We agree that some of the value of the amphitheatre derives from its association and link to the other landscape features of the campus. The EH list entry also makes this clear. We agree, too, that the communal value of the space in its original form is linked to the use made of it by existing and previous students. But the proposal to change the surface of the amphitheatre is designed to evoke a necessarily different response from those who approach the amphitheatre in future; the proposal closes down</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>some of the informal and casual uses to which it has previously been put. We note in passing that the design proposal does not appear to consider the 'use' of the space by visitors to campus over many years past and for many years in the future.</p> <p>The proposal tells us that the use of the space will change as the surface changes from soft to hard, from natural to artificial. We understand that the use of spaces changes over time, but the important point here is that changing the fundamental nature of the space as designed will change the use of the space in ways not supported by the original design, and close off approaches and responses that the original design was meant to privilege. That the change is said to be only the introduction of a small area of hard surface is irrelevant; a prepared pitch in the centre of a cricket field leads the use and purpose of the whole field, and so also here. Now it might be the University's judgement that this is a change for the better, but one cannot at the same time hold that this is a change without implication for the significance of the original landscape design, and therefore for the value of this part of the campus landscape's contribution to the whole as a listed entity.</p> <p>It is worth remembering that, before he came to be York's first vice chancellor, Eric James had been a Master at Winchester School. On coming to York he worked closely with the architects, who will have known James (he was a national figure) and his background. The resemblance of the amphitheatre at York to any number of folds in the Hampshire Downs (with allowances for scale) is a striking and surely designed reminder in the landscape of James's past, and of the closeness with which they all worked together as a design team. The amphitheatre was designed to link to, but be different from, other campus landscapes. It still manifests as a place to enter with respect and contemplation, a quiet space, supported by dignified sculpture close by and visible, benefitting from the drifting sounds of music rehearsals (Hammerklavier when I was there last), and buzzards eyeing up the grazing rabbits.</p> <p>Far from inflicting less than substantial harm, as the proposal maintains, it overturns the key design features of the site. The irony is that this proposal could be implemented, without violence to a listed designed landscape, or to the memory of the University's founders and builders, on several other parts of the University's estate.</p> <p>For these reasons we continue to object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Chris Webb Chair, Yorkshire Gardens Trust
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E21/0512	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Agricultural Building. Allerton Grange Farm Braimber Lane To Allerton Park Interchange Allerton Park HG5 OSE GRID REF: E 441015 N 457492 AGRICULTURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.07.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. On 6th January 2021 we responded to previous planning applications for four agricultural buildings on land between A1M and A168 immediately north of Junction 47 of the A1M which although they are beyond the Registered boundary, they are within the wider setting of Allerton Park: 20/04649/FUL; 20/04650/FUL; 20/04651/FUL; 20/04652/FUL Proposed Agricultural Building. Allerton Grange Farm, Braimber Lane To Allerton Park Interchange, Allerton Park HG5 OSE. These were granted permission in April 2021. In addition, approval had previously been granted for a further double block of agricultural buildings; making a total of six. The current applications: 6.95. 21/02572/FUL; 6.95. 21/02574/FUL; 6.95. 21/02576/FUL; 6.95. 21/02575/FUL are for a further four agricultural buildings in the same area. As you will know Allerton Park remains on the Historic England (HE) 'Heritage at Risk' register: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/list-entry/26153 and it is likely to be negatively affected by further development in its setting. The Registered Park includes a number of designated heritage assets including Allerton Castle (grade I), Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). Both Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are sufficiently elevated to be further harmed by massing of the four proposed agricultural buildings or rather 'sheds'. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust make the following observations of objection in the setting of the Registered and Listed heritage assets of Allerton Park: 1. It is hard to believe that the farmer needs four more agricultural sheds

					<p>on top of the six approvals and the Highways shed.</p> <p>2. The buildings could not be more unattractive in appearance with anthracite roof and green walls.</p> <p>3. There are no landscape proposals, screening etc.</p> <p>4. There is no indication of access for large agricultural machinery, agricultural turning spaces for tractor & trailer etc. Could two agricultural vehicles pass on this new long access route alongside the buildings?</p> <p>5. No parking.</p> <p>6. It is feared that with the existing approvals and these additional four if approved, will be excessive agricultural needs and a change of use for industrial use will arise, needing advertising boards, adverts to the A1M etc.</p> <p>7. There is no provision for parking / circulation that is needed for industrial / warehouse use.</p> <p>8. The whole area seems destined to become the long- term mixed use setting ruining the significant heritage assets of the area.</p> <p>9. The original short-term approval for temporary works should eventually be terminated with the area returned by the highways contractor to agricultural land.</p> <p>We would like to underline NPPF (February 2019) Paragraph 194. We consider that the proposals will further harm the significance of the designated heritage assets and we are not aware of clear and convincing justification and firmly recommend a refusal.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust object to these four applications.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Duncombe Park	North Yorkshire	E21/0538	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for conversion of and lean-to extension to agricultural buildings to form 2 no. dwellings, conversion of workshop to form 1 no. dwelling and conversion and extension of cart shed to form 1 no. dwelling following demolition of timber structures together with the provision of parking,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.07.2021</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 – Duncombe Park at grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This planning application relates to a traditional range of stone and timber buildings located on the west side of Castlegate and immediately next to</p>

				amenity spaces, landscaping works and alterations to existing access (resubmission following expiration of planning approval NYM/2018/0119/FL) at Manor Yard, Castlegate, Helmsley. BUILDING ALTERATION	part of the north eastern boundary of the Registered historic park and garden, alongside Helmsley Castle. The proposal appears to be a sympathetic new use for this part of Helmsley which is within the Conservation Area. We do not consider that it will have any harmful impact on the Registered Park or on the key views from the Castle and its grounds. We have no objections. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Ribston Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/0570	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land to the East of Langshawe Wood	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2021 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 Ribston Hall, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The Ribston estate was owned by the Knights Templar in the 13th Century and the present park has 17th Century origins with pleasure grounds probably of the late 18th Century with 19th Century additions. Thinning is proposed for Compartments 5a, 9 and 12 which lie within Ribston's Registered Park and Garden and is for thinning mixed broadleaves and conifers. 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e,4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, and 4j are outside the registered boundary but 4j could be considered to be within the setting. They are all scheduled as mixed broadleaves and mixed conifers. 4j is just east of the north east registered boundary, 5a 'High Wood' is likely to originate as part of the designed landscape; it bounds a loop of the river Nidd at its southern edge; compartment 9 'Rookery' lies immediately south of 'Tilting Ground' but from its rectangular shape and notation as coniferous, may be 20th Century in origin and compartment 12 is not shown on the registered park and garden map from English Heritage of 2003. Thank you for answering my queries. We understand that there is no Woodland Management Plan for the Ribston Estate. The Estate wish to manage the woodland through a Felling Licence Application for a programme of "Thinning"; the thinning process involving the removal of up to 30% of standing trees in order to benefit the

					<p>health and growth of the stand. We appreciate that thinning is good practice for beneficial woodland management. We do not have any information on the age of the trees, the species involved and their location within the compartments.</p> <p>We advise that if there are older trees in the compartments that they are retained and protected during the thinning works. The woodland edge of compartments 5a and 4j is particularly important as they face onto the park and in the case of compartments 9 and 12 they are notable in being north of the drive from The Avenue to the Hall. Where woodland is important in views, we recommend particular care to ensure their long-term integrity.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposal and trust that our observations will be taken into account.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Rudding Park	North Yorkshire	E21/0611	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of parkland to holiday use and siting of 8 holiday lodges and ancillary communal service building for temporary staff accommodation with access and landscaping works. Rudding Park Hotel Rudding Park Follifoot HG3 1JH CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Ribston Hall, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Ribston estate was owned by the Knights Templar in the 13th Century and the present park has 17th Century origins with pleasure grounds probably of the late 18th Century with 19th Century additions. Thinning is proposed for Compartments 5a, 9 and 12 which lie within Ribston's Registered Park and Garden and is for thinning mixed broadleaves and conifers. 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e,4f, 4g, 4h, 4i, and 4j are outside the registered boundary but 4j could be considered to be within the setting. They are all scheduled as mixed broadleaves and mixed conifers. 4j is just east of the north east registered boundary, 5a 'High Wood' is likely to originate as part of the designed landscape; it bounds a loop of the river Nidd at its southern edge; compartment 9 'Rookery' lies immediately south of 'Tilting Ground' but from its rectangular shape and notation as coniferous, may be 20th Century in origin and compartment 12 is not</p>

					<p>shown on the registered park and garden map from English Heritage of 2003.</p> <p>Thank you for answering my queries.</p> <p>We understand that there is no Woodland Management Plan for the Ribston Estate. The Estate wish to manage the woodland through a Felling Licence Application for a programme of “Thinning”; the thinning process involving the removal of up to 30% of standing trees in order to benefit the health and growth of the stand. We appreciate that thinning is good practice for beneficial woodland management. We do not have any information on the age of the trees, the species involved and their location within the compartments.</p> <p>We advise that if there are older trees in the compartments that they are retained and protected during the thinning works. The woodland edge of compartments 5a and 4j is particularly important as they face onto the park and in the case of compartments 9 and 12 they are notable in being north of the drive from The Avenue to the Hall. Where woodland is important in views, we recommend particular care to ensure their long-term integrity.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposal and trust that our observations will be taken into account.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ripley Castle	North Yorkshire	E21/0639	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conservation and repair works to the West Pavilion and Orangery within the Walled Garden at Ripley Castle. Including repairing renders, re-bedding stonework and repointing open mortar joints using lime mortars. Repairs to the Orangery roof include renewing the polycarbonate covering, redecorating cast iron frame and installation of opening lights to facilitate ongoing maintenance. Introduction of lead weathering to the cornice of the West</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2021</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, in this case Ripley Castle. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are very pleased that the grade II* listed Orangery, bothies, garden walls, East Pavilion and West Pavilion in the walled garden north-east of the grade I Ripley Castle are to be carefully repaired after a period of decline. As well as these structures intrinsic significance and as part of the registered park and garden, this area is part of the Ripley Conservation Area. Historic England has been able to support these works with a Repair Grant for Heritage at Risk (HAR). On</p>

				<p>Pavilion and Orangery and reinstating balustrades. Ripley Castle Hollybank Lane Ripley HG3 3AY REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>completion of the conservation and repair we hope that these important listed garden buildings will be removed from the HAR Register. We are pleased that the work is being supervised by well-regarded conservation architects. We commend the work and assume that due care is being taken to maintain the plants during this period. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Clifton Hall RECONSULTATION	Nottinghamshire	E17/0694	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The extraction and processing of sand and gravel, including the construction of a new site access road, landscaping and screening bunds. Mineral washing plant and other associated infrastructure with restoration to agriculture and nature conservation areas. Land off Green Street, Mill Hill and land at Barton in Fabis, off Chestnut Lane. MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2021 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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and we feel that the CGMS report which covers the impacts on the setting of the Clifton Hall Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) underestimates the value to the significance of the setting that the present Trent Valley agrarian landscape provides. We consider that the report is wrong in suggesting that the restoration to lakes will change the setting ‘for the positive’. In our opinion, there will be negative impacts during and post the 15 year extraction period. The level of harm stems from the public views from around the valley and the appreciation of the hill and woodland in an agrarian landscape. We also consider that there are likely to be more substantial (but less public) impacts on views out of the RPG woodland west and southwards. Your officers will be familiar with Historic 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, in particular (p2) ‘The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.’ Unfortunately, we have been unable to find anything in the LIVA to assist us in establishing the extent of, and impact on views from the RPG. Getting access to the parkland for a site visit is not straightforward and it lies within the City of Nottingham’s area. Our Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust colleague is hoping to be able to speak to Tom Street at the City Council,</p>

					but until then we wish to submit an objection to the application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office
Chetwynd Park RECONSULTATION	Shropshire	E20/1934	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 1no. detached oak framed car port and open porch to front elevation of dwelling Meese View, 7 Chetwynd Park, Chetwynd, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8AE BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2021 ... The comments in our letter regarding the amended application can stand, and in our opinion, this would seem to be more like a listed building issue than anything to do with the Registered Park and Garden, although it is within its setting... Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office
Henlle Hall	Shropshire	E21/0718	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Use of Part of Existing Golf Course for stationing 90 holiday lodges with associated roads, drainage and associated works Revised Scheme) Henlle Park Golf Club Henlle Gobowen Shropshire HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2021 We have received notification of the above application, which was forwarded to us from the offices of The Gardens Trust (formerly The Garden History Society). The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee in planning matters relating to historic parks and gardens and we are responding on its behalf in this matter. This is the second such application for the development of parkland areas at Henlle Hall, albeit much altered in scope and intention from the earlier version which was for 125 static caravans. At the same time, the enhanced significance of Henlle Hall as a designed landscape remains the same, as does its extreme sensitivity to a proposal of this kind. To begin our response to this proposal, it is worth reiterating our previous understanding of this property. What is now called Henlle Park may have had its origins in a park of the early- to mid-18th century, but was substantially altered and expanded in the later-18th & early-19th century, at the time when the now Grade II Listed Henlle Hall, then known as 'Preeshenlle' and afterwards as 'Belmont', was similarly extended and improved. Henlle Park is not itself a Registered Parks & Garden within the National Heritage List, although it is linked historically and aesthetically to the Grade II Listed Henlle Hall and provides also its principal Setting. Henlle Park is however included on Shropshire Council's own Historic Environment Record (HER Ref 07629). It was formerly listed in Appendix 2 of the publication 'Shropshire's Historic Parks & Gardens' (1997) as one of the Sites of Local Importance in the County Compendium for Shropshire. It therefore qualifies as a 'non-designated heritage asset' within the

					<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, revised 2019), as stated also in the Applicant's Heritage Statement.</p> <p>The co-applicant for this proposal, Coppergreen Developments Ltd, owns a number of similar developments across the English Midlands and in Scotland. From their website: (https://www.coppergreenleisureresorts.co.uk/), it would appear that the layout, density, form and standard of 'Lodge' accommodation proposed for Henlle Hall most closely parallels that of the so-called "Clumber Park Lodges" development near Worksop (n.b. not the National Trust Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of similar name), which is shown below in Figure 1.</p> <p>Figure 1: 'Clumber Park' lodges near Worksop, Nottinghamshire, similar in layout, form and density to those proposed for Henlle Hall.</p> <p>On the face of it, it is difficult to square a proposed development of this kind with the assertion in the Applicants' Heritage Statement (para.8.12) that '...The proposed development will not lead to any change in the current significance or setting of any of these assets...' [i.e. Henlle Hall, the Stables, or Henlle Hall Park].</p> <p>This is because the Heritage Statement, prepared for the Applicants by Kembertons (Planning Consultants) far from being an objective assessment of the significance of Henlle Hall Park and of the likely impact of the proposals on that significance, as it is required to be, goes to considerable lengths to present Henlle Hall Park in particular as a remnant landscape, so changed from its original layout, function and form as to be unrecognisable as an historic park.</p> <p>For example, it describes Henlle Park as having '...passed into agricultural use in the early-20th century before becoming a golf course at the beginning of the 21st [century]', reiterating the language used in the previous application for this site (20/02058/EIA).</p> <p>To reiterate our own comments at that time, this is entirely incorrect. Historic map and aerial photography records indicate that surviving areas of Henlle Park are largely unaltered today from their appearance at the end of the 19th century, as attested to also by the many photographs of it on the Henlle Park Golf Club website and by statements in Dr. Paul Stamper's report on the park, as recorded on the Shropshire HER, as well as by statements within the Applicants' Heritage Statement (e.g. at paragraph 9, p.5).</p> <p>It is also directly contradicted in the large number of objection statements</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>(80% of all respondents) made by local residents, who comment specifically on the 'beautiful parkland...even now with the golf course', or the 'wonderful ancient parkland...diverse wildlife and trees that are 100s of years old'.</p> <p>One (Mr Roger Pollitt) specifically contradicts, from his own experience and knowledge of the park, '...The argument that the landscape has been totally remodelled with extensive earthwork so it no longer represents the original landscape and so has no historic context..' which, he says, '...is completely unfounded, there has been very little alteration, the rolling landscape is essentially as it was originally laid out, the photos of excavation are very selective and in no way indicate wholesale remodelling, indeed one photo appears to be clearing of ground for the club house'.</p> <p>Figure 2: Existing and proposed layouts of the park at Henlle Hall, taken from the Applicants' submitted plans, which show the extent and concentration of the proposed 'Lodges' development. This clearly will have a direct and negative impact upon the fabric and the significance of the Henlle Hall Park, as well as on the Setting and significance of those areas of the park not directly impacted by it. It is also inconceivable that it will have no effect at all upon the Setting or the significance either of the nearby Grade II Listed Henlle Hall &/or of its adjacent Stables.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement similarly repeats the earlier assertion that Henlle Hall and its Stables, both of which are Listed Buildings, will be unaffected by the proposals because '...these have been separated from the area in which the application site is situated in terms of function, character, appearance and setting for many years....the important relationship between the Hall and the Park has been severed, such that neither is now visible from the other and they have no functional relationship...' (para.10). This is reiterated at para.8.11 where it is stated that '...The proposed development will not affect the relationship between them...'.</p> <p>As outlined above, the Heritage Statement itself describes the process of design and layout of the park in tandem with that of the Hall, thus establishing the park as the principal element of its Setting. This physical and design relationship remains, even though the park is now in a different ownership to the Hall. Given this incorrect assumption, it is unsurprising that the Heritage Statement finds that there will be 'no harm' caused to that Setting or to the significance of Henlle Hall by the proposed development.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>In our view, both the form and extent of the proposed developments will harm the Setting and the significance of Henlle Hall itself and of its Stables, and that while the degree of harm to these Listed buildings will be less than substantial, it will be significant. We also disagree with the Applicant's statement that, as the proposed lodges are 'temporary structures...', it would in due course be possible simply '...to restore the site to its current condition'. (para.8.8).</p> <p>Third, the Heritage Statement similarly finds that the Impact of the proposed development on the Significance of Henlle Hall Park itself will be only Minor (p.55), with no impact at all on its Setting.</p> <p>This is the inevitable consequence of treating the park as though it no longer functionally exists and thus has little or no significance to which harm may be caused. It is also in direct conflict with para.11 of the Heritage Statement which states that '...the nature and appearance of that area of the golf course in which the application site is located will, of course change as a result of the proposed development...'. It is our view that the proposed development will cause physical harm directly to those parkland areas within the proposed development zone and that the degree of harm will be substantial, as indicated above in Figure 2, as this part of the park will be totally lost and its significance destroyed.</p> <p>The proposed development will also cause harm to the significance of those areas of the historic park which will not be directly affected by the proposals, through loss of a major part of its Setting.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is our view that the scale of the proposed development is wholly inappropriate and will cause unacceptable harm both to the fabric of the historic Henlle park itself, to the Setting and the significance of the Park to the Setting and the significance of the Grade II Listed Henlle Hall and the adjacent Stables.</p> <p>We therefore strongly object to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Christopher Gallagher for Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust & The Gardens Trust</p>
Oakes Park	South Yorkshire	E21/0441	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing extension, erection of a single-storey front/side extension and internal alterations	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.07.2021 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 – Oakes Park, Registered at Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a

				Oakes Park Lodge, School Lane, Norton, Sheffield, S8 8BL DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>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>Oakes Park was established in the C17 by John Morewood. The site was sold to his brother-in-law Henry Gill in 1681 who built a house in the Park. Before the end of the century, through subsequent marriages, the site came into the ownership of the Bagshaw family who remained in residence until the 1980s. During the C18 and C19 the Park was much embellished. The Lodge (which is the subject of this application) and its associated gateway were built in the early C19. However, by the late C20 the Park and many of its buildings were unoccupied and in very poor repair. The Lodge, screen walls and gateway are Listed Grade II.</p> <p>Set in the north-west boundary wall, the gatehouse and its gates are essentially designed to be seen upon arrival from outside the Park with the more functional parts of the Lodge set behind, out of public view. Subsequent poor rear extensions were added/changed in the late C20. By replacing these with more sensitive designs to better construction standards, the Lodge's future is likely to be more secure without jeopardising the public/historic aspects of the building. We note that the only tree work identified would amount to normal tree maintenance irrespective of whether the Lodge is refurbished. We support the application.</p> <p>However, it would be additionally useful if the applicant could identify proposed adjacent external materials and treatments, car parking – ie adjacent external works.</p> <p>And further, we note from the documents submitted, that the applicant also owns the main house and further tracts of the Park – although these are not shown (blue lines) on the location plan. If the applicant also owns the adjacent gates, then can refurbishment work to same be incorporated into the project?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Walsall Arboretum RECONSULTATION	Staffordsh ire	E20/1617	II	PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILED PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL COTTAGES AT NO.	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you so much for the amended documentation. Further to our original response of 22nd February 2021, we have no further comments to make, except to perhaps reiterate our suggestion that the school might consider approaching the Arboretum to plant a strategically placed</p>

				55 AND 56 LICHFIELD STREET (INCORPORATED INTO D1 USE) TO FACILITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TEACHING ACCOMMODATION BLOCK AND THE INTERNAL REMODEL OF NO 57 LICHFIELD STREET (FODEN HOUSE) AS WELL AS ASSOCIATED SITE AND LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS. QUEEN MARYS HIGH SCHOOL, UPPER FORSTER STREET, WALSALL, WS4 2AE. EDUCATION	replacement tree to take over once the existing lime (?) reaches the end of its life? This would have the benefit of partially disguising the façade of the new building whilst being far enough away not to block light from the classrooms. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E21/0572	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement Fascia's x 2 and replacement Awning x 2 Trentham Garden Centre Stone Road Tittensor MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2021 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 Staffordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation, and in itself, harm to the Grade II* registered park and garden at Trentham will be slight as the building faces into the shopping centre car park and not the core historic landscape. We also appreciate that the area is open to diners until 2200 all year round so some degree of lighting is justified, but in our opinion the combination of soffit lighting and internally illuminated signage is over the top for this location. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Ashtead Park	Surrey	E21/0712	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Vehicle crossover to access land to the rear of the property. Arlington, Rookery Hill, Ashtead, Surrey, KT21 1EG ACCESS/GATES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2021 The following Comments are submitted on behalf of the Surrey Gardens Trust a member of the Gardens Trust which is the statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens. The site of the proposed works is partly within and partly adjoining the Register area of Ashtead Park, located at its western extremity with an extensive woodland setting. The submitted Heritage Statement addresses the relevant issues in a proportionate manner. This part of the Register site seems from the 19th and 20th century

					<p>Ordnance Survey maps to have been lightly wooded and marks the western boundary of the extensive historic estate. It presents a lengthy wooded frontage to the main Epsom Road. The curtilage of Arlington is unusual in extending from Rookery Hill to the Epsom Road., and the wooded area has already been opened up for incidental residential uses. The proposed access from Epsom Road will further extend this open break and separate the woodland to the southwest from the main block fronting the road to the northeast. Given the history and character of this part of the Register site this would be regrettable but less than substantial harm to the significance of Ashted Park. If the new access were to be acceptable on other grounds then the visual impact should be mediated with new planting especially behind the visibility splays and along the remainder of the Epsom Road curtilage boundary.</p> <p>Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E21/0524	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for change of use from agricultural land to an equestrian menage. Garden House, The Avenue, Wynyard EQUESTRIAN</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Wynyard Park, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and note no Heritage Statement is included, assessing the impact on the Registered Park and Garden, nor could we find any details of the proposed fencing, other than the description in on the Planning Application Form. This merely states 'Timber log retaining wall (to one side only)', with no details of proposed height design etc.</p> <p>Whilst the construction of a menage might appear to be a relatively minor change within the RPG we have become increasingly concerned by the accumulative impact of the many small changes and developments in this area of Wynyard Park.</p> <p>We therefore wish to lodge a holding objection until the above details are forthcoming.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>

Bilton Grange	Warwicks hire	E21/0578	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of 2no. dwelling and site access</p> <p>48, RUGBY ROAD, DUNCHURCH, RUGBY, CV22 6PW</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and whilst we do not think the proposals will have a large impact on the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Bilton, we were surprised that the applicant had not included either a Heritage Statement or a Heritage Impact assessment and there is no mention of the RPG within the Design and Access statement. The large windows could cause light emittance which may be a cause for concern. We also cannot find any details of the treatment of the boundary with the RPG and we would prefer to see a native hedgerow or estate fencing rather than more urban style wooden fencing panels.</p> <p>We would be grateful if your officers could please bear our comments in mind when deciding this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Harewood House RECONSULTATION	West Yorkshire	E21/0370	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use to enable the additional use as a wedding venue, along with the existing consent for mixed food and drink, educational use</p> <p>The Hovells Weardley Lane Harewood Estate</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-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>In our letter of 18th June 2021, we wrote of our concerns about the car parking provision for this additional use of The Hovels as a wedding venue. Thank you for the additional sketch drawing showing an overspill car parking area for 47 vehicles in the adjacent field. Apart from the notation, 'The area shaded green has a plastic grid over the grass to enable the field to be used as a car park' and squiggly lines round the perimeter, there is no other detail. Presumably the plastic grid is simply going to be laid to</p>

					<p>delineate the parking spaces in the field; there will not be any signage, and the access to the parking spaces from the stoned access will be over the grass?</p> <p>We note the comments from the Highways Team dated 14th July 2021. 'Temporary guides or signs can be installed to direct potential users to the car. Additionally, temporary planting or other form of decoration could be added to soften the impact.'</p> <p>Whilst we understand the need for an overspill car park for the additional use, we are concerned about an additional array of vehicles in what we understand is currently an open field and the impact that it will inevitably have on the area.</p> <p>When we were consulted on the work to Thehovels in 2018, we understood that the field was to be planted up for the Harewood Food and Drink project and include trees. However, we have recently been consulted on Harewood PA2 Feasibility Study Draft Report which at the section for Grassland Fields/Areas at 11.45 Notes that there are five groups of grazed grassland fields that include Thehovels (four Rural Land Registry (RLR) parcels. We are therefore unsure as to the future of this part of the Registered Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>We are also currently being consulted by the Forestry Commission regarding felling and thinning of trees on the Harewood Estate. It seems that of all the trees in the boundary plantation to the north and west of Thehovels: alongside the Otley Road and Weardley Lane to the junction with High Lodge. (Forestry Commission Compartment 2a) may be due to be felled. The trees along the Otley Road are poplars and currently provide screening of Thehovels from the public road as do the trees along Weardley Lane. If they are felled it will be many years before the replanting will provide screening. Perhaps this should be clarified with the applicant and the Forestry Commission.</p> <p>In addition, the Leeds Country Way enters the park through Lofthouse gates and follows the 18th Century route through the park to New Bridge at which point it rises up and follows the wooded ridge above Carr Park through Stub House Plantation. The latter part of the route gives sweeping views down across the Wharfe Valley and is very popular and always busy. So, will the public regularly see a large area of cars?</p> <p>We underline that the Registered Historic Park and Garden at Harewood House is Grade I and strategies need to be in place to ensure that it is not</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>harmed.</p> <p>As we are unsure about the future of the land surrounding Thehovels, we are unable to advise on mitigating the impact of the overspill car park particularly as the boundary plantation may be due to be felled and replanted. We think that it may be better to just leave the cars exposed, then the landscape will not be affected during the majority of the time when there are no weddings or large functions. We do not know how frequently events at Thehovels will require the extra car parking. However, we recommend that the land does not get rutted and damaged by over-use and that the overspill car parking in the field does not become a permanent feature. The land should be returned to field conditions should the use of Thehovels change.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Utle Cemetery	West Yorkshire	E21/0603	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reserved matters application requesting consideration of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for residential development of 5no dwellings (pursuant to outline approval 17/04999/OUT)</p> <p>Former Mortuary Skipton Road Keighley West Yorkshire</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – Utle Cemetery, HE ref 1404586, registered Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Utle Cemetery was opened in 1857, having been constructed under the aegis of the Burial Board. The designer of the cemetery is unknown. Its listing notes its enjoyment of the landscape setting of the site on its north facing slope over-looking the Aire valley. The cemetery has been provided with a substantial number of specimen trees through which meandering walks (now largely car drives) wend their circuitous loops. A substantial proportion of the original trees survive providing impressive settings for many of the elaborate memorials.</p> <p>We comment as follows:</p> <p>The application site is out-with but adjacent to the western boundary of the listed cemetery. The site plans show two blocks of three dwellings (note the application description states 5 no. dwellings but it is evident that there are six dwellings on the site plan). We have not seen a Design and Access Statement or a Heritage Statement amongst the submitted documents and these would have been very helpful, giving an assessment</p>

					<p>of the potential impact on the significance and setting of the cemetery and its heritage assets. We note that the location of the proposed dwellings within their site has been revised since the Outline Approval such that the dwellings are now proposed to be located some 6m or 7m further away from the Cemetery wall – to the benefit of the registered cemetery.</p> <p>The application notes that the western boundary wall of the Cemetery is to “remain as exists”. However, we note that the swept curve of the new site access would appear to require local reconstruction of the junction of the western wall with the Skipton Road wall. Any such reconstruction should be carried out in matching materials and to a matching walling style/technique as existing. We note that the developer will have a duty under The Party Wall etc Act to ensure that the wall in question does not suffer damage due to his works.</p> <p>We note that the applicant proposes to retain and refurbish the existing pedestrian route from Skipton Road into the south west corner of the Cemetery. It is important that this access route is left with a workable interface with the new site considering such issues as levels and gradients. This cemetery provides last resting places for many of Keighley’s great and good including the Butterfields of Cliffe Castle. As a gesture of respect to this important site and to Keighley’s illustrious history we request that the proposed new dwellings might be provided with a little more architectural embellishment – beyond the minimal functionality shown on the current submission. Could the window and door openings be given ashlar surrounds, and perhaps ashlar string coursing might divide the floors?</p> <p>Without an assessment of the proposal on the significance and setting of the nearby heritage assets we find it difficult to fully assess the application, but note the location of a tree at the north east, north west and south west corners of the site and request that these are safeguarded during the proposed development and subsequently. We suggest that tree planting and landscaping around the periphery of the site would help mitigate the visual impact and advise that there should be a more detailed landscape plan with additional tree planting.</p> <p>Without a heritage assessment we consider that this application does not fully comply with NPPF paragraph 194.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E21/0604	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey side extension incorporating dormers to front and rear to create habitable room 1 Wharfedale Fold Menston Ilkley</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469. 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>High Royds Hospital was built as a mental hospital by West Riding County Council, and it was opened in 1888. It had been designed by the County Surveyor, Vickers Edwards. Edwards adopted an “echelon” layout for the facilities – only the second such building in England. Constructed around the centre of its 100ha site the Hospital enjoyed a generous boundary of fields and trees.</p> <p>This application relates to a relatively new dwelling, built as part of a small, tightly clustered group in the “rural” boundary to the south-west of the Hospital buildings. This group is closely sheltered by High Royds Wood which sits on higher ground protecting the Hospital from prevailing SW winds.</p> <p>The proposed extension might be seen to spoil the beneficial grouping and inter-dwelling views amongst its neighbours, but the application drawings show that due to local ground contours the extension is substantially tucked down into the ground, whilst nearby boundary walls and garden shrubbery sit atop the rising ground – largely hiding the visual interruption otherwise caused. However, it is our view that the use of dormer windows rather than traditional rooflights will reverse some of the benefits due to local ground contours otherwise gained by the “dropped” floor level and we object to their inclusion.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E21/0607	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building application to carryout alterations involving conversion of basement to habitable accommodation, existing window opening to be reinstated and light well to front</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469. 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</p>

				<p>3 Bewerley Mews Melbeck Close Menston BUILDING ALTERATIONS</p>	<p>to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The former mental hospital, High Royds, (listed grade II), is a nationally important example of a Victorian asylum designed in 1884. It was deliberately placed in a rural setting with the grounds laid out in the style of a modified traditional country house estate. High Royds was closed in the early 2000's and converted to residential properties with a significant proportion of the original historic designed landscape remaining. The site of this planning application is one of the original asylum buildings. 3 Bewerley Mews is a mid-terrace dwelling, part of an historic property located towards the north of the registered site, and is considered to be listed at grade II along with the hospital buildings. It has a basement similar to other properties at High Royds, and the proposed external light well and metal railing should not affect the registered park and garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--