



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES AUGUST 2021

The GT conservation team received 216 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, 106 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Leigh Court	Avon	E21/0358	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 15no. homes for affordable rent and associated works to form access and landscape. Land Adjacent To Chapel Pill Lane Pill	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development site at Chapel Pill Lane, which lies within the Ham Green Unregistered Historic Park and Garden. The site is in the heart of the North Somerset Green Belt, and is immediately within the vicinity of three listed buildings that contribute to the history of this area. The site faces two registered parks and gardens; Leigh Court, Grade II, and to the north, Kings Weston, Grade II. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated and undesignated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust have studied the additional information regarding, in particular, the response from Metro West and of the Landscape Officer. We have also studied the Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2026 for the area of Abbots Leigh, Ham Green, Pill and Easton-in-Gordano. "As part of the MetroWest Phase 1 works, a new maintenance access road for the track and tunnel is required. The access road must be built to appropriate standards, including width, wearing course and substructure

					<p>for emergency and maintenance vehicles”.</p> <p>“An existing easement to Ham Green Lake is to be moved temporarily for construction and regranted permanently following completion of the MetroWest works and this will require land that the applicant has selected for development”.</p> <p>Further relevant quotes from the MetroWest Phase 1 contd.</p> <p>“Part of the site falls within land required by the scheme to provide a means of access from Chapel Pill Lane to a permanent compound adjacent to the proposed railway line included within the order limits of the scheme”.</p> <p>“The proposed pumping station pipe and pedestrian path seem to go down the adjacent lane, cutting through vegetation twice and possibly more in trenching down the lane, potentially opening up views from Harts Close, of the compound”.</p> <p>There is a restrictive covenant related to the Hays Mays Lane.</p> <p>“A low loader will require a reversing manoeuvre from Chapel Pill Lane which will temporarily block the entrance and exit to the proposed housing development”.</p> <p>“Mitigations are required to stop vehicles parking on the access road from Chapel Pill Lane in the event of emergency vehicles needing to access the tunnel portal”.</p> <p>“A right for the Council, Network Rail and their successors to pass and repass over the access road in perpetuity will be needed”.</p> <p>“Construction programming to ensure Metro West Phase 1 is not delayed by the proposed development. Plots 12 – 15 cannot be built until the Scheme’s permanent access to Ham Green Lake has been provided”.</p> <p>“Consent for the Planning application should not be granted unless and until the MetroWest Scheme is fully protected. A section 106 agreement should be used to control the development so as to not impinge on the MetroWest scheme”.</p> <p>The outcome of the above rectifications results in an unacceptably large area of the proposed building site being of a hardstanding surface. All of the reflective, monochrome, uniform colour and hard edging is likely to result in a ‘block of a site’ to be read as such from the surrounding countryside. Not least of all Leigh Court in the far distance, to the east. This will cause more than moderate damage to the unregistered P&G during the construction phase and beyond, with loss of hedges and mature trees.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The responses to the Landscape Officer’s questions concerning the planting of trees to possibly negate the effect of all of the hard surfaces within the development site, are alarming.</p> <p>Quote: “Additional tree planting in gardens: The applicants do not wish to plant trees in individual [back] gardens as they have had problems in the past on similar developments where trees are damaged or removed by tenants making management onerous. The application already includes extensive tree planting in public areas and off site to provide good habitat and visual mitigation.”</p> <p>Quote: “A detailed arboricultural survey was included in the application – please let me know if you are unable to find this or if specific additional information is needed. A knee rail protection of the RPA for the veteran oak is inappropriate as the field is not public open space”.</p> <p>The number of mature trees on this site are shown on the revised ‘hardstanding’ plan; Seven mature, seven young trees to obscure the pumping station at the front of the site and approximately five new trees and hedging to hide the car parking areas.</p> <p>Proposed Residential Development Chapel Pill Lane.</p> <p>Hard standing area marked in blue = 2430 sq.m.</p> <p>All things considered, major changes have been made to the original application in terms of landscape and protecting designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Policy DM5: Historic Parks and Gardens [both registered and unregistered] are an important part of North Somerset’s heritage. Historic Parks and Gardens are often under threat of unsympathetic development. The council will resist proposals that would harm the character or appearance of these sites, including their setting.</p> <p>Policy DM7: When considering proposals involving non designated heritage assets, the council will take into account their local significance and protect from inappropriate change, including harm to their setting. Ham Green – landscape that is bordered by two registered parks and gardens, makes a valuable contribution to the area’s historic and architectural development, especially social and communal value, sense of place and local distinctiveness.</p> <p>Position of the TPO’d veteran oak tree is shown in bright green. The roots of the tree spread under the back gardens of plots 10, 11, and 12.</p> <p>The roots also pass through the soil where a gradient abutment is planned to be formed. Without the development the tree has an estimated life</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>span of 20 – 40 years. It’s current presence dominates this corner of the unregistered park and garden. It is more than 16 metres high. [arboriculturalist’s report: 2018.</p> <p>Policy DM12: Development within the green belt. The effect of light pollution at night on the Chapel Pill Lane site will have a spoiling effect when viewing across the valley from the north, Kings Weston and from Leigh Court to the east.</p> <p>Policy DM3: Although the site is not in a conservation area, Leaving the land adjacent to Chapel Pill Lane un-built on will secure an essential part of North Somerset’s cultural and local landscape distinctiveness achieved through a legacy of identity with its history and landowners.</p> <p>The fact that the MetroWest development has been ‘overlooked’ by the applicants to build on this site is perhaps the timely moment to refer to the Neighbourhood plan 2020-2026, Abbots Leigh, Ham Green, Pill and Easton-in-Gordano. Pages 18 and 19.</p> <p>Summary: So as to comply with Policy DM5 [Historic Parks and Gardens] of the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan, the Avon Gardens Trust objects to this application because of the potential harmful impact on the unregistered park and garden of the former Ham Green Hospital, now the Penny Brohn Centre, which would result in more than moderate harm to its significance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Hamstead Marshall Park	Berkshire	E21/0721	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION First floor extension and alterations to the existing dwelling. North Lodge, Road Known As Park Lane, Hamstead Marshall, Newbury BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.08.2021</p> <p>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 North Lodge is within the envelope of Hamstead Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>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.</p>

					<p>It is disappointing that the Design and Access Statement makes no mention that North Lodge is within Hamstead Park, and does not consider the views from the park. Notwithstanding this, the proposal is a modest first-floor extension that does not increase the footprint of the house. It has been designed so there is no increase in the elevations from either the north or south, which is the key view from the Park. The elevation profile from the west and east is only slightly increased. On this basis, the Berkshire Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Conclusion The Berkshire Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Janet Fuller, MSc BGT Vice Chair.</p>
Inglewood Hall	Berkshire	E21/0904	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of land within the existing walled garden to provide 22 additional units of C2 accommodation and a new pavilion with associated landscaping, infrastructure and parking. Inglewood House, Templeton Road, Kintbury, Hungerford PARKING, MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT). The Berkshire Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the BGT is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on this planning application. The park and gardens at Inglewood Park (within Audley's site ownership boundary) are not on the Register of Parks and Gardens, and the kitchen garden is not a listed building, but it is evident that these are of local historic interest and form the wider setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>1 The Gardens Trust, a national body recently published a guidance leaflet to explain the place of historic designed landscapes in the planning system, the importance of assessing significance, the statutory consultation obligations, and the role of County Gardens Trusts, in raising awareness of historic designed landscapes as heritage assets. 'The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens' can be downloaded at www.thegardenstrust.org. BGT's own website: www.berkshiregardenstrust.org</p> <p>We are therefore very pleased that West Berkshire consider Inglewood Park as 'a non-designated heritage asset'. We believe it is important that the Park and its listed and non-listed historic assets should be treated as a whole and protected as a local historic asset.</p>

					<p>For the avoidance of doubt, BGT have had no discussions or involvement with Audley Inglewood on this application and our comments are based on the latest amended documents submitted in June 2021.</p> <p>The proposed development should be considered in the light of NPPF's guidance on enabling development, which may be appropriate in this case, in that such development should be considered in respect of securing the future conservation of the heritage assets: in particular the kitchen garden itself and the park as a whole.</p> <p>Weight should be given to conserving and enhancing this non-designated heritage asset in the North Wessex Downs AONB.</p> <p>We agree that the setting of the listed buildings will not be affected by the development. We note that the kitchen garden development area for this application is in the western part of the Park and includes just the kitchen garden and the area to the north for parking. The evidence from the applicant shows that the kitchen garden was historically an essential part of the Park and is today part of the modern extent of Audley Inglewood. We also agree with the Council's officers that the kitchen garden is of more than 'low significance'. The Heritage Report suggests that a low significance is largely due to erosion of the character due its poor condition and redundant nature. However, NPPF 191 says that Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. The kitchen garden walls are intact and capable of restoration as part of this project and its role as part of the new community in Inglewood Park will be reinstated. On this basis the significance of the kitchen garden should be regarded as higher than low. The pavilion is set to the north east next to the open space and contained by mature and dense tree cover. This area also clearly part of the historic Park. Therefore both aspects of this proposal need careful consideration. We very much welcome the revised proposals to contain the residential development within the walls of the kitchen garden and that the design of the units shows the development both physically and visually within the kitchen garden walls. It is essential that the roofline of the new dwellings and any other structures do not project above the top of the walls. The formal layout, with a central garden, seems to work well and would not harm the significance of the kitchen garden. The location of the parking takes advantage of existing hard surfacing and bunding, has a landscaped approach and broken up by beech hedging. Subject to the restoration</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>of the kitchen garden and the avoidance of any exterior structures that would detract from its setting, we have no objection to this aspect of the application. We have no objections to the pavilion subject to the conservation and enhancement of the mature trees cover and open space as part of the Parkland.</p> <p>However, the proposals lack a more holistic approach to the whole Park and the site has a history of piecemeal development with a lack of an overarching conservation management plan for the whole Park to support the planning application and ensure that the historic assets of the Park, and its significance, as a whole is conserved and enhanced. We recommend that as part of the need to conserve and enhance the kitchen garden and open space and tree cover at the pavilion through the proposals, a Conservation Management Plan is submitted for the whole Park to support the developments and provide a context for any further changes, detailed submissions or enhancement of the Park.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion we have no objection to either the 22 units in the kitchen garden and accompanying the parking proposals or the new pavilion, on the proviso that these developments lead to the conservation and enhancement of the relevant parkland assets (the kitchen garden and its setting and northern part of the park) and the park as a whole. The proposals should be set in context through a Conservation Management Plan for the whole Park and we would like to see that as the basis of the approval of detailed matters.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham BGT Chair On behalf of the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/0648	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed single storey side extension and enlarging an existing window opening to form a doorway Lodge Farm Wotton Underwood Buckinghamshire HP18 0SB BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.08.2021</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 are grateful to have been given a short extension to respond in order that our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust could have a site visit to enable them to gain a better understanding of the development area. We appreciated being allowed access to the site. This proposal relates to the historically small lodge which is to be further extended to enlarge a 2002 structure which is out of scale with the original</p>

					<p>lodge building and which obtrudes into the former kitchen garden of the Grade I RPG. The site of the proposed building is largely screened from the main approach to the mansion. The walled garden and its associated historic structures and character have already been subject to the cumulative construction of the glass sports pavilion, the tennis court, the extensions to Lodge Farm and the children's play area. Beyond this are other alterations to the RPG within the same ownership. With this additional development, the effect, cumulatively, will be to harm further the heritage assets at the site and their settings.</p> <p>We object to this proposal for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building and associated works harm the character and fabric of the RPG, the setting of the adjacent historic garden wall, the Grade II estate gateway, as well as the setting of the listed garden wall further to the north and the Grade I historic buildings beyond this. 2. The building would damage the setting of the lodge, a building intended to be seen in isolation, and would be out of scale with the historic building, even in its altered form. 3. The roof structure has an alien appearance. It is possible that the south gable would be visible over the garden gate. The roofing materials and roof form with a pitch and overhanging eaves, but without a ridge, is not appropriate to the historic character of this property or of kitchen gardens of this period. 4. The path and the seating area introduces a formality and style which are inappropriate to the historic character of the walled garden. <p>Notwithstanding our objection, if the planning authority is minded to grant permission then we ask for the following amendments to the scheme to mitigate the effects to some degree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Roof with a monopitch in slate to evoke a potting shed roof or similar working kitchen garden structure. b) Reduce the footprint and amend it to align the new building line behind the existing building line in the walled garden so that the footprint is longer and narrower following line of historic wall (but not against it), to evoke a kitchen garden structure in form. c) Avoid a formal landscaped area around the structure, use instead a simple lawned setting. d) Any proposals to be accompanied by a rigorous Historic Impact Assessment. e) Because of the history of piecemeal proposals for this property, and
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>their effect on the historic character and fabric of the RPG, require this application to form part of an agreed masterplan for the future development of the property within this ownership which affects the RPG. This would help to minimise further potential damage to the historic character and fabric by providing a justified long-term approach which is guided by an appropriate and proportionate strategy.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Latimer Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/0668	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to one garage bay to allow for a garden room Cavendish Cottage, 41 The Village, Latimer, Buckinghamshire, HP5 1TY, BUILDING ALTERATIONS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.08.2021</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>Planning permission was granted in 2016 for a double garage on the rear garden which abuts Grade II registered Latimer Park (RPG). The Gardens Trust was unfortunately not consulted about this planning application and no mention is made in either the application, its Design and Access Statement (D&A) or surprisingly in the Case Officer's report, that Latimer Park directly abuts this property. In fact, the Case Officer concluded that LBC was also not required because the garden is long and the proposed application site was at some distance from any of the listed buildings. This application seeks to alter the 2016 approved plans for a double garage to convert one side to a garden room so that the owner can enjoy the views across the adjacent countryside - as the architect states in point 1.01 of the D&A the proposed garden room/home office "takes in the surrounding views of the fields and lakes to the south of the site" ie. Latimer Park. Again, there is no reference to the RPG but a lot of reference to listed buildings, the conservation area, green belt etc.</p> <p>It would appear that the garage was originally approved on the grounds that it was small, subordinate in scale and would not be visually prominent or visually obtrusive. In our opinion, the proposed alterations to the approved plans, which add a large glazed corner to the proposed structure to allow for views in to the RPG, fundamentally changes this. Should these amendments be permitted, the structure would no longer be a simple timber framed building which blends into the landscape, but a structure</p>

					<p>that has the potential to be visually prominent and obtrusive with the added potential for both light emittance and reflection which will be detrimental to Latimer Park RPG.</p> <p>Given that the architect refers to the views of fields and lakes suggests that the proposed structure is not hidden behind a tree line or a hedge but will be very much on view. There is no Heritage Impact Assessment accompanying the amendments so we are unable to ascertain what impact the proposals may have. We would urge your officers to either request such a statement or else satisfy themselves that the issues we raise are not a problem. We therefore would like to submit a holding objection to the amendments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Formal Gardens at Stockgrove House	Buckinghamshire	E21/0758	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of barn Land At Stockgrove Park Soulbury Buckinghamshire LU7 0BB MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.08.2021</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 formal gardens at Stockgrove Park are grade II listed (RPG) and were laid out between 1929 and 1938 by William Curtis Green (who also designed the Grade II listed country house) for the Danish philanthropist and entrepreneur, Ferdinand Kroyer-Kielberg. The formal gardens are listed as they both complement and provide the setting for the house, the degree of survival of the principal components, and for their group value.</p> <p>Unfortunately, as with so many planning applications close to registered parks and gardens, it is difficult to assess the impact of the proposed works as the applicant has failed to provide an Historic Impact Assessment (HAI). There is very little reference to the RPG status of the site and more concentration on the listed structures. This is surprising given that the Design and Access Statement (D&A) (2.1) mentions a specific response from Buckinghamshire Council dated: 7th June 2021 which states: ‘... concerns have been raised by the Council's Heritage Officer, in relation to the potential impact upon several Grade II listed buildings and a Grade II listed park and garden’ (our emphasis). You would therefore have</p>

					<p>expected the applicant to subsequently refer to any effects upon the RPG instead of just dealing with 'Landscaping and Effects on TPO' (D&A 2.4). There is no mention of the landscaping and it only deals with the impact on the trees. We would therefore strongly encourage the planning authority to require an HIA in order that they and the Gardens Trust can properly consider the impact of these proposals.</p> <p>The proposal is for the erection of a new steel framed barn clad in natural timber for the purposes of storage of maintenance equipment. The application site is currently an area of parkland very close to the north-eastern edge of the RPG, albeit not within the RPG, and whilst the listing notes that there are no "significant elements of formal or informal design" in this area, it continues to provide a very undeveloped and verdant setting for the house, one of the main reasons for the listing of the RPG. Whilst research is not yet complete, Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust is currently working on a dossier to enable a greater understanding of the whole site. We strongly suggest that your officers treat the development area within the Site Block red line plan (Dwg No 21010-SLP002) as not just the essential setting for the RPG but as a significant element of the designed landscape. The attached 1898 OS map shows extremely clearly that Stockgrove had an extensive park of which this was part, and which survives largely intact today. In our opinion, any development in this crucial setting, affecting the formal gardens will be detrimental to their setting and the significance of the RPG and should be strongly resisted.</p> <p>We note that the application states that the existing trees would provide screening to mitigate the impact of the proposed barn. However, we support the comments from the Principal Heritage Specialist, Laura Levitt, who expresses strong concerns as to the seasonal changes and possible condition of these trees which simply may not mitigate the impact. Furthermore, the inclusion of polycarbonate rooflights in the structure may result in light emittance which would be detrimental to the RPG in this undeveloped area of the parkland.</p> <p>Ultimately the Gardens Trust feel strongly that this is a totally inappropriate site for the introduction of a new structure and that other sites should be considered. We note that the D&A identifies other existing structures which have the potential to be refurbished or replaced to provide the required storage space. Therefore, the Gardens Trust objects to the current proposals and recommends that the applicant seeks an alternative site for their proposed barn.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/0786	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of three barns and erection of commercial building with ancillary offices and visitor areas. Creation of parking and associated works Barns 2 3 & 4 The Bail Silk Street Waddesdon Buckinghamshire HP18 0JY DEMOLITION, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation and are surprised that for a site of such heritage sensitivity there is no Heritage Impact Statement (HIA) to inform our decision making. The car park (which we were not consulted about) has already compromised the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG). Any further development needs to balance the heritage damage against public benefits. The existing barns are separated from the visitor car park by a hedge. The barns are modern agricultural barns so are appropriate for their use and setting, and whilst not of particular historic merit in themselves we understand that this proposal is to demolish three of the barns and construct a single building with ancillary offices and a visitor centre for the Real Ale Company. We note that the proposed building covers the footprint of the previous three barns and the roof has a dual pitch therefore reducing its height and therefore impact in the setting. However, across the roof pitches there are a total of 24 roof lights which, we assume, will be needed for the work within the building. We are not au fait with the brewing process but are concerned that so many rooflights seem excessive and may result in unwelcome light emittance and reflection. We note that there are rooflights in the existing structures and so we would ask your officers to satisfy themselves that there will not be increased light emittance and that the proposed rooflights are non-reflective. We are also concerned about the substantial glazed entrance on the south elevation would also query the need for the entrance to be glazed; the same concerns regarding light reflection and emissions apply here also. We understand the need for some signage but query the need for two large signs on the north elevation. Finally we would ask that your officers seek assurance that the proposed</p>

					<p>use will not cause increased traffic, smell, noise and impact upon the RPG. Notwithstanding our comments above, the lack of a thorough HIA means that we are not fully able to appraise the effect these proposals may have on the RPG. We therefore request a rigorous HIA followed by a site visit after the HIA has been submitted. Until we have this information, please treat this as an objection to the scheme.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E21/0847	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning permission 19/00817/AOP (appearance, scale, layout, access and landscaping) to commercial development on land south of the Silverstone Park Innovation Centre (Phase 4) Silverstone Park Silverstone Motor Racing Circuit Silverstone Road Biddlesden Buckinghamshire OFFICE/COMMERCIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We responded to 19/03160/AOP a couple of times and our most recent letter regarding this application is attached. The reserved matters outlined in the above two applications represent a large amount of additional paperwork. We would be grateful if you were able to identify anything specific that has materially altered in the two most current applications, which we should look at in comparison with the 2019 application. If there is nothing specific which you feel we should look at to how the above applications may affect the registered park and garden at Stowe, our position remains the same. However, if you do have any concerns we would be grateful if you could draw our attention to it and we will review the applications again.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E21/0849	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Single storey rear extension Brookend Barn, Dropmore Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NF, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this joint response. This application relates to an 18th century Grade II listed barn which was</p>

					<p>converted in 2001 to residential use. The application site itself is listed but does not fall within the Dropmore registered park and garden (RPG) although the RPG wraps around the application site to the north.</p> <p>We are grateful for the Design and Access Statement, albeit that it makes little mention of the RPG, but it does provide helpful detail as to the existing and the proposed works.</p> <p>We note that the proposed extension is to the west elevation which abuts the RPG. We have some concern about the increase in the amount of fenestration, particularly the glazed gable north end, which has the potential to result in increased reflection and light emittance although we can see that there is already extensive glazing in this elevation.</p> <p>If your officers are persuaded that this increase in glazing will not be detrimental to the setting of the RPG, the Gardens Trust has no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E21/0852	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Detached outbuilding Brookend Barn, Dropmore Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NF, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2021</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 note that this application relates to the construction of a home office within the residential garden of an 18th century Grade II listed barn which was converted in 2001 to residential use. The application site itself is listed but does not fall within the Dropmore registered park and garden (RPG) although the RPG wraps around the application site to the west and the north of the application site.</p> <p>The proposed outbuilding is to be positioned very close to the western boundary with the RPG. We note that there is substantial residential garden space closer to the main building and, whilst we appreciate that the planning authority will seek to protect the listed building itself, we feel strongly that any buildings and structures should be grouped together. We therefore object to the proposals in the current position.</p> <p>However, we recommend that, if the LPA are minded to approve these proposals, this is on condition that the proposed outbuilding is located</p>

					<p>nearer to the existing built structures and away from the boundary with the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Peterborough Cathedral Precincts	Cambridgeshire	E21/0745	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of Existing Buildings and Erection of 8 Dwellings The Garden House Minster Precincts Peterborough PE1 1XS DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2021</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 Cambridgeshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have read the online information, and whilst of Policy LP47 of the Local Plan (Ref: LP47.1) does allocate the site for residential development, there is a proviso that development should be ‘... delivered in accordance with an agreed development brief that covers, amongst other matters, the height and scale of development and the setting of the cathedral and precincts.’ The proposed buildings are largely taller than the adjacent Grade II* Old Deanery, and certainly not subservient to it as the Garden House currently is, which is a cause for concern.</p> <p>A second factor which we consider has a material bearing on the proposals is the apparent complete removal of trees within the development site. The Design and Access Statement (D&A) states that there is a Tree Survey/Constraints Plan amongst the online documentation, which should give precise details of the condition and placement of all the existing trees, but we have been unable to find it. The D&A states that much of the tree cover is in adjacent areas but we need to satisfy ourselves on this point before we can understand what the impact of complete tree removal will be. At present the available online images show a good amount of tree cover which would open up the site completely if removed. We would appreciate it if we could have a copy of this document. We note that one of the large trees which partially screens the site from the Old Deanery is a mature ash tree. This is of course vulnerable to ash die back disease and may well need felling in the next few years, further opening up the site from within the RPG and immediate curtilage of the Grade II* building. Lastly, for a site of such sensitivity, which lies entirely within the Grade II registered park and garden of Peterborough Cathedral Precinct, and within the immediate vicinity of a scheduled ancient monument and many listed</p>

					<p>buildings (in particular the Grade I Cathedral and the Grade II* Old Deanery), we would have expected to have seen a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). We would urge your officers to ask the applicant to provide a VIA with several photographic viewpoints taken from key sight-lines, combined with additional images containing a superimposed wire frame from each viewpoint, showing how the buildings will appear without tree cover. Without this information it is not possible for us to accurately assess how visible the tall new buildings will be and how they impact upon the setting of the heritage assets around. We suspect that should such a VIA be forthcoming, it will become apparent that the proposed buildings are too tall and intrusive for this sensitive site.</p> <p>Without the documentation mentioned above, it is not possible for your officers or ourselves to accurately assess the impact of the proposals upon the RPG. We therefore would like to submit a holding objection until we are able to fully understand the impacts upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E21/0719	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Building Plot for a single detached 4 bedroom house with Garage The Smithy Mercaston Lane Kedleston Derby Derbyshire DE22 5JL RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.08.2021</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 for this application and were surprised by the inadequacy of the Heritage Statement especially considering that the application site lies approximately 40' from the boundary of the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Kedleston and within the Kedleston Conservation Area.</p> <p>We have read the letter of objection from Kim Miller at the National Trust and fully endorse all her comments and will not repeat them for brevity. The proposals will damage the setting of this Grade I heritage asset and the Gardens Trust strongly object to the application and urges your officers to refuse it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E21/0760	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory</p>

			<p>development of 12 no. new dwellings (Departure from the Local Plan) Land At End Of Poyser Lane Poyser Lane Kirk Langley Ashbourne Derbyshire RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have previously commented on other proposed housing developments in Kirk Langley, notably AVA/2018/0648. Our response to the above application highlights many of the same concerns.</p> <p>We have studied the limited online documentation and were concerned to read in the Design and Access statement (D&A) (2.1.8) 'There are no known historic environment constraints' and (4.1) 'The site is of no significant importance in terms of its heritage or architectural status' even though it also curiously and incorrectly states (2.1.8) that 'The site is within the Historic Park and Garden of Kedleston Hall.' The applicant does however, acknowledge (4.2) 'The Design will be developed to comply with all relevant matters in the context of the Historic Park and Garden setting of Kedleston Hall.' Despite this we believe that AVA/2021/0809 shows a lack understanding of the application site's relationship to the setting of the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG). Kedleston is on a hill and Kirk Langley and the application site lie across the valley on the southern side of the RPG, with clear intervisibility between the Grade I RPG and existing buildings adjacent to the application site. (see attached photos Fig 1 & Fig 2)</p> <p>This application ignores the fact that Kirk Langley parish lies within the Setting of the RPG and provides no assessment of the impact of the proposed development on that Setting.</p> <p>It is accepted that it is a distant view, but this in our opinion only highlights the considerable extent of the visual Setting of the park at Kedleston, as was the intention of its designer, the 1st Lord Scarsdale, in the mid-18th century. The Long Walk at Kedleston was clearly designed to afford views both inwards towards the park and Kedleston House, and outwards to the wider landscape. Specific objects included in these latter views to the south and east of the park include All Saints Church in Derby (later, Derby Cathedral) and the Parish Church at Mackworth. Both of these are still clearly visible in the wider landscape Setting of the park.</p> <p>As the application site is clearly visible from the Kedleston RPG, it should be noted that the ridgeline seen in both Figures 1 & 2, which denotes the limit of the wider landscape as seen from the RPG, corresponds also with the southern boundary at this point of the Setting of Kedleston as previously outlined.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>The Gardens Trust strongly OBJECTS to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sudbury Hall	Derbyshire	E21/0821	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of new gate accesses and parking bollards and resurfacing works Sudbury Hall Main Road Sudbury Derbyshire DE6 5HT ACCESS/GATES, PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2021</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 Derbyshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs our joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and appreciate the need to new gates, access bollards and to provide a surface which is more suitable for disabled visitors or families with prams/pushchairs.</p> <p>We have no comments to make about the gates or bollards and are pleased to note that the existing stone setts will be retained in situ. We do have reservations however, about the choice of resin bound gravel for the external paths elsewhere. In our opinion, resin bound pathways are most suitable where there is very heavy use such as bike lanes and road surfaces, and whilst we appreciate it is a durable, low maintenance surface if well laid, we feel it looks relatively artificial and homogenous and would be inappropriate in this site. Your officers may well already be familiar with Historic England's Easy Access to Historic Landscapes (EAHL) publication which deals with this topic. On page 40 it specifically refers to this : 'Modern resin substitutes, though more costly, can achieve a good non-slip surface while retaining the texture of the original gravel. However, gravels completely bound in resin tend to look too modern and lack character.' This seems especially relevant given the age of the Hall.</p> <p>Our preferred choice in terms of historical authenticity would be Hoggin, which if well maintained provides a more accessible and permeable surface than loose gravel. EAHL also refers to this (p40) : 'Naturally occurring self-binding gravels such as hoggin, Coxwell stone or Breedon gravel are common in historic gardens. When well-maintained they are suitable for all visitors but when worn or badly drained, they present hazards. The key factors are the size and shape of the gravel, the quality of construction and the proportion of loose particles on the surface. Binders can be used to secure gravel on paths.'</p> <p>We feel it is also important to consider the environmental credentials of which ever surface is ultimately chosen. We strongly suggest that the</p>

					<p>chosen surface is permeable. Your officers will need to satisfy themselves in that respect.</p> <p>Resurfacing the existing base is probably preferable to full removal and replacement (although of course this will not be fully permeable) on environmental grounds (unless the Hoggin option is utilised). An alternative to consider, which has been common practice in the Royal Parks, is to use tar spray and chip on existing tarmac which can work well as long as the gravel is topped up. Many public parks projects have used tar and chip and/or bound hoggin, eg Cedec or Coxwell. The National Trust have not explained what other surfaces they may have considered and why they decided on this option.</p> <p>We would also suggest trial samples of surface options.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cadhay	Devon	E16/1666	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel, restoration to agricultural land together with temporary change of use of a residential dwelling to a quarry office/welfare facility at Straitgate Farm, Exeter Road, Ottery St Mary EX11 1LG. MINERAL EXTRACTION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Cadhay, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The designed landscape forms the designed setting of Cadhay House, which is Listed Grade I.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon. We have responded to your previous consultations on this proposed development and have set out clear objections to the proposal on the grounds of its unacceptable impact upon the various nationally designated heritage assets at Cadhay.</p> <p>We have reviewed the supplementary documents accompanying this application, and do not wish to add to our previous response. We therefore maintain our objection to this proposal.</p> <p>On the basis of the supplementary documents now provided, we conclude that, if implemented, the proposed scheme would cause more than substantial harm to the Grade II designed landscape at Cadhay, which forms the designed setting for the Grade I house. This level of harm to two, inter-related, nationally designated heritage assets, clearly conflicts with</p>

					<p>Government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (especially paras 193-195), and with local and County planning policy.</p> <p>In these circumstances we urge your Authority to withhold consent for this highly detrimental proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Teignbridge Local Plan	Devon	E21/0468	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2021</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust is concerned to note that you did not consult either it or The Gardens Trust on the Local Plan Review. We would request that in future all relevant consultations on this document are sent to both organisations as sites included among the proposed housing and employment land allocations affect both nationally designated designed landscapes, or landscapes of regional and local significance which are included on the Devon Gazetteer of Historic Designed Landscapes.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon; in addition, Devon Gardens Trust responds to consultations affecting sites included on the Devon Gazetteer.</p> <p>We have given careful consideration to the proposals and analysis contained in the document Local Plan Review (Part 2) Site Options Consultation, and particularly the detail contained in chapters 4-9 (May 2021).</p> <p>We note that proposed allocations at Forches Cross, Cannon Road, Ilford Park, and Land North of Forches Cross A382 all affect the setting of Stover, an historic designed landscape included on the Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II. We will expect to see detailed assessment of the impact of development at these locations on the nationally designated designed landscape as part of any proposals brought forward as part of the on-going Plan Review.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposed allocations at Mamhead Road, Kenton, South Town, Kenton and East Town, Kenton affect the setting of Powderham Castle, an historic designed landscape which is included on the Register at</p>

				<p>Grade II*. Detailed assessment of the impact of development on the setting of the historic designed landscape will be expected as part of any future proposals for these sites.</p> <p>Several proposed allocations affect designed landscapes which are of regional and local significance and which are included on the Devon Gazetteer: the proposed allocations at Churcombe Bridge Road and Canada Hill in Newton Abbot have potential adversely to impact on the setting of Bradley Manor; and the proposed allocation at Bovey Tracey Golf Centre has the potential to impact adversely on the setting of Parke. These potential impacts need to be evaluated in detail as part of the on-going Plan Review process.</p> <p>We specifically object to five proposed allocations included in the consultation document which affect two historic designed landscapes, Peamore and the former Exe Vale Hospital, which are included on the Devon Gazetteer.</p> <p>Peamore</p> <p>The proposed allocations at Peamore and West Exe Business Park would, if implemented, effectively obliterate the designed parkland setting of Peamore House, an heritage asset which is nationally designated at Grade II. We would advise that in our professional opinion, the Picturesque historic designed landscape at Peamore, with its associations with artists of national repute and significance including Francis Towne (1739/40-1816), John White Abbott (1763-1851) and William Payne (1760-1830), is of national significance and merits inclusion on the Register of Parks and Gardens. The development envisaged, should the allocation in the Plan Review be implemented, would have a significantly adverse impact on the setting of the nationally designated heritage asset (Peamore House) and what is at present the locally designated asset comprising its designed landscape setting. Such an impact would cause actual harm to both heritage assets.</p> <p>· We therefore object to the proposed allocations at Peamore and West Exe Business Park, and advise, for the reasons set out above, that the inclusion of these sites in the Plan Review is inappropriate and unsustainable.</p> <p>Former Exe Vale Hospital</p> <p>The proposed allocations at Milbury Barton, Sannerville Close and Land to SSE of Exminster House would, if implemented, have a seriously adverse impact on the setting of three nationally designated heritage assets: the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Former Exe Vale Hospital (II*), the former Hospital Chapel (II) and the Lodges and gateway (II). Further development within the former Hospital site would have a significantly adverse impact on the designed setting of Fowler's building and would significantly impair the ability of an observer to understand it as a purpose-designed landscape. We advise that the development envisaged by these proposed land allocations would cause actual harm to both the nationally designated heritage assets (former Hospital, Chapel and lodges) and the locally designated designed landscape.</p> <p>· For these reasons we object to the inclusion of the proposed allocations at Milbury Barton, Sannerville Close and Land to SSE of Exminster House in the Plan Review, and advise that these proposed land allocations are inappropriate and unsustainable.</p> <p>We will be pleased to discuss proposed land allocations and the further development of the Local Plan with your Local Plan Review Team.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Lulworth Castle	Dorset	E20/1460	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a 25m Telecommunications Mast together with 4 cabinets, compound fence, 2 transmission dishes and ancillary development. Binford Range, Lulworth Camp, West Lulworth, Wareham, BH20 5QS. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2021</p> <p>Further to our original letter regarding this application (12th January 2021) stating that the heritage landscape had not been satisfactorily assessed, we are glad that the applicant has commissioned a comprehensive Heritage Assessment by Pegasus. We are now happy to accept that there is no impact on the Avenue which runs westwards from the castle, even though the mast is close to it at the west end.</p> <p>We therefore withdraw our previous objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Thorndon Hall	Essex	E20/1578	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Conversion of existing garage to habitable space including new glazed link to front. Two storey extension Alterations and extensions of detached listed building with a two storey</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2021</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 about the above reconsultation and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Orchard House is located on a wall between two conjoined walled gardens</p>

				extension to replace the existing 1968 extension. Orchard Cottage, Thorndon Park, Warley, Brentwood, Essex CM13 3SA. BUILDING ALTERATION	that were built to serve Thorndon Hall, a Palladian mansion designed by James Paine in 1763 for the 9th Lord Petre. The surrounding landscape was improved by Capability Brown, with later work by Richard Woods. The estate is now a country park and a grade II registered landscape. It is reassuring to find that the amended proposals in this application are much more sympathetic to the listed building and the setting of the walled garden, and we are pleased to support them. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E21/0922	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of four semi-detached dwellings on land to the rear of the existing public house utilising existing access off Cambridge Road, reconfiguration of public house car park, with associated hard and soft landscaping Coach And Horses Inn Cambridge Road Newport RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this further response to another application to build housing behind the Coach and Horses. We have objected previously on the grounds of harmful erosion to the wider setting of the registered parkland (RPG), originally laid out by Capability Brown at Shortgrove Hall, which is situated adjacently on the other side of the River Cam. In each application the scale of the housing has been reduced. The current proposal is more subordinate to the listed building and proportionate to the site. Nevertheless, it would add to the suburbanisation of the surroundings of the RPG which forms a green space at the edge of the town, and so our concern remains. Should your officers decide to approve the application, we would ask for a condition requiring sympathetic boundary treatments and a tree management plan to ensure effective screening of the site. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Pittville Park	Gloucestershire	E21/0764	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed installation of 18m high 'slim line' Phase 8 H3G street pole, wrap around cabinet and 3no.cabinets Land At Central Cross Drive	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for development proposals the impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. This proposal is supported by a full-some Planning Statement that reflects the strong Governmental drive for improved 3g networks. GGLT would not

				Cheltenham COMMUNICATION/CCTV	want to frustrate this position. However, when considering a standard "layout block" to service this mast, GGLT suggests that the installation is moved north to the opposite side of the adjacent gravel path, and aligned exactly parallel to that path edge. This would help to avoid unnecessary damage to the roots of the verge-side tree, and would be visually more coherent. Yours sincerely, David ball (on behalf of GGLT).
Barnet Local Plan	Greater London	E21/0545	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Regulation 19 (Publication) consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2021 The Local Plan leaves non-designated designed landscapes of heritage value unprotected from the impacts of development either within the open space or, arising from development outside. Such impacts could be on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • designed views into, as well as from, the landscape and setting, • their landscape character and • defined significance. The most effective way of identifying these sites is via the Local List. Indeed, this is the approach that Historic England has advised since its 2016 publication, updated 2021. https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/ Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage, Historic England Advice Note 7 (2nd edition), Published 27 January 2021 "Local heritage lists are one way in which local heritage – buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas, historic parks and gardens or other designed landscapes – can be formally identified, as part of the wider range of designation, so that their significance can be taken into account in planning applications affecting the building or site or its setting." In August 2019 Barnet held a Local Heritage List consultation. We pointed out the discrepancy between the HE advice and the Barnet local list criteria relating only to buildings and structures. HE defines "Cultural landscapes: heritage assets associated with a significant period in an area's history, including historic parks, gardens, grounds and their structures and other designed landscapes." The Senior Planning Officer for Urban Design and Heritage replied to us on 2 Sept 2019 stating: "The decision was made to exclude parks, gardens and other open spaces from the asset types that could be nominated for local listing. It was felt

					<p>there were sufficient policies and protection elsewhere in the Local Plan.” Since then the new Local Plan has been drafted. There has been time to ensure the new local plan policies would ensure protection of designed landscapes from any adverse impacts of development.</p> <p>The current draft excludes landscapes. Developers are likely to argue that this is a deliberate omission rather than a careless oversight. This leaves cultural landscapes, as defined by HE unrecognised and therefore unprotected in Barnet.</p> <p>The general Parks and open spaces policies do not give protection to that subset of designed landscapes from development outside their boundaries eg Policy ECC04. So this is a threat to all Barnet’s open spaces.</p> <p>Evidence base</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.</p> <p>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 Barnet List</p> <p>Detailed information on each of the 101 sites in Barnet can be accessed here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sites-in-borough/?Borough=Barnet</p> <p>A few of these sites of heritage interest are associated with buildings or structures which may already be recognised by Barnet as locally listed buildings. 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.</p> <p>Policy CDH08 Barnet’s Heritage</p> <p>Insert “designed landscapes” after locally listed buildings in 1st clause.</p> <p>Insert “and designed landscapes” after Locally Listed Buildings and their settings in the clause headed Locally Listed Buildings and Other Non-</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Designated Heritage Assets</p> <p>Insert</p> <p>Development proposals affecting heritage assets such as designed landscapes should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect and conserve the borough’s heritage assets of designed landscapes such as parks, gardens, squares, churchyards, cemeteries and other sites of historic interest; • give proper recognition and consideration of designed landscapes and open spaces, and evidence that their status and significance has been given due consideration in the consideration of planning applications including details such as lighting, noise, intrusion, overlooking, overshadowing, boundaries, change of use, temporary uses/reinstatement. In our experience, these impacts are often not thought of at planning application stage. • Provide landscape improvements to mitigate adverse impacts on the experience of being within the open space arising from the development. We are sorry that we have had to make this response at this late stage. London Parks and Gardens Trust responded to Barnet Draft Growth Strategy 2030 Consultation in August 2019. I have checked through our records and I can confirm that we were not consulted on the Reg 18 draft Local Plan. London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust trades as The London Gardens Trust (previously London Parks and Gardens Trust). The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust is a registered charity, affiliated to the national Gardens Trust (GT) a statutory consultee for planning applications. We champion all London green space and make observations on planning proposals, both on behalf of the GT for sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, and also in relation to other green open spaces, especially those in our Inventory https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/
Wanstead Park	Greater London	E21/0669	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Temporary portacabin for education space (for period of two years). (summary)</p> <p>Blake Hall Sports Ground,Blake Hall Road,Wanstead,London,E11 2QW</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2021</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 reviewed the online documentation and although the Design and Access statement (D&A) mentions in Para 2.7 that the application site</p>

				MISCELLANEOUS	<p>'benefits from the following designations/constraints' : 'Historic Parks Gardens', there is no further reference or detail of how the proposed portacabin may impact on the heritage asset. The proposed very large portacabin (20m x 12m) lies within the Grade II* registered park and garden of Wanstead Park (RPG). As such we would have expected to have seen a Heritage Statement and an Impact Statement to enable us to judge whether this structure would detract from the setting of the heritage asset. One of the other respondents (from 72 Blake Hall Road) queried whether the extensive existing hard standing had been permitted given that the site lies within the Green Belt. Your officers will have to satisfy themselves on this point as well as whether a building approximately 65 ½ feet by 39 ¼ feet is justifiable for what the applicants themselves say is teaching just two days a week. We would be concerned that should this utilitarian structure be permitted it does not become permanent. We would ask that should you allow this application it is conditional upon the Sahajanand Gurjarati School finding a lasting solution elsewhere after the two year period has elapsed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Amport Park	Hampshire	E21/0802	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of Amport House into a Boutique Hotel with additional accommodation in the grounds (planning use class C1), kids club, energy centre, cycle storage, new swim club (planning use class E) and landscaping enhancements Amport House , Furzedown Lane, Amport, SP11 8BG CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2021 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 did send you a response after the pre-application advice closed having been able to contact the HE officer responsible for the original listing. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and it appears that the extensive historic pleached lime avenues on the western side of the hotel are to be retained as they remain on the drawings. In our pre-app response we stated our considerable concern at the possibility of replacing these with ornamental cherry trees. We are surprised that the Design and Access statement makes no mention of this notable feature of the gardens. We are generally supportive of the proposals which we feel have been done with sensitivity to the historic site. We appreciate the need for wheelchair access, and feel that for example, by the Memorial Parterre the proposed removal of a small section of hedging is discreet and sensible. We</p>

					<p>also are glad to see that the parking for 33 cars at the front of the house is largely screened by trees with an understory of evergreen shrubs.</p> <p>We would not support the removal of the historic lime avenues to the west of the house or its replacement with flowering cherry trees. We would appreciate confirmation of what is planned for this particular feature.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Westwood Park	Hereford and Worcester	E21/0762	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of existing wooden chalet</p> <p>The Boathouse, Westwood Way, Droitwich Spa, WR9 0HE</p> <p>GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hereford and Worcestershire Gardens Trust who are familiar with the site, and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Westwood Park and its Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) is in multiple ownership which is often problematic. At Westwood it has resulted in piecemeal development within the park which has a cumulative adverse impact on the RPG. This proposal is for a rather more complex building than the existing one, which can be seen on occasion between the trees. We would suggest that a heritage assessment is done with specific reference to historic tree planting around the lake, in particular in the vicinity of the proposal with a view to restoring tree cover.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Broxwood Court	Hereford and Worcester	E21/0839	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Hybrid planning application; Full planning application for the proposed erection of a new poultry site with solar panels, associated buildings & development and connection to the A480. Outline planning application for a poultry managers' dwelling including Access and Layout with matters of appearance, landscaping, and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2021</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust who have asked me to make the following general and specific points relating to this application.</p> <p>Is it not time to draw a line under the creation of new poultry units in Herefordshire? Apart from providing some inferior employment, they do little for the county. Even the foods for the chickens are generally imported from outside. Notwithstanding the applicant's special pleading contained in an exhaustive (and exhausting) collection of documents, which always provide the same answer; an affirmative (or inconsequential negative) to make it impossible for the Council to reject the application? Over the last decade poultry units have been dumped in the virgin countryside all over</p>

			<p>scale reserved. Land forming Green Farm, Lyonshall, Kington, Herefordshire HR5 3JY MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>Herefordshire. No village or community want one as a neighbour and thus, the remote and best landscapes of the county are polluted. Albeit well enclosed in new planting their presence is always advertised by arbitrary planting of shelter belts with a liberal scattering of abandoned tree guards at their feet; all pervading smells, lanes damaged by regular heavy traffic bringing Eastern European grain or taking away, rubbish and carcasses. On closer inspection, which is never very difficult, there are dirty concrete aprons and, within a few months proliferating junk, as old materials and fabric are discarded but never disposed of properly. There is polythene galore, stuffed in every recess and the human contribution of random car parking and litter from snacks. All around there is wasteland – rank weeds in summer and muddy pools in winter, which inevitably cause run-off into the local stream system thus contributing to the poison in the rivers of Herefordshire, which has made the Wye salmon virtually extinct and sterilised planning in the Lugg catchment area. This development, I assume, will drain into the Wye.</p> <p>The site chosen is in the midst of one of the great forests of Herefordshire, which was only slowly cleared in the Middle Ages and beyond. In 1233 the woods in the vicinity of Eardisley and Almeley were so dense that the sheriff of Herefordshire was ordered by the king ‘to cause a breach to be made through the woods’ between Hereford and Painscastle. As anyone who travels down the A480 knows, as you leave Crump Oak Wood behind, the Wye Valley with the Black Mountains behind, opens-up before you. It was this view that Richard Snead Cox (1820-99) wished to capture in April 1858 when, guided by his architect, Charles Hansom (1860-80) and the landscape gardener W.A. Nesfield (1793-1881) chose the site of Broxwood Court after visiting several spots including Crump Oak Wood. Nesfield’s plan for the grounds were implemented in 1859 and included the St John’s Avenue, which focussed on the west front of the house and was planted with cedars, Wellingtonias and Scots pines. The avenue is flanked by an arboretum but ends abruptly at the A480. It looks as if this is an incomplete avenue looking for a terminus.. This was likely to be a high point marked by a grove of trees, a seat or an eye-catcher. It is also possible that the avenue was designed for a west drive, in which case there would have been a lodge on the main road. As the applicants for the poultry unit state, the end of the avenue today is a mere 260 metres from their development. It thus, severely compromises any aspirations that a present or future owner of the Broxwood estate might</p>
--	--	--	---	---

					<p>have to complete the avenue. Indeed, the poultry unit will occupy or be very close to the logical terminus point for the avenue.</p> <p>Broxwood Court is a Registered Grade II historic landscape garden; it is well maintained and regularly open to the public. The proximity of the development will compromise its status. It will be immediately to the east of the unit and being 'down-wind' from the prevailing westerly wind will enjoy regular whiffs of chicken effluent and no doubt, many of the lorries visiting the site will make the A480 busier and more intrusive.</p> <p>For the sake of our future and for the integrity of the Registered landscape at Broxwood Court we urge the Council to refuse permission for this development.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, David Whitehead on behalf of the Executive committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust</p>
Three Rivers Local Plan	Hertfords hire	E21/0447	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.08.21 Part 1 Preferred Policy Options Heritage and the Historic Environment. Agree Approach is correct. Comments: All heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Local Heritage Lists as described in Historic England HEAN7 on 'Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage' and as advocated under the MHCLG pilot programme should be compiled for all undesignated heritage assets in Three Rivers District. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust has compiled such lists for the historic gardens and parks of other LPAs within Hertfordshire and would be happy to help if required</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2021 Part 2: Sites for Potential Allocation Langleybury and The Grove: Disagree that the Policy is correct. Suggested amendments: These two sites are of great landscape heritage value dating back to the medieval period. The Grove was landscaped in the Regency period by Humphry Repton and the forest garden of The Grove and that of Cassiobury Park were designed as a unified whole. Langleybury parkland also dates from the late 18th century and like The Grove has been adapted over the years. Langleybury being purchase post WWII (1947) as part of the Green Belt Act initiative. Both sites have listed houses and these parklands</p>

					provide their setting, and therefore contribute to their significance. The policy should be amended to protect the landscapes from development except for limited leisure purposes, in line with conserving and enhancing heritage assets as outlined in NPPF. & The Grove Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Aldenham House	Hertfords hire	E21/0957	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Development within the curtilage of a Listed Building. demolition of some existing buildings and erection of new office hub buildings in their place. Extension of an existing building, external and internal alterations and conversion to office space, a cafe and a function room. Associated landscaping and planting. Alterations to the existing highway access. Home Farm, Aldenham Road, Elstree, Borehamwood WD6 3AZ	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member and authorised to respond on their behalf. The site lies within the Registered Aldenham House Park & Garden, just south of the Gibbs ornamental gardens around Tykes Water, but within the former home Farm On the basis of the details in this application and our knowledge of the history of the landscape of Aldenham House, we have no objections to this proposal. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/0749	II	PLANNING APPLICATION x 2 storage containers for bicycles and administrative purposes. Stanborough Park Stanborough Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6DF OUTBUILDINGS/MAINTENENCE/S TORAGE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objection to the siting and provision of these containers for bicycles and administrative purposes. However, as these are such basic, utilitarian structures, we would suggest that some tree/shrub planting be undertaken to screen them where possible and mitigate the effect these will have on the landscape. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Panshanger Park	Hertfords hire	E21/0768	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION (Retrospective) Application for a Certificate of Lawful Use for Existing Development for engineering works associated with extensions to original car park created in 1987, including resurfacing and installation of a	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2021 Panshanger Park is a Grade II* Registered Landscape and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is responding as Statutory Consultee for the Gardens Trust. Although the Park had not been added to the EH Register when the car park was first created in 1984, it was on there when the alterations to it were carried out in 2014 and under the policies of PPG15, any changes to this RPG should have had planning consent. We are concerned that very recent changes, not those in this planning

				metal vehicle barrier at the entrance to the car park Thieves Lane Car Park, Panshanger Park, Hertford SG14 2WN	application, could lead to congestion on nearby residential roads. A fuller application to address the whole of the Panshanger Park access and parking, rather than individual sites within it, should be submitted. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hexton Manor	Hertfords hire	E21/0832	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of existing barns to create two residential dwellings (1 x 3-bed and 1 x 4-bed). Model Farm, Mill Lane, Hexton, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG5 3JE CHANGE OF USE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust. We have no objections to the conversion of the barns to dwellings as described in this application. We do note that there are no details about the garden ground outside of the barns , with the garden on the southern side lying within the Registered area of the Hexton Manor RPG. We would welcome the opportunity to comment on any plans for this garden ground, which should respect the open nature of Mill Lane and the position of the Generator House with regards to the Model Barns. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Panshanger	Hertfords hire	HERO20	-	PLANNING APPLICATION AMENDMENT OF CONDITIONS OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR 6/2016/0873/OUTLINE Variation of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 24, 28, 30, 31 & 32 on outline planning permission (6/2018/0873/OUTLINE) for a residential-led development of up to 650 residential units, a two-form entry primary school, provision of six gypsy and traveller pitches, a new local centre (comprising retail and community uses), new vehicular access from Hens Lane, car parking, associated infrastructure and landscaping works with all matters except access reserved Land North East of Welwyn	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, on the recent proposed amendments to the conditions for planning permission for 6/2018/0873/OUTLINE. We have no comment to make on these particular proposals but remain concerned that there is insufficient screening on the northern and eastern boundaries of suitable cover, including evergreen spp to protect the heritage assets on the northern banks of the Mimram as detailed in our response to the original planning application. The amended landscape plans do not supply sufficient detail to determine the harm to these heritage assets, especially during winter months when leaf cover is much reduced. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

				Garden City Panshanger Welwyn Garden City AL27 2QJ	
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	HER021	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Two Storey side and rear extension, modification to roof of crown form, single storey rear extension. 52 North Cottages, Napsbury, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL1 1AW BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application and our knowledge of Napsbury Hospital Landscape and its history we do not consider that this proposal would cause harm to the Grade II Registered landscape. We therefore have no objections. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/0855	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 2x two-storey detached houses and associated parking and access on the land to the rear of 52 & 54 Bridge Road. Rear of 52 and 54 Bridge Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UR RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The cottages at 52/54 Bridge Road are a pair of estate cottages built by Earl Cowper in 1876 on the edge of Sherrards Park Wood, which has been in existence since at least 1599. Bridge Road itself is the southern boundary of these historic woodlands and has been for centuries. These cottages are noted in the WGC CA Appraisal. Development to the rear of these cottages would severely harm the setting of the cottages, which pre-date the Garden City, both in the approach to it via the proposed drive and the destruction of the rear woodland aspect. It would , in addition, be an intrusion into an area which has formed part of the historic woodland for years and introduce a built element close to the line of the old railway, currently a green walk for the residents of the Garden City. We consider this development inappropriate and harmful in the location. We have objected to development here prior to this and do so again. Kate Harwood Trust Hertfordshire Gardens
Hatfield House	Hertfords hire	E21/0879	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Internal alterations, new patio, entrance door re-positioned 47 The Ryde Hatfield AL9 5DQ BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The Cockaigne Housing Association houses, listed Grade II, were designed to have easily adaptable interior layouts to suit individual occupants. On the basis of the information in this application we consider the proposed alterations to be in line with the architects' intentions. The group of houses and gardens, including the rear communal garden, are included on HGT's List of Locally Important Gardens in Welwyn Hatfield. We do not consider

					the proposed alterations would have an adverse impact on the landscape and therefore have no objections to the proposed alterations. Kate Harwood Trust Hertfordshire Gardens
Shenley Park	Hertfords hire	E21/0881	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of remedial piers to stabilise existing wall to the rear of Gardeners Cottage. Walled Garden Shenley Park, Radlett Lane, Shenley, Hertfordshire, REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust.. The Walled Garden at Shenley Park is shown on maps earlier than those in the Heritage Statement, notably in 1766 and 1792, although altered to its present octagonal shape in the 19th century. The southwest wall has a number of buttresses on the exterior wall of brick which do not detract from the appearance of the wall. The proposed buttresses on the north east wall all appear to be on the interior side, i.e. within the garden, and to be of concrete. We have no objection to these necessary structures as the interior facing of the wall has had concrete render at some time in the past. We are unclear from the plans submitted if any structures are to be put on the exterior of the wall which is brick with a stone capping. We would be concerned if any supporting structure on this side were of concrete as brick or brick-faced would be preferable to retain the visual integrity of the historic wall. Kate Harwood Trust Hertfordshire Gardens
Thwaite Hall	Humbersi de	E18/1666	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Residential Development for 95 dwellings comprising the conversion of existing buildings into 34 flats and 27 town houses and erection of new buildings to provide 9 flats and 25 town houses following demolition of ancillary buildings. University Of Hull, Thwaite Hall, Thwaite Street, Cottingham, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU16 4RE. RESIDENTIAL, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2021 I was very pleased to visit Thwaite Hall a few weeks ago and see for myself the situation as I'd not been before, although I had been briefed by my Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) colleague, landscape architect, Jane Furse whom I think you met in 2019. My local YGT member, Tricia Sharp was able to get permission from Stephen Dale at Hull University so that we were able to look at the whole site. Unfortunately the prospective developer Mr James Ledger was out of the country so I was unable to meet him. Since his return I have spoken with him on the phone and e-mailed him the two letters that I wrote dated 19th March 2019 and the reconsultation letter of 30th June 2021. As I have written in my letters, Thwaite is important as a rare survival of an impressive 19th Century villa garden in an urban setting and particularly now for its collection of many unusual ornamental trees. About 80 trees in the Thwaite collection were assessed by the Tree Register of Britain and Ireland (TROBI) who considered no fewer than 37 to be "remarkable" in some way. Of these, 31 were confirmed to be Yorkshire

					<p>Champions and 6 were National Champions. This list does not include many other trees which, although not 'remarkable' are nevertheless highly admired - like the Redwoods and Foxglove Tree. Chief recorder for TROBI - Dr. Owen Johnson (author of Collins Tree Guide) described the Thwaite collection as "After Thorp Perrow, it's perhaps the most interesting collection of mature rare trees in N.E. England".</p> <p>When I spoke with Mr Ledger I emphasised that this is a special site and needs a detailed survey of the trees; species, approximate age, condition and their accurate position etc, which would form the basis of a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), so that informed decisions can be made about such things as vehicle parking, access and paths. This should ensure that the heritage asset and particularly the significant planting is retained, and a maintenance schedule is implemented. This survey and CMP should be carried out by a heritage professional familiar with this type of historic garden. I mentioned that we think that the exceptional nature of the designed ornamental landscape at Thwaite Hall will make the proposed development very attractive.</p> <p>As I noted in our letter of 19th March 2019: ' The CMP should be developed in conjunction with expertise from Historic England (HE) and the Friends of Thwaite Gardens and the University of Hull. Such a document would give substantial enhancement to the site over a period of years and should encompass paths and their surfaces, ornamental and wildlife planting, seating, management of the lake, as well as road and car parking surfaces etc.'</p> <p>If the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust can be of any further assistance then please let us know.</p> <p>I am also cc Chris Mayes, Heritage at Risk Landscape Architect, Historic England, for information.</p> <p>Kind regards Mrs Val Hepworth YGT Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Swaylands	Kent	E21/0775	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of one 5-bed dwelling house with basement, landscaping and refurbishment of boat house. Land South Of Swaylands School Farm Penshurst Road Penshurst</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We commented twice on the previous application (19/00239), referring</p>

				KENT RESIDENTIAL	<p>back to the original application of 2011. In the most recent of these responses we maintained our original objection stating that the planned house was too large, despite the 2019 application being more in keeping with Swaylands to the North and the Dairy to the south.</p> <p>This application is for a property of similar size above ground but it also contains a substantial basement of 2000 cu m, so that its total volume is estimated at 6050 cu m, whereas the previous application had a volume of 4150 cu m. Completely different materials have been proposed to clad the building, including steel and glass, to produce a building which in our opinion, is completely out of character when situated within a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, within the Green Belt and within the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>GT/KGT wish to continue to object to this planning application on the basis that the proposed building is too large and the proposed cladding of steel and glass is not sympathetic with the surrounding buildings located within this Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Swaylands.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Redleaf Penhurst Place	Kent	E21/0782	II I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of existing structure to one 2-bed dwelling house to form an annexe to Redwood and single storey extension to side. Redwood Penshurst Road Penshurst KENT TN11 8HY BUILDING ALTERATION planning.comments@sevenoaks.gov.uk</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2021</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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation. The Planning Statement and the Design and Access Statement, which are very similar, refer to the conditions in paragraph 1.6 which have to be met in order that a building can be reused in the Green Belt. One of these conditions is that :- ‘The applicant can demonstrate through a detailed structural survey and method statement that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction that would distract from the original character.’</p> <p>The applicant has not provided any structural survey, method statement, photos or details of the current construction to comply with reuse of buildings in the Green Belt, apart from stating in the application form that the building is of timber construction with a slate roof. Consequently GT/KGT are opposed to this application until such documentation is</p>

					<p>provided.</p> <p>Should Sevenoaks be mindful to grant approval we would request that a condition be imposed to restrict permitted development rights.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Rackheath Hall	Norfolk	E20/1880	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline permission for up to 43 dwellings and 2) Change of use of land for public open space & connecting cycle/pedestrian routes</p> <p>Land At Home Farm,Rackheath Park,Rackheath,NR13 6LP</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2021</p> <p>We refer you to our letter of 17 March 2021 concerning the proposed residential development and change of land use at Home Farm, Rackheath. We have reviewed the additional information provided and the revised drawings with our colleagues in the Norfolk Gardens Trust and have no reason to change our position.</p> <p>We sustain our joint objection to this proposal. The amendments made do not materially alter the detrimental impact that the development would have on the openness of the Grade II listed Rackheath Hall, its parkland and the wider setting.</p> <p>Even with the increased area allocated to public access, the slight reduction in housing density and the amended building design, in our opinion the benefits are not sufficiently significant to outweigh the harm that it will inflict. The development should not, therefore, be allowed under Policy GT2. Moreover, it would have a significant adverse effect on the function of this area as a landscape setting to the future built edge of Norwich.</p> <p>Rackheath Park should be preserved in its entirety for its value as a heritage landscape as well as its important contribution to the landscape buffer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan Review	Norfolk	E21/0744	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2021</p> <p>Non-Designated Heritage Assets. The PPG [Planning Practice Guidelines] say these are locally designated 'buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which are not formally designated heritage assets'.</p> <p>Non designated assets are by definition not designated.The paragraph as drafted seems to limit them to locally designated sites. We know there are many parks and gardens which are not designated, nationally or locally, but</p>

					are of historic and/or landscape importance. Non-designated heritage assets can be identified not just by the planning authorities but by other bodies as well, such as the Norfolk Gardens Trust. In addition, our knowledge is incomplete and research may identify heritage assets which we don't yet appreciate or fully understand. Norfolk Gardens Trust
Barningham Hall	Norfolk	E21/0748	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Reconstruction of garden wall Barningham Hall, Barningham Park, Matlaske, Norfolk, NR11 7HY REPAIR/RESTORATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.08.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust. The Trust works closely with the Norfolk Gardens Trust in formulating its comments on planning applications. The Heritage Assessment says the wall is about 200 years old. The kitchen gardens are an important element of the historic garden/park. They contribute positively to the setting of the Hall. There appears to be careful consideration of the design detail in order to replicate what has been lost as far as possible, although many of the original bricks are beyond use. The Trust does not object to the application. Conditions should be used to ensure that as much as possible of the original material is used, with careful scrutiny of the suitability of all new materials. Norfolk Gardens Trust
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1976	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid planning application for proposed employment park seeking: a) Detailed (full) planning permission for erection of two warehouse buildings for B2 (General industrial), B8 (Storage and distribution) and/or Class E (Commercial, business and service E (g) (i)(ii) (iii)) uses, with ancillary offices, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works; and b) outline planning (all matters reserved with the exception of access) for Class E (Commercial, business and service), B2 (General industrial) and B8 (Storage and distribution)	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2021 Thank you for re-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. The land for this employment park is within the wider setting of Allerton Park and especially the views from the two elevated buildings within the registered park and garden; Allerton Castle at grade I and the Temple of Victory at grade II*. We are very concerned that the massing, scale and landscape scheme that is proposed in this hybrid application will be damaging to the significance of the heritage assets in what has been until recent times a largely rural setting where the reciprocal views can be widely enjoyed. The character of this area will be fundamentally changed. And this application is for only a portion of the proposed employment park and as such gives even greater concerns for the future impact of development on the heritage assets.

				<p>uses, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works, to be implemented in phases. Land Comprising Field At 440633 457078 Allerton Park North Yorkshire</p>	<p>The new documents are for details of Units 1 and 2 which are large units near the middle of the site 13m to either parapet or eaves. The Unit 1 appears to have been pulled back very slightly from the area of the swale but still in our view, encroaching upon it. There is no further information on the other development areas ie the ones closer to A1M and the A 59, Zones 1,2,3,4, with units on Zone 5 proposed at 18m high. We note the addition of a few more trees. We consider that the so-called 'primary viewing corridor' remains inadequate. There will be vast expanses of vehicle parking and inadequate tree planting over the whole employment park. Even when the planting has been growing for 15 years, the buildings will remain dominant in the verified views. We conclude that the employment park will not integrate at all with the surrounding countryside. We strongly refer you to our comments in our letter of 24th April 2021 and also strongly support the detailed and carefully considered Historic England advice in their letters dated 19th April and 24th August and the report from your authority's Principal Conservation Officer. We urge your authority to address their concerns.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register their objection to this application in its present form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
University of York Campus West designed landscape	North Yorkshire	E21/0137	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of all-weather surface with underground anchors to enable erection of a marquee within part of the Vanbrugh Bowl and associated land regrading and access paths Vanbrugh College University Of York University Road Heslington York MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2021 I'm responding to Robin Copeland's email of 2 August containing outline revised proposals for this application. As before, I'm writing 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. We are grateful to the University for considering and engaging with our reply in such a positive way. Subject to a caveat (see below) we see this as a welcome and constructive response to our concerns, and believe it offers an approach from which there is net gain. We believe we are likely to withdraw our objection to the proposal, based on these revisions. As we understand it, the University proposes to install new drainage to the bowl (it has had inadequate drainage for as long as I can remember, which inhibits its use), plant a new, hard-wearing grass surface, and retain its existing profile. In return for this improvement, it will install underground</p>

					<p>supports for a marquee, which will be erected for student-focused events. During those events the new turf will be covered by a protective surface, and the turf will be restored and repaired after each such event. The proposal thus retains the aesthetic of the bowl during those periods when there is no marquee; and increases the periods when the bowl is usable for informal, quiet use, by addressing the problem of drainage. The revisions specifically acknowledge the importance of informal use of this space. The caveat we have is about the number, length and timing of events for which a marquee would be erected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We would be loath to see a marquee in place for more than a small portion of the year; · at the same time (while acknowledging that ends of terms and the summer degree ceremony impose their own logic upon timing) we would be concerned if the marquee were to be in place too long when the lifeforms we share the site with need it most. <p>We note that the University has access to expert internal knowledge about the impact of the proposals on the ecology of the area, and wonder whether this might open the possibility of a long-term study on the way the site responds to them in practice.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Chris Webb Chair, Yorkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Hornby Castle Park	North Yorkshire	E21/0776	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to equestrian and residential use with formation of stables and double garage building 1 North Road Hackforth Bedale North Yorkshire CHANGE OF USE, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2021 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 Hornby Castle Park, at grade II. List Entry Number 1420079. 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. Hornby Castle's medieval hunting park dating from at least the early 14th Century was redesigned as landscape pleasure gardens and park for the 4th Earl of Holderness from 1765. Recent research has shown that the Earl employed Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-83) at four estates including at Hornby Castle. The Rev William Mason (1725-97) who was chaplain to Holderness and the author of 'The English Garden', 1772, was the architect of the Bowling Green House completed in 1762. Hornby Castle Park is</p>

					<p>significant for a number of reasons including as a well-preserved example of a Brown landscape, its listed structures, its long history and association with nationally influential owners and the significance of its association with Brown and Mason.</p> <p>This planning application relates to land alongside the south eastern corner of the registered park boundary and south of the early 19th Century Hackforth Lodge; the entry to the estate from the east with a tree-lined drive to Hornby Castle.</p> <p>We are unsure as to the entry on the Application Form for three number two bed houses and suggest that this should be checked. We also query whether this land is outside development limits in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We have some other concerns about the proposals and the potential impact on the registered park and garden:</p> <p>The stables and double garage are proposed to be roofed in pantiles but the house roof is of natural slate. We suggest that the roofing of the new constructions should be of a similar colour and texture.</p> <p>The boundaries are proposed to be 1.2m post and rail fence with mixed species hawthorn hedge. We advise that there should also be some tree planting along the boundaries with the trees protected from grazing by substantial tree guards. Tree planting should assist the proposed development to flow more seamlessly into the registered park and we suggest that species used in the park should be planted.</p> <p>We do not have any further comments to make on this application. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Shirburn Castle	Oxfordshire	E16/0816	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for the erection of up to 100 residential dwellings including vehicular access, public open space, car parking, landscaping and drainage. Land off Pyrton Lane, Watlington. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2021</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The GT and OGT have not been involved until now in the clearly controversial application above due to lack of capacity in previous years. The nearest Registered Park and Garden (RPG) to the application site is that of Grade II Shirburn Castle, which will be significantly adversely</p>

					<p>affected by bringing the built form of Watlington to the very edge of the park's southern boundary. Development would also include the introduction of a roundabout at the junction with Pyrton Lane which would be floodlit in the interests of road safety.</p> <p>We consider the harm to be the higher end of less than substantial harm. The rural setting of Watlington Park is threatened by the development which would have a negative urbanising effect, merging with the town. This is contrary to the NPPF 2021 sections 199,200,202,206.</p> <p>The GT/OGT strongly object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E20/1558	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of renewable led energy generating station comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancement. Land to South West of Cowley Substation, Nuneham Courtenay, OX44 9PA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to amendments to the above application, affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The GT and our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust maintain the strong objection set out in detail in our letter of 25 January 2021. Since it was written we have gained access to the site following the lifting of Covid restrictions and we can confirm that the proposal will have a significant effect on the setting of the Grade I registered park. The revised assessment by the applicants fails to address the importance of the purpose and design of All Saints church. It was not only deliberately placed as an eye-catcher when viewed from the house, but it was also designed with a north-facing portico and seat to enjoy the views across the open landscape beyond, which embraced both the dreaming spires of Oxford and its surrounding agricultural context. Although the view has been partly obscured by later tree growth, there is currently an aspiration to fully restore its impact through sensitive arboricultural management. The wide view is a crucial element in the design of the park, and it must not be compromised by the introduction of such an alien landscape feature.</p> <p>Moreover, the planned village of Nuneham Courtenay is another essential feature of the original design of the estate, and is an integral part of the conservation area that covers the park. The approach from Oxford was deliberately planned to take advantage of the rising ground to conceal its presence from the open countryside to the north. This subtle effect would be lost by the encroachment of a solar farm.</p>

				<p>Although we recognise the importance of alternative energy sources, the landscape and the heritage assets in this particular location are of such national importance that we urge your officers to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to amendments to the above application, affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The GT and our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust maintain the strong objection set out in detail in our letter of 25 January 2021. Since it was written we have gained access to the site following the lifting of Covid restrictions and we can confirm that the proposal will have a significant effect on the setting of the Grade I registered park. The revised assessment by the applicants fails to address the importance of the purpose and design of All Saints church. It was not only deliberately placed as an eye-catcher when viewed from the house, but it was also designed with a north-facing portico and seat to enjoy the views across the open landscape beyond, which embraced both the dreaming spires of Oxford and its surrounding agricultural context. Although the view has been partly obscured by later tree growth, there is currently an aspiration to fully restore its impact through sensitive arboricultural management. The wide view is a crucial element in the design of the park, and it must not be compromised by the introduction of such an alien landscape feature.</p> <p>Moreover, the planned village of Nuneham Courteney is another essential feature of the original design of the estate, and is an integral part of the conservation area that covers the park. The approach from Oxford was deliberately planned to take advantage of the rising ground to conceal its presence from the open countryside to the north. This subtle effect would be lost by the encroachment of a solar farm.</p> <p>Although we recognise the importance of alternative energy sources, the landscape and the heritage assets in this particular location are of such national importance that we urge your officers to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Christ Church	Oxfordshire	E21/0698	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of surface layers with surface finish resin-bound gravel at pathways at Peckwater Quad, Canterbury Quad and the area leading from Peckwater Quad to Tom Quad.</p> <p>Christ Church College St Aldate's Oxford</p> <p>FOOTPATH/CYCLEWAY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2021</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust, who are very familiar with the site, and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We appreciate the need to improve the surface as there is poor drainage in some of the gravelled areas and 'dust storm' effects in dry periods. The proposal is to resurface pathways in resin bound gravel which may be on top of the existing tarmac, although there is also a suggestion that the tarmac might be renewed. The proposal retains a layout which was created in 1978, generally based on the Williams' 1730s plan, but which might not have been implemented.</p> <p>In our opinion, resin bound pathways are most suitable where there is very heavy use such as bike lanes and road surfaces, and whilst we appreciate it is a durable, low maintenance surface if well laid, we feel it looks relatively artificial and homogenous and would be inappropriate in this site. Your officers may well already be familiar with Historic England's Easy Access to Historic Landscapes (EAHL) publication which deals with this topic. On page 40 it specifically refers to this : 'Modern resin substitutes, though more costly, can achieve a good non-slip surface while retaining the texture of the original gravel. However, gravels completely bound in resin tend to look too modern and lack character.'</p> <p>Our preferred choice in terms of historical authenticity would be Hoggin, which if well maintained provides a more accessible and permeable surface than loose gravel. EAHL also refers to this (p40) : 'Naturally occurring self-binding gravels such as hoggin, Coxwell stone or Breedon gravel are common in historic gardens. When well-maintained they are suitable for all visitors but when worn or badly drained they present hazards. The key factors are the size and shape of the gravel, the quality of construction and the proportion of loose particles on the surface. Binders can be used to secure gravel on paths.'</p> <p>We feel it is also important to consider the environmental credentials of whichever surface is ultimately chosen. Whilst we would not claim to be knowledgeable in this sphere, we have heard that the Addagrip system</p>

					<p>illustrated in the application is permeable (crucial we would suggest), it may possibly have a worse carbon footprint than concrete. Your officers will need to satisfy themselves in that respect.</p> <p>Resurfacing the existing base is probably preferable to full removal and replacement (although of course this will not be fully permeable) on environmental grounds (unless the Hoggin option is utilised). An alternative to consider, which has been common practice in the Royal Parks, is to use tar spray and chip on existing tarmac which can work well as long as the gravel is topped up. Many public parks projects have used tar and chip and/or bound hoggin, eg Cedec or Coxwell.</p> <p>We would also suggest trial samples of surface options.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wentworth Castle	South Yorkshire	E21/0675	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new dormer bungalow with detached one and half storey outbuilding and associated works Pine Lodge, Stainborough Lane, Hood Green, Barnsley, S75 3EZ DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on this amended application which affects Wentworth 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 I. As you are aware the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens in Yorkshire, we would therefore be grateful if you would accept the following comments as being submitted on behalf of both our organisations. In addition, we refer you to our joint comments of 30th January, 28th May and 28th October 2020 in response to the previous application for Pine Lodge, 2019/1526. For the sake of brevity, we will not repeat those here but many are still relevant to this latest application and we request they be referred to for this application.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that considerable work has gone into the redesign of this application in an attempt to address concerns raised with the previous application, we do retain considerable concerns about this application. We would like to point out that the historic appraisal is much out of date. The HLF award c.2007 provided £17 million to resuscitate the main house, Wentworth Castle, with extra funds to renovate the gardens - since all the planned improvements to the gardens and car parks had been cost cut to get the buildings done. As a result, increased access to the parkland as well as the gardens was insisted upon and agreed as a condition of the grant.</p>

					<p>This allowed the WC&SPHT/NT visitors paths through the tenant farmers fields and continued the use of the permissive path from Hood Green Lodge to Stainborough village. The latter passes underneath the battlemented wall boundary of the 'pay cordon' and most pertinently to the north of this application, between Keeper's Pond and The Arcade aka Archers' Hill gate. The northern and western boundaries of the applicant's site are far more visible therefore than the writers assert.</p> <p>We note that the positions of the house and garage as amended in application 2019/1526 have been retained thus allowing some separation from the boundary with the Registered Park and Garden and former avenue and parkland immediately beyond, which is to be welcomed. However, whilst the redesigned house is now more linear in character the overall design is basically very large and ungainly incorporating extensive areas of glazing, including at both gables; the gables in particular will reflect and glint across the park thus increasing the visibility. We are also disappointed that prominent dormer windows are proposed on the south and north elevations. The height of the proposed house is greater than the existing bungalow across the full, unbroken length of the building, increasing its scale and mass in the landscape. Coupled with the large areas of glazing and the inclusion of chimneys this can only increase the prominence of the development in the landscape. We had hoped that there was an opportunity at Pine Lodge for a contemporary architecturally innovative and low carbon design set into the landform but this does not appear to have been taken. We do not consider that that the proposals respond to this part of the designed landscape nor will establish an appropriate transition with the open parkland beyond. We are uncertain as to how the buildings, terracing, domestic infrastructure etc will fit sympathetically into this grade I designed landscape.</p> <p>We have further concerns about the amount of tree clearance which is proposed. Whilst we agree with the Heritage Statement that some of the species around Pine Lodge at present are clearly inappropriate in the context of the Registered Park and Garden, they currently offer a certain extent of screening within the landscape.</p> <p>The amount of borehole testing carried out on site is worrying - for us because of their proximity to mature trees, eg. oak (on Geoenvironmental Survey WS03 in particular) between the new house site and access drive - and for the owners, due to the need for expensive raft or pile foundations. Since 11/2019? there has been a test well bored right next to the mature</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>oak (profiles down to 14m provided) and lots more exploration is suggested as/once the bungalow is demolished. The report advises that more be carried out prior to building which could well invalidate the newest house position and compromise even more tree roots and their longevity.</p> <p>The planting/ tree plan suggests much tree removal and pure hawthorn/holly hedge replant but no long- term tree cover. As the Ash trees are due for removal and are vulnerable to ash die back, the ancient Beech to the north east may be compromised by suggested further test holes in the north east corner and the mature Oak that has already been invaded by a borehole, large scale parkland trees of the appropriate stature could well disappear soon. Replacement trees such as oak, beech and Scots pine, should be part of any future permission granted.</p> <p>We would therefore advise that replacement tree planting is requested to reflect the historic planting layout, further that any removal of trees be phased to reduce the initial impact should permission be granted for this development; with only those necessary for the construction works removed initially and replacements allowed to establish prior to the requested removal of specimens for purely aesthetic purposes.</p> <p>It is interesting to note the Heritage Statement assessment for the existing site:</p> <p>‘The site makes an overall negative contribution to the Grade I Registered park and garden of Wentworth Castle, an asset of High National Significance, and the character and appearance of Wentworth Castle and Stainborough Park Conservation Area... The principal negative aspects of the site relate to the generic suburban architectural style of Pine Lodge bungalow; the total visual separation of the site from its historic context; and the proliferation of modern amenity garden plants’.</p> <p>The GT and YGT consider that although the existing bungalow contributes little to the surrounding historic assets, its low form and reduced visibility in the landscape render its impact as neutral. We therefore fail to see how these proposals for a much larger-scale building, in our view still suburban, together with the proposed tree and shrub clearance, can avoid negative impact on the Wentworth</p> <p>Castle Grade I Registered Park and Garden, Wentworth Castle and Stainborough Park Conservation Area and associated Listed Buildings.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust maintain their objection to the current proposals.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Keele Hall	Staffordshire	E21/0694	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of a new bus entrance Adjacent To Newcastle Lodge Keele University Three Mile Lane MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.08.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust over this application. I am replying on behalf of TGT and Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two trusts. The application site lies adjacent to Newcastle Lodge, a grade II listed gatehouse of mid 19th century date at what was historically a principal entrance into the park at Keele Hall, now a grade II registered historic park and garden. The original sweeping entrance flanked by tall curved walls has been significantly altered in modern times, initially through widening to accommodate modern traffic flows, lowering of the flank walls and latterly by closure to vehicular traffic. The visual quality of what remains has been further compromised by installation of traffic signals on the central axis of the entrance. While the Trusts are disappointed by the current redesign which introduces more signage and visual clutter into the space it will not cause sufficient additional harm to the significance of the listed building or its setting in the RPG to warrant our objecting to the proposal. Yours sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman
Guy's Cliffe	Warwickshire	E21/0736	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Garage extension to the front with converted loft space. Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension 5 Larch Grove, Warwick, CV34 5TA BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.08.2021 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 looked at the online documentation and agree that the proposed extension is similar in style and scale to other nearby properties. The Planning Appraisal (PA) omits to mention the crucial fact that the property lies immediately adjacent to the southern edge of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Guys Cliffe. We would therefore have expected to have seen a Heritage Statement and some form of heritage assessment to examine any possible impact the proposals might have on the setting of this heritage asset. From the drawings it appears that the largest areas of new glazing are to the rear of the house facing away from the RPG, therefore producing only limited glint and light emittance. We would ask

					<p>that your officers satisfy themselves that our assessment is correct and that the new extensions will not produce additional glare and glint to detract from the setting of the RPG, despite the lack of a heritage statement and impact assessment to guide us.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Combe Abbey	Warwicks hire	E21/0784	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of building and use for Class B8 (storage and distribution) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) with PV roof panels, including ancillary offices. Primary vehicular access from Pilot Way (Ansty Park), secondary vehicular access from Combe Fields Road, access road, car parking, cycle parking, lorry parking, service areas, drainage, landscaping, demolition of existing buildings, ground remodelling, associated works and temporary use of land for deposition of soil arisings. ROLLS ROYCE LTD, COOMBE FIELDS ROAD, ANSTY, COVENTRY, CV7 9JR DEMOLITION, PARKING, ACCESS/GATES, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2021 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 looked at the online documentation and this application is the latest in a series of applications over the past few years which have expanded or redeveloped the Rolls Royce industrial site to the north of the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Coombe Abbey. The online documentation states that there is 'extensive woodland' on the northern edge of the RPG so 'no visual change or relationship with the application site' but looking on Google Earth it certainly does not look like 'extensive woodland'. We have not been able to make a site visit, so cannot verify this first-hand. In the past we have not commented on applications for this site. However, we are concerned that should such development continue unabated, there will shortly come a time when the setting of the RPG will begin to suffer from this encroachment. We wish therefore to bring this to the attention of your officers, especially as this application appears to be on a greenfield site. We would not be happy to see such expansion continue unabated in future. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Leonardslee	West Sussex	E21/0806	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retrospective application for the construction of additional areas for visitor car parking. Leonardslee House Brighton Road</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2021 Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the above application. The Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens includes some 1600 sites and Leonardslee is one of the very small number (approximately 9%</p>

				<p>Lower Beeding Horsham West Sussex RH13 6PP PARKING</p>	<p>of the total) with a Grade I designation as a site of exceptional interest. Hence it is re vital that all parties give meticulous attention to the justification for approval of the application.</p> <p>Process SGT works closely with the Gardens Trust (GT), national umbrella organisation, on matters concerning registered parks and gardens. These are separate bodies and as a statutory consultee on applications affecting all Registered Parks and Gardens, the GT should be consulted directly on this application (via consult@thegardenstrust.org); similarly Historic England should be consulted, if that has not already happened.</p> <p>Comments Given the great increase in the size of the car park (from 248 to 724 spaces, an increase of nearly 300%), the scope of the application represents a major development.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes the following statements: In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected... (para 194 of NPPF 2021 edition) Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal. (para 195 of NPPF 2021 edition) When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. (para 199 of NPPF 2021 edition) SGT has a major problem with the application. The documents submitted describe the parking solution in detail; however, there is little information about the planned events giving rise to a need for additional parking, no assessment of the significance of the site and no heritage impact assessment (HIA) regarding the effect of more events and higher visitor</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>numbers.</p> <p>A new document has just been published by the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) (in partnership with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC)): Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK. The purpose of the doc is: to establish an authoritative set of principles to promote good practice in cultural heritage impact assessment across the UK, and help achieve sustainable development for current and future generations see https://www.iema.net/resources/blog/2021/07/20/launch-of-principles-of-cultural-heritageimpact-assessment</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>SGT objects to the approval of the application and requests Horsham District Council to ask the applicant to undertake a heritage impact assessment using a relevantly qualified professional. The scope of this should cover all parts of the site where events will take place as well as the car park areas.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.08.2021</p> <p>The above planning application was brought to our attention by colleagues in the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT). It is surprising that you omitted to consult the Gardens Trust (GT) as we are statutory consultees with regard to development which might affect all grades of registered parks and gardens (RPG) listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We would be grateful if you could please ensure that in future you do not miss us off the consultation list. We have studied the online documentation and were surprised that the suite of planning documents did not include a statement of significance for this major heritage asset - a Grade I RPG - or a Heritage Impact Assessment. The Planning and Heritage statement explained the need for additional parking and mentioned the possibility of perhaps 10 large events annually, but it contained very little detail as to their exact nature. In order for the GT and your officers to assess the impact of the additional large area of unauthorised car parking, further information is necessary so we can fully understand which part(s) of the RPG might be involved and how</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the works/future events impact upon its setting and significance. We have been told that the originally consented parking area is insufficient for the number of visitors already coming to Leonardslee. In order to feel comfortable with the almost trebling of parking capacity, we would urge your officers to ask for this additional information before reaching a decision as to whether or not to grant planning permission.</p> <p>Until this information is forthcoming and we have had a chance to study it in greater detail, the GT objects to this unauthorised development within a Grade I RPG. We also fully endorse the comments made by our colleagues in the SGT which are already on your website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E21/0709	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building application to carryout alterations involving dismantling and rebuilding of a section of the Bothy garden wall</p> <p>Ledston Hall Hall Lane Ledston</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.08.2021</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 the park and garden at Ledston Hall is registered grade II* with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We refer you to our letter of 28th June in response to planning application 21/04285/LI Listed building application for dismantling and reconstruction of the bothy wall and for the construction of wall opening piers in stone rather than brick at Ledston Hall to which we had no objection.</p> <p>Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The Park has 17C origins and the walled gardens and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with later additions/changes. The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest.</p> <p>The planning application 21/05656/LI is for the careful dismantling and rebuilding of a section of the north wall of the Bothy, (possibly late 18th or early 19th Century with rebuilt elements) using lime- based mortar. We understand from the Design, Access and Heritage Statement that the garden wall is in poor condition and incapable of being underpinned safely. It has been fully recorded by an archaeologist and the recovered stone and brick will be reused in the wall's reconstruction to the same height and in</p>

					<p>the same location.</p> <p>Overall, the work proposed will be beneficial and we have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E21/0726	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single dwelling Land Adjacent To 2A Park Avenue Roundhay RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.08.2021</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 Roundhay Park, 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>Park Avenue forms a major length of the southern boundary of Roundhay Park with No 2A and its adjacent land facing north west across Park Avenue to the most southerly end of Roundhay Park which is known as Military Field. The Park was purchased by Leeds City Council c.1871. Tree lined Princes Avenue stretches north from the southern corner of Roundhay Park. This part of north east Leeds forms the Roundhay Conservation Area and in addition to the c. 200 ha Registered Park, it is known for tree-lined roads with remaining villas constructed in the 19th Century and early 20th Century set in mature landscaped gardens.</p> <p>This application updates a previous planning permission for a detached dwelling that was approved in April 2019, reference 18/07199/FU. This included approval for the removal of trees to facilitate the development. Historically the site forms part of the gardens and former garaging to 2A Park Avenue and is bounded by hedging and smaller trees to the front (northwest) boundary which screen views of the plot from Park Avenue. We note that there are several large trees and support their retention. As the site is within a Conservation Area, we presume that all these trees will be protected. There is the proposal to crown reduce the English Oak at T1 by approx. 3m. This appears to be planted near the north eastern boundary but within the neighbouring property 4 Park Avenue.</p> <p>In view of our concerns about climate change and increasing incidents of heavy rain we trust that the block paving and the drive will be of a material and construction to allow drainage. We note that an existing hedge is to be</p>

					<p>retained along part of the north eastern boundary but we suggest that other boundary treatments would benefit wildlife if they were also hedging.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposals will impact on the significance of Roundhay Park and we do not have any objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---