



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES SEPTEMBER 2021

The GT conservation team received 210 new cases for England in September, 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, 56 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Ashton Court	Avon	E21/0865	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use from grassed open space and temporary overflow car park to a permanent car park with associated signage and ticket machines. The proposal is to make the overflow car parking a permanent year round facility with 98 additional spaces. With amendments to the existing car park, to improve traffic flow and landscape setting, increase of car parking spaces from 111 to 188 including disabled parking bays and a mini-bus bay.</p> <p>Car Park, Adjacent To Ashton Court Golf And Cycle Centre, Ashton Court Estate</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development which would affect the Grade II * Registered Historic Park and Garden (RPG) of Ashton Court Estate.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust [GT] is a Statutory Consultee with regards to such developments. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note that the design of the proposed car park has been carefully considered, and that its visibility within the Estate would be limited by its location, local topography, and proposed screening. There would be some adverse impact to local landscape character, and whilst this area of the Estate was not included within the parkland at the time of Repton's visit, it does still form part of the designated RPG. However, the Trust are also aware of the demand for visits to such open spaces, particularly since March 2020, and the popularity of Ashton Court Estate, which has led to issues of traffic congestion locally and within the Estate.</p>

					<p>Overall, the Trust considers that the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the Registered Park and Garden, and taking account of the public benefit that would result, Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Bristol University Botanic Gardens	Avon	E21/1000	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed alterations to the front vehicular and pedestrian entrances from Church Road and erection of new brick boundary walling and gates. Demolition of existing rear extensions and erection of a replacement two-storey rear extension. 1 And 2 Red Cottages, Church Road, Leigh Woods BUILDING ALTERATION, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development adjacent to the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden of the former Bristol University Botanic Gardens and Rayne Thatch. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The construction of Bracken Hill House, together with its lodge and the combined stable and staff accommodation block, was largely completed by 1895. The whole of the two and a half acre site was enclosed within a stone boundary wall capped with red clay tiles. In 1897 Melville Wills acquired an additional two and a half acres of land adjacent to Bracken Hill. Comparison between the OS maps of 1901 and 1916 shows that, by the later date, there had been an extension to the original plan of the house. Melville Wills also constructed a house, in the corner of the site close to the stables, for the children's nanny. Later, following the purchase of his first car, his chauffeur occupied this house. Today, this house is called Heather Lodge, and is adjacent to the application site.</p> <p>In 1907 Melville Wills purchased land on the opposite side of North Road. This was developed as a spectacular pleasure ground of pools and rocky outcrops for Bracken Hill. He also constructed a separate house, originally known as The Bungalow [now Rayne Thatch] which was used to provide additional guest accommodation and later became the estate office.</p> <p>Between c1900 and 1905, Pulham and Son constructed a rock and water garden to the north of Bracken Hill. This was followed by the construction of the more extensive rock and water garden of 1908 – 10, also by Pulham and Son, at 'Rayne Thatch'. Later, between c 1917 and 1929, the rock garden to the north of Bracken Hill was extended eastwards by Pulham and Son. To the south-west corner, stone steps were formed to give access to a formal garden known as The Old English Garden.</p>

					<p>This garden was laid out by Pulham and Son and is shown on the OS map of 1916. Rayne Thatch is listed in the Gazetteer of Pulham sites in the West of England as being a 'principal site'.</p> <p>Melville Wills insisted the ancient oak trees remained when the house and gardens were developed. The rest of the land to the west of the house remained as a woodland garden. This garden still had, [in 2002] deciduous trees that are remnants of the original woodland of Leigh Woods. Trees in this part of the garden include the Bristol Whitebeam [ Sorbus Bristollensis]. This species is very localised, occurring on both sides of the Avon Gorge where the total population of about a hundred trees may be increasing in response to conservation management.</p> <p>The garden at Bracken Hill together with the pleasure garden opposite in Rayne Thatch has been recognised as being a nationally important survivor of this period, and listed accordingly. These gardens are significant both for their association with the Wills family and as well for the rock work – Pulhamite. To develop and maintain both gardens, in 1928 Melville Wills employed the horticultural journeyman Len Warren, who remained to work in the Botanic Gardens until 1972 and continued to live on site until 1990.</p> <p>Since 1959, the University of Bristol has utilised this site as its Botanic Garden. The former stable block was converted into offices. Heather Lodge, which is next door to the subject of this planning application, '1&amp;2, Red Cottages', was the former chauffeur's house with its garden. It is now in private ownership but still represents faithfully the Arts and Crafts architectural style of the late Victorian and Edwardian period. In fact, the majority of surrounding properties built on the 'triangle' formed between Church Road, North Road and Vicarage Road, still reflect the late C19 and early C20 Arts and Crafts style of architecture.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust note that the North Somerset Planning Policy CS12 States: " Proposals of all scales will be required to demonstrate sensitivity to the existing local character already established in the area and should take every opportunity to enhance the sense of place and local identity through a well thought out design". With that in mind, it is not clear from the application information if the original boundary wall surrounding the Botanic Garden, part of which is a shared 'North West' boundary between Heather Lodge and 1 and 2 Red Cottages, is to be retained. Similarly, the Botanic Garden occupied the south side of North road and is enclosed by a distinctive stone wall, capped by red-tile coping, which</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>separates the gardens from the vicarage garden and the churchyard of St. Mary's church.</p> <p>Is it proposed to lose part of the original stone wall at the front of the two Red Cottages? This wall continues as the original boundary of the Botanic Gardens between Heather Lodge and the Red Cottages, on Church Road. It is not clear from the documents submitted whether the "proposed alterations to the front vehicular and pedestrian entrances from Church Road and erection of new brick boundary walling and gates," infers the partial demolition of the heritage boundary wall belonging to the former Bristol University Botanic Garden.</p> <p>Policy DM38 provides criteria for judging the appropriateness of residential extensions, which states:</p> <p>"Proposals to extend existing residential properties and construct new additions which are ancillary to the main residential use will be permitted provided they respect the massing, scale, proportions, materials and overall design and character of the existing property".</p> <p>The scale, proportions, details and overall design and character of the existing property is of late C19 and early C20 architecture. The proposed rear extension does not appear to be subservient to the host building, but over large, and unnecessarily complex. The centre rear roof that previously had a gable, reads as one long rectangle stretching from the front eaves to the rear.</p> <p>The application site lies within the Leigh Woods conservation area within which, the trees are protected by TPO No. 50 – Leigh Woods. The arboricultural report lists just 4 trees to be retained on site and 23 to be removed, Is this a typographical error in the table at section 2.3?</p> <p>Appendix 1, Schedule of tree works, states that 5 trees and 2 groups within the site are to be removed.</p> <p>T8 and T10 would need to be crown lifted. In view of the contradiction within the arboricultural report we would appreciate a revised version to be submitted in order to clarify the impact on trees and confirm that none of the off-site trees are to be removed.</p> <p>Summary: Aspects of this application lack detail and a specific landscape design. The over large and insensitive rear extension would be out of keeping with and harmful to its setting in the conservation area. Therefore, Avon Gardens Trust objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan	Berkshire	E20/0739	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Proposed Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2021 EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC MAIN MATTER 7 – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT 30 SEPTEMBER 2021</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1 This Hearing Statement is prepared by Berkshire Gardens Trust in support of our request for some amendments to policy DM7.</p> <p>1.2 The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens was consulted in September 2020. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites (both national and local), and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. The Berkshire Gardens Trust would like to make the following submissions with regard to Policy DM7.</p> <p>2. Policy DM7 (Conserving the Historic Environment)</p> <p>7.13 Should the policy be expanded to include a list of the categories of assets and their relative importance to be consistent with national policy?</p> <p>2.1 BGT would like to see a list of categories of all historic assets included in the policy (as found under DM3 for Habitats and Species) to emphasise the regard to be given to all assets including historic landscapes and non-designated assets. NPPF 189 and the NPPF glossary makes this point clearly.</p> <p>2.2 We suggest the following wording: The following assets will be protected in accordance with their relative importance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Scheduled Monuments;</li> <li>b) Listed buildings;</li> <li>c) Conservation areas;</li> <li>d) Registered parks and gardens;</li> <li>e) Registered battlefields;</li> <li>f) Sites of archaeological importance; and</li> <li>g) Other locally recognised assets: buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes.</li> </ul> <p>2.3 We suggest that the wording for Item g) should be wider than just ‘locally listed assets’ as we have found that there are many parks and gardens of historic interest that have yet to be assessed by a local authority or added to the HER or a local list. These are often investigated through an</p>

					<p>application for development or by other parties and their significance may be greater than originally thought.</p> <p>2.4 We are not however convinced that the relative importance of each category of asset needs to be set out in the Plan as the relative importance is set out in NPPF and Historic England’s documentation.</p> <p>2.5 The text under Implementation still places a good deal of emphasis on archaeological assets which, although a significant concern, underplays the regard to be given to other categories.</p> <p>7.14 Is the policy effective with regard to the measures which could mitigate harm to the historic environment?</p> <p>2.6 The text under Implementation to guide policy DM7.4 places a good deal of emphasis on mitigation with regard to archaeological assets. Mitigation may also be required to a potential impact on an historic landscape and/or its setting. Such measures may include limits on working areas, buffer zones, screen planting, controls on visual impacts, protection of water sources for historic water features, and restoration of landscape and built features. The proposed sites in the Joint Plan do not affect any known historic parks and gardens but should sites within the safeguarded areas be put forward, these may give rise to adverse impacts. A current example of this is the existing minerals site at Riding Court Farm, Slough which lies to the immediate south of Ditton Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, and where mitigation measures to conserve landscape features in the Park were necessary.</p> <p>2.7 BGT therefore request that the supporting implementation text on mitigation be expanded to cover the specific needs of other historic assets.</p> <p>2.8 For example Policy DM5.2 specifically includes that development is expected to meet the highest standards of design, operation and restoration. The highest of standards also applies where a development would have an impact on an historic asset or its setting, where the asset is not lost but affected by the development. The significance of an asset could be badly eroded through a poor standard of design, operation and restoration. Restoration schemes should to be guided by Heritage Statements to ensure conservation and enhancement of the historic assets.</p> <p>7.15 Should the policy include a requirement to record all assets to be lost and the recording to be deposited in the public archive to be consistent with national policy?</p> <p>2.9 BGT are aware that lost archaeological finds can include historic</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>landscape features. NPPF 205 highlights the importance and value of recording historic assets and make the information publicly available. Although policy DM7 requires an assessment of historic assets and their significance, there is no requirement to ensure that this information is added to the Historic Environmental Records. As the Plan covers a number of local authorities, information on where it should be made publicly available might be useful.</p> <p>2.10 GT and BGT rely on publicly available information to enable us to undertake research and respond to planning matters. The need for publicly available records is all the more important for non-designated assets, local listings and other assets identified through the planning process.</p> <p>2.11 Proposals for interpretation and enjoyment of the heritage assets such as information boards and permissive access should be encouraged where practical and possible to meet NPPF 190 b).</p> <p>7.16 Is the policy consistent with national policy on heritage assets in relation to how to weigh harm?</p> <p>2.12 The Policy and its supporting text is missing the emphasis set out in NPPF 199: 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. This sends a clear message to potential minerals and waste operators on the great weight to be given to the conservation of assets (whatever they are, with greater weight to those of greater importance) and to the weight to be given to all types of harm from the outset. We suggest that this should be added into the Preamble before the policy.</p> <p>Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI Chair Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
The Royal Estate, Windsor: Windsor Great Park	Berkshire	E21/0800	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a food storage unit. Shaw Farm Albert Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2HJ MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Home Park is one the Royal parks, administered by the Crown Estate and is a Grade I Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these</p>

					<p>heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.<sup>1</sup> One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. As Home Park, Windsor is on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, it is an important part of the history of Berkshire's parks and the richness of its history. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the application. Shaw Farm is located on the southern border of the Home Park and adjacent to the A308 Albert Road. It is a small working farm comprising a complex of agricultural buildings and the proposal is to add a further large bunker for animal feed within the environs of the existing farmstead. We have no objections to the proposal as it is far enough beyond the setting of Frogmore House, Windsor Castle and the Park to have an effect on their significance. The existing agricultural buildings are of no architectural merit, being 20th and 21st century functional structures, the appearance of which can be expected in the semi-rural context. As the buildings are closely grouped together the design of the proposed building is utilitarian using pre-cast concrete panels and a steel frame the appearance of which will blend in with the other agricultural buildings. The roofing material is not stated within the proposal details so we would suggest a Condition that a non-reflective, matt dark colour roofing material be used so that what is a large expanse of roof, which will be visible from Albert Road, can visually recede. We are satisfied there is no direct effect of the proposal on the Registered Park and have no objection to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin Planning Advisor Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Hall Place	Berkshire	E21/0949	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION x4 individual blocks to provide x8 classrooms - retrospective Berkshire College of Agriculture Burchetts Green Road Burchetts Green Maidenhead SL6 6QR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed Council strategies affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation</p>



				<p>EDUCATION</p>	<p>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 Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on the most recent planning application for Hall Place.</p> <p>We have looked at the proposals and are familiar with the Grade I listed building and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden. The existing temporary classrooms lie within the Registered Park and Garden but the proposed new temporary classrooms are just to the west lying within the setting of the Park (see the plan below). Therefore both aspects of this application should have regard to the harm to the historic asset in accordance with NPPF 189, 194 to 205 and your own policies.</p> <p>We note with great concern that there is no mention of the historic importance of the Park in the supporting submissions. Any development within the Park or its setting should be assessed to the same depth as the impact on the Green Belt, even though these are temporary buildings. The need to renew a temporary permission also shows the potential longevity of these classrooms to meet current and future need.</p> <p>We appreciate that the existing temporary classrooms sit on the site of the former tennis courts. However national guidance requires the conservation and enhancement of historic assets so that on the demolition of the classrooms arrangements are made to achieve this. The same requirement applies to the new classrooms in the setting.</p> <p>The application should therefore be accompanied by a Heritage Statement setting out the historic significance of the Park and the effect of the development on the significance of the Park. In view of the potential damage from incremental growth at the college, the statement should be supported by a Conservation Management Plan for the Park and the Grade I listed building within which the long term proposals to enhance the two sites proposed for temporary classrooms should be included.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Both applications undermine the historic character of the Park through the introduction of built form into open areas. If a further temporary permission is seriously under consideration, the proposals should include plans to conserve and enhance the Park on demolition and should be set out in the Heritage Statement and a Conservation Management Plan for the Park. It is important to note that deterioration of the Park should not</p>
--	--	--	--	------------------	---

					<p>be taken into account (see NPPF 196).</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI BGT Chair.</p>
Sunningdale Park (Civil Service College)	Berkshire	E21/0960	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use and Refurbishment of the Grade II listed Silwood Manor and attached Stables from D1 educational use to residential use to comprise 21 apartments (mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms), plus associated external works to provide parking, access, and landscaping. Retention and refurbishment of Silwood Lodge. Erection of 13 new dwellings within the Silwood Park grounds comprising 9x 2-bed terraced houses, 1x 3-bed detached house, and 2x 2-bed apartments following the demolition of the existing outbuildings including access, parking, and landscaping. Reuse of existing site access from London Road</p> <p>Land At Silwood Park London Road Sunninghill Ascot</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.1 One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire.</p> <p>Silwood Manor with its adjoining stable block is a Grade II Listed Building located in an unregistered, yet historic, Park and Garden. The parkland and gardens contribute to the setting of the heritage asset as well as being of local historic importance in their own right.</p> <p>There are remnant survivals of a 1790 Repton designed valley landscape to the north of the Manor House (rebuilt late 1870s) and a later terrace and Lily Pond to the south (appearing by OS 1890). It is satisfying to see that these features close to Silwood Manor are proposed to being retained. The proposed demolition of the outbuildings is welcomed as the listed building and Lily Pond will be better revealed.</p> <p>There is no objection to the principle of development for retirement residences. It is the detail that can mar the setting. In particular there are 72 car parking spaces proposed (over the whole site) and some revisions to the layout and landscaping should be considered so that views to and from the west of the Manor and the historic pond setting can be enhanced further. The view from the front of the listed building over the ha-ha to the northern Repton valley will be adversely impacted by the view of parked vehicles. Could the parking scheme be revised by lowering the parking deck? As a minimum, consideration should be given to appending a Condition to screen with hedging/small trees the views of parked vehicles, specifically to the north east of the Manor, for the Stable Block residences. Other details missing from the plans are any gardens for the residences, their boundary treatments, bin and cycle stores. Again appropriate vegetational screening should be considered.</p>

					<p>I have not been able to gain access to the site so defer to the Conservation Officer about whether so much of the wall to the Walled Garden should be demolished, especially if it is of historic brickwork. Are there any remnant survivals of the original Silwood Lodge that could be conserved and incorporated into the residential scheme? Whilst appreciating that the structures here are not listed building(s), again revisions to layouts might be appropriate so that its former use can be understood and conserved.</p> <p>I am satisfied with the proposals that affect tree felling within the parkland, as it will allow more open views to the established Cedars, Oaks, Beech and London Planes within the landscaped parkland areas.</p> <p>This is a site of historic interest and notable that it also holds the National Daffodil Collection and the scope of the Heritage Statement should be increased to encompass the wider setting of the Heritage Assets. In conclusion there is no objection in principle to the proposed development, but the periphery arrangements and in particular vehicle parking proposals detract somewhat from the significance of the gardens and parkland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin</p>
<p>Milton Keynes East Land East And West of A509 London Road, Newport Pagnell <b>RECONSULTATION</b></p>	Buckinghamshire	E21/0112	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid planning application encompassing: (i) outline element (with all matters reserved) for a large-scale mixed-use urban extension (creating a new community) comprising: residential development; employment including business, general industry and storage/distribution uses; a secondary school and primary schools; a community hub containing a range of commercial and community uses; a new linear park along the River Ouzel corridor; open space and linked amenities; new redways, access roads and associated highways improvements; associated</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) who are very familiar with the area and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The site for this extensive new area of Milton Keynes is due east of Grade II Campbell Park Registered Park and Garden (RPG), and so is likely to be visible in the long and panoramic views from its east-facing belvedere on the highest ground in the west of the RPG. These views are outlined in BGT's Research and Recording Dossier on the site, available at <a href="https://bucksgardenstrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Campbell_Park-rvsd1.pdf">https://bucksgardenstrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Campbell_Park-rvsd1.pdf</a> While these views already include built up areas we are particularly concerned to ensure that buildings taller than the general heights in place are not planned as these would be intrusive and damaging to the intended views. We urge the Council to ensure that tall buildings which affect these view lines are not permitted.</p> <p>In order not to damage these panoramic easterly views from Campbell</p>

				<p>infrastructure works; demolition of existing structures and (ii) detailed element for strategic highway and multi-modal transport infrastructure, including: new road and redway extensions; a new bridge over the M1 motorway; a new bridge over the River Ouzel; works to the Tongwell Street corridor between Tongwell roundabout and Pineham roundabout including new bridge over the River Ouzel; alignment alterations to A509 and Newport Road; and associated utilities, earthworks and drainage works</p> <p>Milton Keynes East, Land East And West of A509 London Road, Newport Pagnell, MK16 0JA MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>Park we also request additional tree planting to filter and break up views of the proposed developments as this area is short of trees generally. The proposed new park along the River Ouzel is an extension to the Ouzel Valley Park which the BGT has identified as of considerable local historic interest within the whole network of city open spaces. This is set out in its Research and Recording Dossier on the site, available at <a href="https://bucks gardenstrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Ouzel-Valley-BGT-R-R-FINAL-dossier-01-Dec-19.pdf">https://bucks gardenstrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Ouzel-Valley-BGT-R-R-FINAL-dossier-01-Dec-19.pdf</a>. We agree with the Milton Keynes Parks Trust that the applicant should follow Milton Keynes' original parkland design principle of 'strings, beads and settings' as identified in the BGT report. The application of this principle will help to provide continuity of character with the existing open space network of Milton Keynes which is very important to preserve, whilst providing functional and varied open spaces for the future inhabitants of Milton Keynes East. We request that the applicant works with the Milton Keynes Parks Trust in developing the scheme in detail.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wycombe Abbey <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Buckinghamshire	E21/0614	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of a new Energy Centre with four dual fuel boilers located in a purpose built modular building, a containerised Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit in an adjacent compound and a heat pump utilising waste heat and maximising the carbon savings and efficiency of the CHP. An exhaust stack of 17m is proposed as determined by stack height screening. The compound will have permanent fencing installed to denote the boundary and provide a degree of visual screening.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021</p> <p>Further to our letter of objection of 15th July due to concerns about the height of the stack, we can see the recently posted 'Site Elevation South' drawing appears to confirm that the flue is now below the height of the screen fencing surrounding the energy centre and no longer visible against the skyline. However, whilst we have been advised by the applicant that the exhaust stack for the proposed new energy centre will be reduced from 17m to 7m, we cannot see written evidence of that in these revised drawings.</p> <p>The GT/BGT are writing now therefore to confirm that, if the proposed exhaust stack is no higher than 7m, then we retract our previous objection to this scheme. The LPA must ensure that the height is no higher than 7m and that this would not be visible from Wycombe Abbey RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

				Wycombe General Hospital Queen Alexandra Road High Wycombe Buckinghamshire ENERGY/UTILITIES SUPPLY	
Wycombe Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E21/0795	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of lighting columns suitable for multi sport play Wycombe Abbey School Abbey Way High Wycombe Buckinghamshire SPORT/LEISURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2021 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 very much appreciate the extension given to us which has enabled our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust to make a site visit to assess the proposals in situ. We welcome the well-researched Heritage Statement and Landscape Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) commissioned by Wycombe Abbey and prepared by LUC, along with the two additional overspill diagrams. These proposals are for the installation of 10 x 10m lighting columns on the existing tennis courts which will be used to extend playing times between dusk and 10pm, October-April. We understand that the courts are for school use only and that the lighting can be manually operated to be turned off when the courts are not in use. The proposed lighting columns will replace existing low-level lighting fixed to the court perimeter fence and temporary mobile floodlighting units currently used to facilitate later playing times. We also note that the lighting is to be installed to the south-eastern two of the three banks of courts furthest away from the main school buildings. The Heritage Statement states that the courts are constructed on a level terrace to the south of the east park of the Wycombe Abbey grounds, bounded by an area of woodland to the south, and flanked on the south-east and north-east sides by belts of tree and shrub planting. Immediately adjacent to the courts are areas of gravel paths, grassed banks, low hedges and topiary. A raised path which provides access to the hockey pitches is lined with low level lighting which must create a line of illumination in this area but is lower than the proposed lighting columns. Site of tennis court on terrace Closer view of tennis court on terrace with likely position of proposed lighting columns indicated The position of the terrace reduces the impact within the immediate grounds although may make the site more prominent within the wider Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) and from views outside of the

					<p>RPG. The LVIA explores this and acknowledges where this impact might occur.</p> <p>The belts of trees will help to mitigate the impact of the proposed new lighting and must be maintained. However, we would not recommend the introduction of new planting to further diminish the effect of the proposals as this would represent further intervention into the landscape. We request that standards and lights are coloured black on the upper level visible above the planted screen to minimise visibility from a distance. However, we appreciate that, below the court boundary fencing, it may be necessary to paint them a different colour or to have some other means of highlighting them for the safety benefit of players.</p> <p>Looking at the Lawn Tennis Association’s guidance to lighting (floodlighting-guidance.pdf (lta.org.uk)) they suggest that if lower columns are installed there should be more of them.</p> <p>In terms of visual impact on the wider landscape, it would be preferable to have more columns, ideally 8m high, which would reduce the effect in longer views. Views close to the courts are more enclosed and less visible due to the level changes.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that additional lights are not added subsequently and that if possible, consent is conditioned on the lighting being manually operated and only turned on when in actual use and when the daylight drops below a certain level between October and April (as stated by the applicant).</p> <p>We would also urge the Planning Authority to ensure that this is the limit of floodlighting permitted on the courts and that further columns are not added to the remaining four courts nearest to the main house. This area/corner of the tennis court site is much more visible in the near and wider landscape and such an introduction would damage the RPG considerably.</p> <p>(see photo below)</p> <p>Corner of tennis courts nearest main building – these four courts are NOT currently proposed for lighting columns in order to protect the setting of the listed building. The LPA must ensure that this remains the case as lighting here would be very visible from the building and the RPG</p> <p>On our site visit, we noted the substantial lighting columns surrounding the hockey pitch which is less enclosed than the tennis courts. This should not set a precedent for the introduction of new lighting elsewhere on the site. We would recommend that should the applicant wish to replace this</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>lighting at some stage in the future, such proposals must be carefully considered in order to reduce the considerable visual damage resulting from the current lighting around the hockey pitches.</p> <p>Alongside tennis courts showing level change with tennis court area behind topiary on far right, concrete area on level below and then land slopes down to car park Lighting columns proposed here – 10 in total, i.e. three along each length with two in the middle of the middle</p> <p>The lighting columns will be 10 metres tall. Thus they will be as high as the surrounding trees seen in this photo (obviously the trees on the bank behind rising up the hill will be higher).</p> <p>8m would still be higher than the column shown in the photo below but would have less impact in wider views.</p> <p>Lighting columns by hockey pitch further away from main house are more prominent in landscape</p> <p>To summarise therefore, we would prefer that the lighting is not visible above the existing vegetation at all but we agree to this as long as the following conditions are imposed to minimise the damage to long views from the core of the site around the house:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce the height from 10m to 8m with additional number of lights as necessary, beyond the 10 currently proposed</li> <li>- No additional lights beyond the agreed number of 8m columns</li> <li>- Standards and lights coloured black on the upper level visible above the planted screen to minimise visibility from a distance</li> <li>- Lighting manually operated only when play is occurring, not automatic</li> <li>- All existing lights to be removed from court area</li> <li>- Allow the present planting to reach maximum height, without an additional strong screen, but add a few standard trees around the boundary at random intervals using woodland species on site to break up the screen vertically and offer some filtering of views of the lights</li> </ul> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grendon Hall	Buckinghamshire	E21/0903	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for access and scale for the construction of a new Category C prison (up to 67,000 sqm GEA)</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.09.2021</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) has brought the above application to the notice of the Gardens Trust (GT). As you are aware, the GT is a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting all grades of historic landscapes listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Although the grounds at Grendon Hall are</p>

				<p>within a secure perimeter fence together with access, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works on land adjacent to HMP Grendon and HMP Springhill, Grendon Underwood, Edgcott, Aylesbury HP18 OTL MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>not yet a Registered Park and Garden (RPG) it is, nonetheless, a hugely significant site and we strongly suggest that your officers consider this application in the light of its significance. This application has the potential to impact on the garden and parkland of Grendon Hall, the nearby Lawn as well as the wider historic landscape and listed buildings.</p> <p>The Bucks Gardens Trust has recently conducted a rigorous research project on both Grendon Hall and Lawn House to identify the significance of both as designed landscapes, as we have done with so many as yet unregistered sites. The result of our findings informs our comments. Our findings are available in our report Grendon-Hall-MASTER-23-Mar-21revised-6-June-2021-CdeC-1.pdf (bucksgardenstrust.org.uk)</p> <p>The GT/BGT OBJECT to this application. BGT in its rigorous Research and Recording Project (endorsed by Bucks Council HER and Historic England) has identified that the key elements of the late C19 country house designed landscape and its associated structures survive to a high degree, and are of considerable significance to the county of Buckinghamshire. There is no recognition of this by the applicants nor a rigorous and appropriate historic impact assessment.</p> <p>We object to the scheme because of the high level of damage it will inflict both to the historic environment, particularly the parkland, and its prominent and important immediate setting. We object further because there is apparently another similarly large scale scheme to be submitted for an adjacent site, the effect of which has not been considered with this application. It is invidious to have two such large scale applications and not to consider their cumulative effects on the historic environment together. Our detailed reasons for objection are as follows:</p> <p>The Significance of Grendon Hall and its Designed Landscape :</p> <p>Grendon Hall is an 1880s country house designed by Rev. Randolphe Henry Piggot, who, as well as the Hall, seemingly designed the stable block, stable yard crenelated walls, lodge (gone), and associated structures. The structures were united in the design using fashionable Jacobean style in red brick with stone dressings. Grendon Hall is listed Grade II, the Walled Garden is included under this listed as a curtilage structure. The gate piers, pedestrian gates and railings at the entrance to the site are separately listed Grade II. These historic assets are set within their contemporary and integral landscape which is of high local significance for its artistry, relationship with the built environment and level of survival. The house sits on an elevated site with the associated parkland and gardens which include</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--



					<p>a terrace, informal lawns with mature trees and shrubberies, and parkland. The layout of the site survives considerably intact, except for a 7ha. housing estate in the south park and HM Springhill Prison buildings in the pleasure grounds around the Hall to the east and south. The elevated areas of the site enjoy extensive views south and west. Whilst the site does not currently offer public access, we consider that the potential exists for former features related to the designed landscape since the 1880s to be uncovered, such as buildings, paths, beds, terraces, boundaries, and the lost north drive. The 1880s design incorporated hedgerow trees as specimens in the new park and a straight main drive was framed by an avenue. Some of the early specimen trees survive enclosing the informal lawns within the modest pleasure ground. The rural setting enjoys views over the Vale of Aylesbury to the south, south-east and west. Views remain from the house north-east towards Edgcott and from the pleasure grounds and park south-west towards Mill Hill, Doddershall Wood, and south to the village of Grendon Underwood and Waddesdon Hill in the distance. Unfortunately, the historic landscape and setting has been compromised to some degree due to the later developments including the 7ha. housing estate in the south park and prison buildings east and south of the Hall. In the 1960s Springhill housing estate was built in the area to the south of the approach road to house prison staff. These developments all took place prior to Grendon Hall being listed in 1985 (Grade II). It is highly unlikely that the two existing prisons, and the Springhill housing estate, would have been constructed if Grendon Hall had been listed prior to their development. We reiterate that a considerable degree of the designed landscape survives, particularly the key features such as the drive, parkland, pleasure grounds and principal buildings.</p> <p>There is also potential archaeological interest due to evidence of Roman occupation given the proximity to Akeman Street and archaeological evidence nearby along the route of HS2. The medieval Forest of Bernwood provides this area with a unique heritage, many of the features and place names being a direct legacy of the ancient royal forest. There is also the potential for evidence associated with the Forest particularly relates to banks, routes, boundaries and buildings. The park itself is rich in ridge and furrow.</p> <p>The Significance of Lawn House :</p> <p>Lawn House is a Grade II listed 17th century house with later alterations standing on the edge of the park. The area around the house is wooded</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>with some trees in excess of 100 years in age. During the C19 there were orchards to the south and west of the house and deciduous trees around the boundary (1st Ed OS). Other features include a large pond (possibly a stock pond), possible ha-ha, and remnants of park fencing. A former kitchen garden was situated directly to the west of the house and is shown on the 1885 6" OS by diagonal dotted lines. Lawn House and its grounds were formerly part of Grendon Hall and the historic park associated with the Hall. However, today the grounds of Lawn House extend to 12 acres of garden, a grass field and a wooded area. There are three ponds and the grounds are registered as a great crested newt site. On two sides of the grounds belonging to Lawn House, the site shares a boundary with the prison site. The distance from Lawn House to the nearest prison site boundary is just 115m. From the outbuildings of Lawn House the prison boundary is just 80m away.</p> <p>Impact of these proposals :</p> <p>This planning application includes an LVIA and a Heritage Statement. The Heritage Statement acknowledges the potential harm that these proposals will have on Grendon Hall, Lawn House and their associated landscapes and setting. However, it completely undervalues the significance of these heritage assets. One of the justifications is a wholly inaccurate evaluation of survival of the designed landscape, that the land and setting has already been eroded by the previous development and that 'therefore the historic narrative of an isolated dwelling set within a deliberately verdant wooded landscape is already significantly diminished'. Having visited the publicly accessible areas of the application site, we entirely disagree with this. In spite of previous damaging development, much of the historic site and its significant fabric, design and setting remains intact. The landscape and its views could be restored to a great degree. Further development would result in irretrievable damage and ultimately loss of the significance of this historic asset.</p> <p>The assessment of the potential impact upon Lawn House states that the 'inter-visibility and interrelationship between the heritage asset and the application site is limited due to intervening vegetation including scrub and woodland in conjunction with an undulating topography.' That topography contributes to the significance of the site and its associated views, and the scrub and woodland could be restored to reinstate the historic landscape and setting. Further 'mitigation' planting merely adds to this 'intervening vegetation' and would considerably damage the historic character and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>design.</p> <p>The assessment of the impact upon the Walled Garden merely repeats the previous assessments to suggest erroneously that previous development has already significantly diminished the asset.</p> <p>We conclude, following a visit to the publicly accessible areas of the application site that the intervisibility and interrelationship of the heritage assets and the application site would result in serious harm to the heritage assets and we therefore disagree entirely with the assessment offered in this Heritage Statement.</p> <p>We also disagree with the Heritage Statement’s assessment that the application site is peripheral and that the impact of these proposals on the heritage assets is limited. Furthermore, just because a piece of land is currently redundant from its previous use does not make it available to inappropriate development. The Heritage Statement directly references ‘the Prime Minister’s objective to build modern, efficient prisons..,’ and we consider therefore that this Statement has been written in order to diminish the significance of the heritage assets in order to support this objective.</p> <p>In conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Gardens Trust agrees with the many other voices of objection to these proposals in that they would have a significant, irreversible and harmful impact on the settings of both Grendon Hall and Lawn House. In addition there would also be harm to the setting of the Grade II listed gate piers and metal fencing at the current entrance to the prison site as well as the parkland.</li> <li>· The new prison would be effectively in the ‘rear garden’ of Grendon Hall and would only be separated by some of the much lower buildings belonging to HMP Springhill, built prior to the listing of Grendon Hall.</li> <li>· The new prison would be within 230m of Lawn House and the closest buildings would be approximately 100m from the boundary of Lawn House.</li> <li>· The green field where the new site entrance and road, plus the relocated football pitch are to be located, is part of the historic park and garden for Grendon Hall as well as being part of a historic area of ridge and furrow and would result in further irreversible harm.</li> </ul> <p>The Gardens Trust therefore strongly objects to this application and urges the Planning Authority to reject this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E21/0931	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of agricultural building Mentmore Park Farm Mentmore Buckinghamshire LU7 0QN AGRICULTURE	<p>Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2021</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 for both applications as they relate to the same site. In March this year we wrote to object to 20/03303/APP as the building then proposed was considerably higher. Regardless of the subsequent and extant permission for a building on this site, these two new applications continue the unwelcome, incremental increase of industrial scale sheds at the edge of the Grade II* Mentmore registered park and garden (RPG) and in an exposed part of it. Inspection of aerial photos since the mid-C20 shows clearly the scale of this continued development which, although Mentmore park is large, has become entirely out of keeping with its historic setting in both scale and character. For this reason we therefore object to this application.</p> <p>Whilst the GT/BGT continues to object to the ever-increasing footprint of industrial size barns where there was no farm before, should your officers decide to approve both these applications (moving the permitted barn to allow the insertion of another between it and other buildings), we reiterate our advice put forward in our letter of 5th Oct 2019 with regard to essential screening:</p> <p>‘We would advise a narrow belt of mixed trees in the field along the outer (west) side of the present clipped hedge parallel with the Cheddington road and continuing in the field wrapping around the south side of the buildings. It should be informal, in two staggered rows, and comprise a mixture of suitable, historically appropriate species (ideally immune to currently prevalent pests and diseases) which should include a mix of something like sycamore, Scots pine, common oak, field maple and walnut. Initially we suggest these be planted at final mature spacing, interspersed with poplar as a nurse crop that will be removed once the main species are maturing. The trees will need management to ensure they achieve an attractive form. We suggest that AVDC tree officer advises on the practical detail of choosing and mixing species, siting, spacings, pruning during maturing, etc. and ensures completion of this.’</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
-----------------	-----------------	----------	-----	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E21/0953	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement floodlights to tennis courts and new column lighting to car park area Stowe School Stowe Park Stowe Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH EXTERNAL LIGHTING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed Grade I by Historic England (HE) on the Register of Parks and Gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Ideally, we would prefer to see the tennis courts restored as the flower garden for the Menagerie, as stated as the main aim in the Conservation Plan of 2013 (Rutherford), relating to Area 3c, the Lower Flower Garden. However, if this is not yet possible and the tennis courts are to remain then we do not oppose replacement floodlighting if it is appropriately sited and causes no further damage. We advise an approach which, while improving the lighting and safety of this part of the site, does not cause increased harm to the heritage assets or their setting. The applicant must demonstrate that this proposal causes no additional damage to such a significant area of the historic site and all the affected assets in its vicinity. Careful scrutiny of the documents relating to the proposal indicates that it does not fulfil this criterion and so we object for the reasons set out below. The Planning Statement does not quantify the damaging effect on the heritage assets, beyond acknowledging their existence and identifying that they will definitely be affected. We suggest that the 2013 Conservation Plan (S Rutherford) and the further wealth of information about Stowe as a heritage asset should form the basis for such an assessment. Neither does the Planning Statement include a Heritage Statement. A designed landscape as significant as Stowe requires a Heritage Statement and a fully rigorous and objective Heritage Impact Assessment for every application that potentially damages the heritage asset as this does. Wycombe Abbey, in a similar current case within a RPG, and also a school, has employed specialist historic environment landscape architects and planners to assess the impact of proposed lighting changes. With regard to the effect of the proposed columns, the Planning Statement notes that "... the new columns are almost double in height than the existing. Whilst it is recognised the impact of the new lights will therefore be more than that of the existing (sic). However, it is felt that the setting of the Menagerie has already been heavily altered and impacted on by the tennis courts and other recent development and that the alterations to the

					<p>flood lighting will not cause further harm." [our emphasis] Implementation of recent damaging alterations should not be used to justify further damaging changes. Such continued incremental development further damages the historic fabric, character and significance of internationally significant Stowe.</p> <p>Your officers will be aware of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. This states (p2) 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change' and also (p4) 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' Both are relevant in this instance.</p> <p>The Statement makes no credible attempt to quantify the impact on the wider landscape. While there are indeed tall trees, their type and role in screening is not assessed, nor the effect if the trees are lost. There is no understanding of whether there are gaps between the trees or any assessment of the trees as part of the heritage asset. They have only been considered as an obstruction to light emittance.</p> <p>The reference to the impact on the South Lawn implies that this is the only significant heritage asset which could be affected. This is disingenuous as the entire RPG is a heritage asset. In addition, the late-C18 Grade II Menagerie is the closest listed structure and the focus of the flower garden that formerly occupied the area of the current tennis courts. The level of damage to the entirety of the affected heritage assets in all their complexity needs to be adequately assessed and, if possible, justified. By acknowledging that the column lighting for the car park causes less damage than the floodlighting, therefore, by definition, it is accepted that the impact of the floodlights will continue and compound the damage of the present column lighting.</p> <p>Unless the applicant can demonstrate credibly that the impact on the heritage assets will not further damage either the internationally significant landscape or the setting of the built heritage, we urge the Council to refuse consent for this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office
Latimer Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/0954	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Single storey timber framed extension to rear. Old Rectory, Church Lane, Latimer, Buckinghamshire, HP5 1UA BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021</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 there have been numerous applications regarding this property which are listed on both the planning site and also run to almost 5 pages in the Design and Access Statement submitted as part of this application. We are very concerned that the planning authority has failed to consult the Gardens Trust on these previous applications and, as a consequence, many works have been permitted which potentially negatively impact upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Latimer Park.</p> <p>Latimer Park is an 18th century RPG which Capability Brown advised upon. The application site sits just south of Rectory Plantation and within the north-east section of the RPG which extends along the west side of the valley going north from the village. The Old Rectory itself is an 18th century two storey brick building and there are ancillary structures within the gardens including a former outbuilding which has been converted to residential use and is known as Rectory Cottage.</p> <p>The proposal is to construct a single storey timber framed orangery garden room on the north side of outbuildings associated with the Old Rectory although its position appears to also be close to Rectory Cottage. The proposed orangery garden room would appear to look towards the swimming pool and tennis court and to have views across both of these towards the Rectory.</p> <p>As we have not visited the property, we are unable to assess whether the proposed orangery garden room will be visible in views. However, the introduction of a predominantly glazed structure in this position may result in light emittance and reflection in both near and distant views, especially as the proposed lantern roof is also glazed which would potentially impact on the RPG.</p> <p>The proposed Orangery is already surrounded by other structures and the site as a whole has seen quite a lot of development, which as we</p>

					<p>mentioned, were were not consulted upon. Your officers need to reassure themselves that this additional building will not be visible from the wider park and that no light emittance is visible from the wider parkland. We would also suggest that there needs to be a consensus as to the limit of development and alterations within Latimer Park, as the incremental development has already taken up much of the available space. We are extremely concerned that this cumulative development has had an adverse effect upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/0967	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey side extension Lodge Farm Wotton Underwood Buckinghamshire HP18 0SB BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2021</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 extended yet again to enlarge a structure which is already out of scale with the original 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 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 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"> <li>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 and lodge, as well as the setting of the listed garden wall further to the north and the historic buildings beyond this.</li> <li>2. The building would detract from 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.</li> </ol>



					<p>3. The building has an alien appearance, particularly the roof structure which is not typical of an historic garden structure. 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 historically appropriate to the historic character of this property or of kitchen gardens of this period.</p> <p>4. The path and the seating area introduces a formality and style which are inappropriate to the historic character of the walled garden.</p> <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> <p>a) Roof with a monopitch in slate to evoke a potting shed roof or similar working kitchen garden structure.</p> <p>b) Reduce the footprint and amend it to align the new building line behind the existing building line 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.</p> <p>c) Avoid a formal terrace area around the structure, use instead a simple lawned setting.</p> <p>d) Because of the history of piecemeal proposals for this property, and 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 minimise further potential damage to the historic character and fabric by providing a justified long-term approach which is guided by an historically appropriate and proportionate strategy.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E21/0980	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use from paddock to equine manege and new permeable access track</p> <p>Stud Cottage Crafton Lodge Road</p> <p>Crafton Mentmore</p> <p>Buckinghamshire LU7 0QJ</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021</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 manege lies within the setting of the Grade II* Mentmore registered park and garden (RPG). The application site is within an area which has</p>

					historically had an equine use with paddocks, starting with Lord Rosebery. As long as the applicant does not install lighting gantries or anything which might be seen from the RPG and which could contribute light pollution, we have no objection to this proposal from the heritage point of view. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Fawley Court and Temple Island	Buckinghamshire	E21/0981	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration of grade II listed riding school, restoration of grade II listed chapel, dairy and service courtyards, restoration of clock and water tower, construction of new estate office, staff and guest accommodation and demolition of existing derelict structures Fawley Court Marlow Road Fawley Buckinghamshire REPAIR/RESTORATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021 The above applications have been brought to our attention by colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust. Their local knowledge informs this joint response. We are pleased to see this currently disused but important area, being sensitively restored and re-used. We are supportive of the proposals as long as : - Historically appropriate screening of the service area from the wider RPG is ensured using historically appropriate species as identified in the conservation plan - Any additional vehicle movements generated as a result do not require alteration to the historic gateways or drives Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Beachampton Hall	Buckinghamshire	E21/0986	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a sunken swimming pool to be located within the walled garden Beachampton Hall Thornton Road Beachampton Buckinghamshire MK19 6DU MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.09.2021 AVDC's Heritage Officer has specifically requested that the Gardens Trust (GT) and Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) be consulted about this application as we are all aware of the great potential significance of the site and the strong possibility of future designation, despite the fact that currently the garden is not listed as a registered park and garden. Beachampton was identified in the 1995 Buckinghamshire Register Review exercise as a strong potential candidate for registration when Historic England has an opportunity to fully review it. This application raises legitimate concerns regarding the historic significance of the site and the proposed works. The GT/BGT object to this application. Our preliminary research indicates that there are potentially the remains of a garden dating back to 1603, laid out by Sir Thomas Piggot for the reception of Queen Anne of Denmark and her entourage. The Buckinghamshire Heritage Portal notes the following : 'surviving remains of

					<p>walled area with raised side terrace and terminal gate piers. Existing rose garden perhaps originally the privy garden... Detailed earthwork survey indicates a series of regular terraces (one of which was known as 'Old Orchard' in 1771) and raised walkways, with at least 3 rectangular ponds along 2 sides of the 'East Gardens', on the east side of the existing farmhouse. Further larger terraces or closes, laid out on a similar alignment, and traces of possible raised walkways in the field to the east of the access drive to Hall Farm, suggest that the formal 17th century gardens originally extended beyond the surviving walled area.... Eastern garden possibly an early 17th century privy garden, designed and built at the same time as the Great Parlour wing, with a knot garden designed to be seen from the oriel window of the Great Chamber, and a bowling green overlooked by terraces on the west side.'</p> <p>We feel very strongly that this or any future applications for this site should only be made once the historic significance of the site is fully understood. There is a real opportunity here to recognise and identify potentially an extremely significant historic garden. We therefore ask that the Planning Authority either refuse consent for this application or that the application is withdrawn by the applicant until a full Historic Landscape Assessment and/or Statement of Heritage Significance is conducted on the entire site by an independent Landscape Historian. In our opinion it is crucial that no further works are carried out in the meantime in case a rare and as yet under-researched historic garden is damaged by development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Huntercombe Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/1011	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Approval of conditions 4 (LEMP), 6 (Lighting Strategy) 9 (Waste Water Capacity Check), 16 (Estate Roads &amp; Footpaths), 17 (Parking Strategy), 22 (Landscaping), 25 (Energy Statement), 28 (Boundary Treatment Plan) of planning permission PL/19/2305/FA Demolition of the existing office buildings (Use Class B1) and erection of 3 nos three storey and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021</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 again liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this third joint response.</p> <p>The GT has already responded twice to the Huntercombe applications and we are particularly concerned to ensure that the key aspects identified in our previous responses (dated 20th May 2015 and July 29th 2020 and appended to this e-mail) are adequately addressed to ensure that the development does not further damage the setting of the RPG. It is unclear</p>

				<p>2 nos four storey buildings to provide 165 residential flats (Use Class C3) (comprising 45 x 1 bedroom units, 113 x 2-bedroom units and 7 x 3-bedroom units), incorporating car parking, open space, landscaping, drainage and infrastructure works.</p> <p>Land at Huntercombe Park (former Pfizer Pharmaceuticals), Huntercombe Lane South, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL6 0PH</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>from the documents submitted whether these aspects are adequately addressed. We therefore ask the Council to ensure that the following stipulations are absolutely complied with, in the conditions relating to two particular aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the effect of night-time lighting does not damage views from the RPG, via the use of low level light sources directed downwards, and that this provision cannot be altered to more intrusive methods at a later date.</li> <li>2. That the current screen planting on the applicants' land is maintained in perpetuity, and enhanced to ensure it screens all views of the development including night-time light, using appropriate species based on the historic palette in the woodland planting of the RPG.</li> </ol> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tabley House	Cheshire	E21/1067	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of freestanding rock buttress to northern face of the Roaring Bridge</p> <p>Roaring Bridge, Tabley Mere, TABLEY LANE, TABLEY</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2021</p> <p>We have noted this application and are informed that The Gardens Trust (GT) has no record of being notified in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Tabley House is a registered park and garden Grade II. Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We do not object to this application for a rockfill buttress, but are concerned that a time limit be imposed on this 'temporary' permission. We have knowledge of the site and have visited Tabley Mere, the Roaring Bridge and boathouse previously.</p> <p>In brief, the significance of Tabley Park lies in the time depth of the historic landscape, home of the Leicester family for 700 years, site of their medieval moated manor house with island garden, Palladian mansion by John Carr of 1767 (Grade I) and 17th century family chapel (Grade I). The park is traversed by the route of the historic road to Knutsford as well as a series of later drives and walks for access and pleasure. These are all within a designed landscape laid out in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries which include a moated site with enlarged pool, the mere and extension of the mere by John Webb in 1803. Features such as the Folly Tower (listed Grade II), the roaring bridge, the Gothick boathouse (listed Grade II), as well as a number of lodges (which are also listed Grade II) add to the</p>

					<p>character and quality of this well documented historic designed landscape, recorded by artists such as Anthony Devis and JMW Turner as well as in sketches by members of the Leicester family.</p> <p>Our concerns relating to this application are as follows:</p> <p>Under “Details of pre application advice”, it is stated that a “Site Meeting to discuss remedial works proposed for the reservoir including works to the roaring bridge. No objections raised provided that the works were temporary”. We consider that, as in the case of temporary structures, a time limit should be placed on the duration of the permission. This would allow the applicant time to develop permanent proposals to safeguard the integrity and conserve the historic significance of the weir, bridge and boathouse together as part of the registered historic landscape.</p> <p>The compound for the Roaring Bridge work is sited on the Tabley House Collection car park but there appears to be no provision for alternative car parking for visitors. This facility is important for visitor access and the sustainability of the Tabley House Collection.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Cheshire Gardens Trust</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021</p> <p>The above planning application has been brought to our attention by our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT). We are disappointed that your officers failed to notify us of this as Tabley House is registered as a Grade II Park and Garden (RPG). You will be aware that the Gardens Trust (GT) is a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site of any grade listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The requirement for consultation is currently set out in Article 18/Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Before granting planning permission for development, LPAs must consult the Gardens Trust and Historic England as explained in detail at : <a href="http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk">http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk</a></p> <p>We do not object to this application for a rockfill buttress, but are concerned that a time limit be imposed on this ‘temporary’ permission. Our colleagues in the CGT have knowledge of the site and have visited Tabley Mere, the Roaring Bridge and boathouse previously. The</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>significance of Tabley Park lies in the time depth of the historic landscape, home of the Leicester family for 700 years, site of their medieval moated manor house with island garden, Palladian mansion by John Carr of 1767 (Grade I) and 17th century family chapel (Grade I). The park is traversed by the route of the historic road to Knutsford as well as a series of later drives and walks for access and pleasure. These are all within a designed landscape laid out in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries which include a moated site with enlarged pool, the mere and extension of the mere by John Webb in 1803. Features such as the Folly Tower (listed Grade II), the roaring bridge, the Gothick boathouse (listed Grade II), as well as a number of lodges (which are also listed Grade II) add to the character and quality of this well documented historic designed landscape, recorded by artists such as Anthony Devis and JMW Turner as well as in sketches by members of the Leicester family.</p> <p>We have concerns relating to this application. Under “Details of pre application advice”, it is stated that a “Site Meeting to discuss remedial works proposed for the reservoir including works to the roaring bridge. No objections raised provided that the works were temporary”. We consider that, as in the case of temporary structures, a time limit should be placed on the duration of the permission. This would allow the applicant time to develop permanent proposals to safeguard the integrity and conserve the historic significance of the weir, bridge and boathouse together as part of the registered historic landscape.</p> <p>The compound for the Roaring Bridge work is sited on the Tabley House Collection car park but there appears to be no provision for alternative car parking for visitors. This facility is important for visitor access and the sustainability of the Tabley House Collection.</p> <p>I am attaching a copy of our Planning Leaflet with guidance for Local Planning Authorities, and consultation guidelines for your information. We would be most grateful if in future you could ensure that we are not omitted from any consultations which might affect RPGs in your area and look forward to being advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Creedy Park	Devon	E21/0640	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of additional pavilion,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above revised

				change of use of agricultural land to cricket pitch and associated works to land at Sandford Cricket Club, Creedy Park SPORT/LEISURE	<p>application.</p> <p>Creedy Park is included on the Devon Gazetteer of landscapes of local and regional significance. The park forms the designed setting to Creedy Park, which is Listed at Grade II. We submitted comments to your Authority on the original application, to which we objected, in a letter dated 12 July 2021.</p> <p>We have carefully reviewed the revised information on your website, and particularly the email dated 25 August 2021 from the Applicant's Agent in which it is undertaken that no pavilion will be built, no building operations will take place, no tree felling will take place and new fencing will match existing. We conclude that this revised development would not cause substantial harm to the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park, notwithstanding the detrimental impact of increased traffic movements within the park arising from more intensive use of the site.</p> <p>If your Authority is now minded to grant permission for this revised development, we would ask that appropriate conditions should be applied to that consent in order to ensure that the undertakings made in the Agent's email of 25 August 2021 are implemented in a robust manner.</p> <p>In view of our increasing concern at the incremental development taking place or proposed within, or immediately adjoining Creedy Park, we would urge your Authority to bring forward supplementary planning guidance for the area of the historic park in order to ensure that its historic significance as a designed landscape and the setting of a Grade II Listed building is not eroded by such development. Clarity on matters such as, for instance, the acceptability in principle of new building within the historic park landscape would be beneficial for residents, landowners and potential applicants. Devon Gardens Trust would be pleased to participate in the development of such supplementary guidance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Shobrooke Park	Devon	E21/0826	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of carport, formation of hardstanding and alterations to existing potting shed Rookery Lodge Creedy Park Crediton	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Creedy Park, an historic designed landscape included on the Devon Gazetteer of designed landscapes of regional and local significance. The development also has the potential to affect the setting of Shobrooke Park, a site included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and</p>

				BUILDING ALTERATIONS	<p>Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon. In addition, Devon Gardens Trust may comment on proposals affecting sites included on the Devon Gazetteer of historic designed landscapes of local and regional significance.</p> <p>We note that the applicant has not evaluated the potential impact of the proposed development on the setting of Shobrooke Park in the submitted Planning Statement (11 August 2021). While we have concluded that any impact is likely to be minimal, we consider that this should have been made explicit in the supporting documentation.</p> <p>While Devon Gardens Trust is seriously concerned by the level of incremental development proposed, or taking place within, and in the immediate setting of Creedy Park, having reviewed the information and documents on your website relating to this application, we do not wish to make any comment on these proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
The Hoe	Devon	E21/0969	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of conditions 1 (plans) &amp; 21 (roof additions) and addition of condition (to allow roof plant works to be undertaken prior to certain conditions being discharged) in relation to application 20/00673/FUL</p> <p>The Laboratory Hoe Road Plymouth PL1 2PB</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects The Hoe, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</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 considered the information on your website and conclude that the proposed amendments would have a less than substantial impact on the historic designed landscape of The Hoe.</p> <p>We have no objections to the proposed variation of conditions, or the proposed new condition.</p>



					Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust
Endsleigh	Devon	E21/0983	I	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land along riverside within RPG	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects an area within or immediately adjoining (and lying within the setting of), the historic designed landscape of Endsleigh, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade I.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have examined the supporting documentation for this application, and note that the sites of the proposed felling lie within that part of the Tamar valley which forms the designed landscape setting of Endsleigh, an internationally significant example of a Picturesque designed landscape, the core of which was laid out for the sixth Duke of Bedford by Humphry Repton from 1814.</p> <p>As a general comment, we would highlight the Picturesque character of the internationally significant designed landscape at Endsleigh, which relies, in part, upon visual contrast of coniferous and broadleaf tree species to create contrasts of colour and texture. It is very important to understand that this Picturesque aesthetic extended to landscape improvement beyond the immediate confines of the gardens and pleasure grounds at Endsleigh, and can be found in what might otherwise be considered to be wider Estate planting, for example at Carthaartha, Bishop's Rocks, Castlepark Hill and adjacent to Greystone Bridge. The Duke's Drive on the Cornish bank of the Tamar extends from Tutwell in the south, north to Greystone Bridge; while the Endleigh Drive extends on the Devon bank from Horsebridge north to Greystone Bridge. The inter-related views across the valley from each drive is a key element of the Picturesque landscape design. These views, together with key views from structures within the Grade I designed landscape such as the Swiss Cottage (which extend west towards Dunterton and Bodmin Moor) will need to be taken into consideration when planning felling and replanting in this area.</p>

					<p>This understanding of the design principles underlying the historic designed landscape at Endsleigh will need to be considered in future planting and management decisions affecting the Tavistock Woodlands. We would be happy to advise further as plans for the Tavistock Woodlands evolve.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Arlington Court	Devon	E21/1005	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land to the S, SW, W of St James Court</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects an area within the historic designed landscape of Arlington Court, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have examined the supporting documentation for this application, and note that some of the proposed felling would take place within the nationally designated historic designed landscape (eg compartments 16f, 34b and 35a). There is a clear need for appropriate forestry management, especially in the context of the loss of significant numbers of ash.</p> <p>We are generally supportive of the proposed felling and re-planting. In relation to those areas lying within the historic designed landscape or its setting, we would recommend that appropriate species should be selected for replanting which will reflect the aesthetic character of Arlington Court as an example of early and mid-nineteenth century Picturesque planting. We would highlight the Picturesque character of the nationally significant designed landscape at Arlington, which relies, in part, upon visual contrast of coniferous and broadleaf tree species to create contrasts of colour and texture. It is very important to understand that this Picturesque aesthetic extended to landscape improvement beyond the immediate confines of the gardens and pleasure grounds at Arlington, and can be found in what might otherwise be considered to be wider Estate planting. This understanding of the design principles underlying the historic designed landscape at Arlington will need to be considered in future planting and</p>

					<p>management decisions.  We would be happy to advise further as plans for woodlands on the Arlington Estate evolve.  Yours sincerely  Jonathan Lovie  Conservation Officer  Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Rushmore Park	Dorset	E21/0908	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION  Felling Licence Application  Land surrounding Sandroyd School</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2021  The Forestry Commission has consulted The Gardens Trust on this felling application, and they in turn have forwarded this to the Dorset Gardens Trust for comment. I am the local contact for conservation and planning matters, and this may be taken as the formal response from both Trusts. The Trusts' interest in this stems from the designation by Historic England of the Rushmore Estate as a nationally registered Park or Garden. The great majority of the designated area is within Wiltshire, with only a small part on its southern edge in Dorset. The detailed official statement for Rushmore Park, designated Grade II, is within the HE register, and I am sure that you will have made reference to it.  The Trusts recognise that the question of felling of woodland is at some stage inevitable, but do suggest that the designation should not be ignored as a result. I have a copy of the letter sent to you dated 15 September 2021 from the Cranborne Chase AONB office, which includes a number of paragraphs on the relationship of the proposals to the designated area of Rushmore Park. As these comments relate to the whole area, and not just the Dorset part, the Trusts ask please that these comments are given due weight.  The issue here is that the estate is not just a woodland per se, but was laid out in the 19th century as much as a pleasure ground for local people as for any commercial use, and it still has this use. This creates a different character and context to the estate, and it is this that needs to be recognised and used as a reference point for any felling. The Trusts understand that many of the pockets proposed for work relate to thinning rather than clear felling, which clearly is more acceptable within this context.  Yours sincerely,  Christopher Clarke  for the Dorset Gardens Trust, and on behalf of The Gardens Trust</p>
The Garden House	East	E21/1122	N	PLANNING APPLICATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2021

Dewhurst Lane, Wadhurst	Sussex			<p>Extension and Folly attached to Walled C19 Kitchen Garden. The Garden House Dewhurst Lane Wadhurst East Sussex TN5 6QB BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have closely examined the documents submitted with this application. The Trust objects to the application in its present form since it is not supported by a proper conservation statement prepared by a suitably qualified person, nor is there sufficient detail to be sure the proposed openings and new structures will not cause harm to the existing historic walls.</p> <p>Rationale</p> <p>In 2015 SGT commented on the draft Wealden Local Plan. Amongst other things SGT agreed with a statement at paragraph 21.35 of the Wealden document that stated: “there may be other historic parks and gardens in the District that would warrant protection because they are demonstrably of equal significance to those designated.”</p> <p>SGT provided a schedule of sites known to the Trust which may be of significance so that planning applications at such sites are not approved without adequate evaluation (see SGT Comments on Draft Wealden Local Plan Dec 2015).</p> <p>Although not included on the Historic England Registers of Listed Buildings and Parks and Gardens, Dewhurst Lodge, the Walled Garden, Clock House and The Garden House together form a complex of buildings with historical interest; as such they constitute a non-designated historical asset.</p> <p>Paragraph 203 of the 2021 version of the NPPF states: 203. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. Any development in such a potentially sensitive location, deserves a properly considered appreciation of the significance of the walled garden, its sensitivity to change and the development's impact on the setting of this non designated heritage asset. Only then can one fully assess the appropriateness of the architectural detailing, the physical effect of new structures on existing fabric, and the appropriateness of height and location.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Before this application is determined, SGT considers a proper conservation statement from a professional consultant should be provided, with supporting visuals, to demonstrate the appropriateness of such structures</p>
----------------------------	--------	--	--	---	---

					<p>on the walled garden's appearance and significance to the whole complex and the historic relationship of the complex with its surrounding landscape. Full construction details should also be provided to demonstrate the historic walls are not compromised.</p> <p>Yours faithfully  Jim Stockwell  On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.  CC: The Gardens Trust</p>
Danbury Park, Riffhams	Essex	E20/1622	II, II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Installation of a solar photovoltaic (PV) park generating up to 25 MW of electricity spread over two sites (sited either side of St Cleres Hall Pit), comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, grid connection cables, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements. Land East And West Of St Cleres Hall Pit, Main Road, Danbury, Chelmsford.  SOLAR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2021  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 considered the various revisions submitted by the applicant after our previous letter of 17th February 2021.  We appreciate the measures taken to mitigate the impact of the solar farm, but they are an acknowledgement that it will have an impact on its surroundings, creating what is in effect an industrial site in an area of landscape sensitivity much appreciated by local people, and close to two registered landscapes. We see no reason to alter our original stance and maintain a strong objection.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Boreham House	Essex	E21/0251	-	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Construction of electric vehicle charging station with 12 charging points and associated ancillary works. Land West Of Paynes Lane And North Of Main Road Boreham Chelmsford Essex  MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2021  Thank you for sending us the updated landscape plans etc. I have discussed these with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust who are familiar with the site.  Whilst we appreciate this effort to screen the development and mitigate its impact on the wider surrounds, the additional information still gives no sense of wider visualisation of the general appearance of the forecourt, its canopies and signage, and so we maintain our objection.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung</p>

					Conservation Officer
Cowley Manor <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Gloucestershire	E21/0996	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Free-standing new-build pavilion for 4 new family guest bedrooms set within the unused NW Courtyard Terrace (Former Swimming Pool) at Cowley Manor Cowley Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 9NL BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.09.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Cowley Manor has had a chequered history, with many interventions to the building and its surrounding gardens and park. In its current re-imagining as an hotel, inevitably these changes will still occur. The redevelopment of the derelict swimming pool to give the additional form of a pavilion, does help the overall massing of the building. I am grateful to the Heritage Statement prepared by Mr. James Edgar, as it does provide the only coherent image of the extended wing and the precast units. I leave this to the District's Conservation Officer to determine that their colour, texture and detailing will merge happily with the existing building. The impact of this proposal has little direct visual impact on the defined parkland setting. However, the spin- off issue of parking that is associated with and raised by this proposal, might result in further interventions into the landscaping. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Woodchester Park	Gloucestershire	E21/1035	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 2.7km play trail through Marmontsflat Wood. Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Gloucestershire, GL10 3TS. PLAY AREA	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this submission on its behalf. The proposed play trail replaces an earlier set of play structures within the Ancient Woodland, that have ceased to be safe or useful due to their age and natural deterioration. However, the need to rethink and reinstate this feature is very logical, as it helps to sustain the interest of young people in their trek from the National Trust car park down to Woodchester Park house and its parkland. This proposal has been the subject of extensive consultation, and the siting of each play element has been carefully considered to minimise damage to the Ancient Woodland environment. Where overuse is evident, elements of this trail can be closed on a temporary basis for the site in question to recover.

					Overall, this proposal represents an appropriate and controlled intensification of use in the woodland, which will benefit this low intensity visitor asset. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Osterley Park	Greater London	E20/0868	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the demolition of existing building and car park and erection of buildings to provide up to 1,677 residential homes, plus up to 5,000 sqm flexible non-residential space comprising commercial, business and service space, and/or learning and non-residential institution space, and/or local community space, and/or public house/drinking establishment, and/or a mobility hub, along with associated access, bus turning, car and cycle parking, and landscaping arrangements. TESCO SUPERSTORE, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5NZ. MAJOR HYBRID	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2021 The Gardens Trust (GT), as a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site of any grade listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens, strongly objected to both the above applications on 4th December 2020. The applications will cause a high degree of harm to the setting of three of the most important registered parks and gardens (RPG) in England: Osterley Park (Grade II*), Syon Park (Grade I) and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (Grade I) which is also a World Heritage Site. The Gardens Trust requests that you call in these planning applications for your own determination as they raise issues of national significance. We set out below clear reasons why the application should be called in. In summary, the applications damage to an unacceptable degree the setting of not just one but most unusually, three sites of national significance (two of which are additionally of international importance) on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. Only about 1660 sites in England are listed, 40% of which are Grade II* and 10% Grade I. We refer you to our letter of 4th December 2020 (attached) which sets out our main objections, identifying the high level of harm to the significance of these designed landscapes. The applicant's assessment of level of damage is in our opinion, seriously inaccurate in its appraisal of the effect on views from all three, unrealistically minimising the effect and damage inflicted, and omitting a number of key views. As we set out in our letter, Osterley Park will suffer the greatest visual damage, the proposed development having a considerably worse effect than existing developments which are currently visible. With regard to the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew and Syon Park, we attach an authoritative Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) by an independent conservation professional of many years experience, Dr Sarah Rutherford. This credibly identifies 'substantial harm' to a number of key heritage assets in Kew and Syon including the Kew World Heritage Site. The applications will harm the outlook from the south-western parts of Kew, in particular the outlook from the seminal C18 Arcadian Syon Lawn across the

					<p>Thames to Syon Park, from where these two proposed developments will appear above the tree line forming the backdrop to both internationally significant landscapes. This outlook is at present, remarkably almost entirely unaffected by intrusive modern development, with an unbroken treeline extending all the way along this reach of the river. These areas of Kew's setting possess priceless attributes (such as the Capability Brown designed landscape), which contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of Kew as set out in its World Heritage Site Management Plan 2020-2025, and ratified by this government in 2020. These areas of Kew's setting possess priceless attributes (such as the Capability Brown designed landscape), which contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of Kew as set out in its World Heritage Site Management Plan 2020-2025, and ratified by this government in 2020.</p> <p>The United Kingdom has obligations under the World Heritage Convention of 1972, by which the United Kingdom as a State Party to the convention, has undertaken to conserve and protect World Heritage Sites within its boundaries. This raises issues of national and international importance in relation to the above applications, which we consider fully satisfies the criteria for a call-in. We believe that insufficient regard has been given to this obligation by both the London Borough of Hounslow and the Mayor of London.</p> <p>In our decades of experience, it is extremely rare that a number of highly significant designed landscapes are affected to such a degree by damage from just one scheme, with a consequent effect on the cultural heritage of England. The Gardens Trust's exceptional request for a call-in is an indication of how seriously we view this matter.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Syon Park	Greater London	E20/0871	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for the demolition of existing building and car park and erection of buildings to provide 473 residential units, a replacement retail foodstore with additional commercial, business and service space, and a flexible community</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT), as a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site of any grade listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens, strongly objected to both the above applications on 4th December 2020. The applications will cause a high degree of harm to the setting of three of the most important registered parks and gardens (RPG) in England: Osterley Park (Grade II*), Syon Park (Grade I) and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (Grade I) which is also a World Heritage Site.</p>



				<p>space, and ancillary plant, access, servicing and car parking (400 customer spaces and 105 residential spaces), landscaping and associated works.  HOMEbase LTD, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5QE. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>The Gardens Trust requests that you call in these planning applications for your own determination as they raise issues of national significance. We set out below clear reasons why the application should be called in. In summary, the applications damage to an unacceptable degree the setting of not just one but most unusually, three sites of national significance (two of which are additionally of international importance) on Historic England’s Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. Only about 1660 sites in England are listed, 40% of which are Grade II* and 10% Grade I. We refer you to our letter of 4th December 2020 (attached) which sets out our main objections, identifying the high level of harm to the significance of these designed landscapes. The applicant’s assessment of level of damage is in our opinion, seriously inaccurate in its appraisal of the effect on views from all three, unrealistically minimising the effect and damage inflicted, and omitting a number of key views.</p> <p>As we set out in our letter, Osterley Park will suffer the greatest visual damage, the proposed development having a considerably worse effect than existing developments which are currently visible.</p> <p>With regard to the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew and Syon Park, we attach an authoritative Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) by an independent conservation professional of many years experience, Dr Sarah Rutherford. This credibly identifies ‘substantial harm’ to a number of key heritage assets in Kew and Syon including the Kew World Heritage Site. The applications will harm the outlook from the south-western parts of Kew, in particular the outlook from the seminal C18 Arcadian Syon Lawn across the Thames to Syon Park, from where these two proposed developments will appear above the tree line forming the backdrop to both internationally significant landscapes. This outlook is at present, remarkably almost entirely unaffected by intrusive modern development, with an unbroken treeline extending all the way along this reach of the river. These areas of Kew’s setting possess priceless attributes (such as the Capability Brown designed landscape), which contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of Kew as set out in its World Heritage Site Management Plan 2020-2025, and ratified by this government in 2020.</p> <p>The United Kingdom has obligations under the World Heritage Convention of 1972, by which the United Kingdom as a State Party to the convention, has undertaken to conserve and protect World Heritage Sites within its boundaries. This raises issues of national and international importance in relation to the above applications, which we consider fully satisfies the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>criteria for a call-in. We believe that insufficient regard has been given to this obligation by both the London Borough of Hounslow and the Mayor of London.</p> <p>In our decades of experience, it is extremely rare that a number of highly significant designed landscapes are affected to such a degree by damage from just one scheme, with a consequent effect on the cultural heritage of England. The Gardens Trust's exceptional request for a call-in is an indication of how seriously we view this matter.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Enfield Local Plan	Greater London	E20/1733	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2021</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (that currently trades as London Gardens Trust – LGT).</p> <p>The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (GT), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>1 Objection to the preferred option</p> <p>1.1 Green Belt</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt –Green Belt land in Enfield is not in the gift of Enfield residents to pass over to developers. It forms strategic green infrastructure for the whole of London.</p> <p>Enfield Council is the local custodian of much of the Green Belt, having inherited it via Middlesex County Council &amp; later the GLC.</p> <p>MCC purchased the estates of Enfield Chase in the 1930s to create a green girdle which in 1947 became the Green Belt.</p> <p>The land was purchased with public money as a public resource to be safeguarded through public ownership for public benefit.</p> <p>1.2 Enfield Chase</p>

					<p>Enfield Chase is a historic landscape of national importance. In April 2011 the London Parks &amp; Gardens Trust held a study day on the subject of 'Enfield Chase: from Hunters to Commuters'. The papers can be read here: <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/publications/enfield-chase/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/publications/enfield-chase/</a></p> <p>We object to the development of parcels of land which will sever the visual and landscape connection between the historic estates of the Enfield countryside.</p> <p>1.3 Lee Valley</p> <p>We object to the loss of open space needed to create new parks for residents of Meridian \Water and eastern Enfield</p> <p>2 POLICY SP DE4</p> <p>Clarify that the whole policy applies to designated and non designated heritage assets.</p> <p>3 POLICY SP DE4 2d</p> <p>Clarify / Confirm the objective to remove heritage assets from the Heritage at Risk Register is by safeguarding their future and ensuring they remain designated heritage assets.</p> <p>4 POLICY SP DE4 3</p> <p>Clarify - All new development should contribute to the character and appearance of adjacent heritage assets (both designated and non designated). This is especially important in the context of parks and open spaces.</p> <p>5 Para 7.4.1</p> <p>"Long-term aspirations for management of the Borough's heritage are contained in Making Places: Enfield Heritage Strategy Supplementary Planning Document15."</p> <p>The introduction to the draft plan states that it will replace all SPD but this policy relies on the Heritage Strategy SPD.</p> <p>6 POLICY DM DE5</p> <p>This DM policy should also apply to views of and from designed landscapes including parks and open spaces. Developments can potentially impact on designed views into, as well as from the landscape and its setting, adversely affecting their landscape character and defined significance.</p> <p>Para 7.5.3 should be part of the policy. V C</p> <p>7 POLICY DM DE6</p> <p>The policy should cover the impacts of tall buildings on the design of the open space, the experience of being within the space and on views from</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>within looking out and from outside looking in. Such impacts could be loss of tranquillity, daylight, outlook, air quality, microclimatic effects, overshadowing and amenity.</p> <p>8 POLICY DM DE10 This policy is worded as a strategic policy; it does not provide certainty to developers for the preparation of development proposals and does not provide decision takers with the detail to assess an application. Proposals affecting the layout, design, character, use and function of both designated and non designated historic parks and gardens should retain and enhance their significance and should not prejudice their future restoration. Features such as original planting layout, garden buildings, statuary, railings, steps and fountains should be identified and protected. The impact of development on views from and towards historic open spaces should be carefully managed to maintain the character and enjoyment of these spaces. Consents for temporary development and events in open spaces should ensure subsequent restoration.</p> <p>9 POLICY DM DE11 3 Support In addition, housing development which benefits from its proximity to a public open space should contribute to its ongoing maintenance. Development close to or adjacent to a greenspace should contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional maintenance costs arising from increased footfall</li> <li>• additional facilities to cater for the additional users eg playspace, seating, planting</li> <li>• landscape improvements to mitigate adverse impacts on the park arising from the development.</li> </ul> <p>10 General comment on the draft Local Plan In general, policy has been placed in the supporting text rather than the policy statement. This means it will not have the status of the adopted plan and will carry limited weight in the determination of planning applications by the council or by the planning inspectorate. Helen Monger For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group</p>
Hounslow Local Plan	Greater London	E20/1936	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021 I am writing on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of</p>

					<p>the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (commonly known as the London Gardens Trust – LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (GT), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT’s Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). We have received a recent email drawing our attention to the Examination of the Hounslow Local Plan. We have contributed to earlier drafts including to the Regulation 19 Consultation. We note the “Submission” version of the DPDs introduces policy changes which materially affects the policy direction of policies of interest to us. We have considered the schedules of major and minor modifications and in particular a proposed change which appears not to have a reference. We outline the changes which are of concern to us because they change the meaning of the policies and would bring into question the soundness of the plan at this stage.</p> <p>Tests of soundness LGT opinion</p> <p>(a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;</p> <p>The current policies have not been subject to the same level of scrutiny and community engagement of the Reg 19 draft. The original wording should be reinstated.</p> <p>(b) Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;</p> <p>The changes have come out of the blue with no justification for taking an alternative approach at this final stage.</p> <p>(c) Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that The revised policies fail</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>to deliver the outcomes which have been consulted upon during the drafting of the Local Plan.</p> <p>have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and (d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.</p> <p>The original policies were consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Changes to National policy including the new sections on design place a greater emphasis on the quality of landscape design.</p> <p>West of Borough Local Plan Review Policy WoB4(d)</p> <p>We regret the deletion of “landscape features” in Policy WoB4(d) as this drew attention to the value of landscapes. Generally, attention is paid solely to structures. (WOB_SP_19_M0029ZA</p> <p>We are concerned that strategies and masterplans which are not subject to the robust scrutiny, engagement and consultation of the development plan are being brought into policy, and even before they have been prepared. This does not pass the test of soundness.</p> <p>Policy WOB5Design and Culture Modified paragraph “Our response”</p> <p>The Council will seek to preserve and enhance areas which are of heritage value and have high quality, well established coherent characters the historic environment.</p> <p>The Council’s proposed modifications (no ref?) to Policy WOB5Design and Culture have had unintended consequences.</p> <p>The policy addresses heritage assets. Heritage value can derive from historic or from cultural significance to the community.</p> <p>This modification has changed the meaning of Policy WOB5, restricting its application to the historic environment rather than to the wider definition of heritage.</p> <p>We think this is important because Hounslow has a wealth of cultural assets and because many parks and open spaces may not be recognised as historic environments but do have valued designed landscapes.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sitelist/?sitename=&amp;borough=Hounslow&amp;type=%25&amp;keyword=&amp;Submit=Search">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/sitelist/?sitename=&amp;borough=Hounslow&amp;type=%25&amp;keyword=&amp;Submit=Search</a>  We continue to support WOB5g  We hope that our comments help you in your consideration of the documents. Please let us know if we can be of further help.  Helen Monger Director, for Planning and Conservation Working Group  London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust  Duck Island Cottage, St James's Park, London SW1A 2BJ</p>
Trent Park	Greater London	E21/0772	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Variation of condition 2 of 16/04324/FUL (as varied under reference 20/03992/VAR) to allow 1) amendments to the Walled Garden comprising reduction in the number of homes from 32 to 22, revised housing mix, increase in build footprint, alterations to the design of the buildings, increase in the size of private gardens, removal of private terraces at first floor level, decrease in the size of the communal garden with changes in layout ; 2) amendments to the Gardeners Cottage comprising a new private garden and alterations to window and door openings ; 3) amendments to the Energy Statement and; 4) amendments to the Landscape Masterplan.  Former Middlesex University  Trent Park Bramley Road N14 4YZ  RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2021  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application.  I am writing on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (that currently trades as London Gardens Trust – LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (GT), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). The application site (OS Grid reference TQ 29094 97348) is located within Trent Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden which is included in Historic England's Heritage at Risk register.  The LGT Objects to this application on the following grounds:  The proposals as set out in the revised planning application and its supporting documents are likely to cause harm to the significance of the historic designed landscape.  The original application 16/04324/FUL  We supported the principle of redevelopment of the former Middlesex University site, involving demolition of all of the former university buildings and re-landscaping of the land within the site area, including restoration and reinstatement of historic features within the designed landscape.</p>

					<p>The original application was granted consent having regard to the extensive analysis of the impact of development on the historic landscape provided by the developers and their advisors. The proposals showed in great detail how elements of the original garden would be restored and/or reflected in the layout of the housing estate.</p> <p>We expressed our concern in our response re the walled garden in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the introduction of new development within the Walled Garden;</li> <li>• the impact of proposed new buildings on wider views across the site and within the locality; and</li> <li>• the safeguarding of future public access to open landscaped areas.</li> </ul> <p>The current application 21/02813/VAR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although there is a reduction in the number of houses proposed, they are increasing in size and there is therefore an acknowledged increase in footprint. Yet the developer has absolved themselves from doing a new EIA</li> <li>2. When you compare the latest scheme to the original 2016 scheme, via the 2017 variation – there is a significant reduction in the communal garden space being offered. See Design and Access Statement.</li> <li>3. The relocation of the Gardeners Cottage’s private outdoor space to within the walled garden (reducing publicly accessible open space and throwing off the garden’s symmetry), compromises the legibility of the walled garden’s extents</li> <li>4. The loss of the design elements of the walled garden which in the heyday of the Mansion was a valued designed garden and erodes the understanding of this historic asset as a productive kitchen garden essential to the running of a country house.</li> <li>5. The deterioration of the experience of the publicly accessible route between the various elements of the historic garden. The reduced public area will make the garden uninviting and appear to be private and inaccessible to all but residents.</li> <li>6. All this leads to the erosion of the public asset within the development overall and reduces the public benefit to below an acceptable threshold to justify this variation The Trust urges Enfield to reject the current designs from the Developer.</li> </ol> <p>Yours Sincerely, Helen Monger</p>
Stockley Park: Business park	Greater London	E21/0840	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of the site to	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.09.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory



<p>Phases I and II, and country park and golf course</p>				<p>provide a last mile delivery centre (Use Class B8) and ancillary offices together with associated van storage deck and parking, access arrangements, landscaping and infrastructure.          FORMER GSK OFFICES, STOCKLEY PARK, IRON BRIDGE ROAD WEST DRAYTON          MISCELLANEOUS</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. We have liaised with our colleagues in the London Gardens Trust (LHPGT) who responded to the previous iteration of this application (39207/APP/2020/2188) on our behalf, and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation for the new application and are immediately struck by the total contrast in style, size and layout of the proposed buildings with the existing, carefully designed layout of the Grade II registered Stockley Park (RPG) site as a whole. Currently the application site has 4 approximately square buildings of similar size effectively spaced into 3 'rows' (one on top of the other) running west-east, separated by two interspersed 'rows' of car parking similarly aligned. The individual blocks of parking are separated by lines of formal trees running north-south. The design of the buildings and car parking spaces are completely integrated, and the whole screened by the generous planting belts around the perimeter. Looking at the Stockley Road site in its entirety on Google Earth, it is apparent that the buildings on the eastern side of Stockley Road mirror those on the application site to the west, and are also broadly square in shape and of a comparable size, with similar car parking arrangements. Application 39207/APP/2021/3065 presents an entirely alien layout which bears no relationship whatsoever to the carefully thought-out original design of the business park as a whole. Savill's Heritage Impact Assessment (Para 5.3.8) is incorrect when it states 'The existing buildings within the Site are not in accordance with early designs and the enclosed nature of the Site, legible as one whole Site, is unlike the character and plots to the east of Stockley Road. As such the replacement of the buildings would not cause any appreciable harm to the significance of the park as a heritage asset.' There are now two enormous adjacent buildings (dwarfing the existing ones) which run north-south (totally opposite to the current layout), with some smaller areas of parking to the north-eastern edge, separated by trees in a west-east direction, again completely the opposite of what is currently there.</p> <p>Both the size and orientation of the new proposals bear no relation to the designated character of the park and the coherent design and detailing of the remaining original estate, effectively overwriting the original masterplan intent, crucial to the Site's recent listing as an RPG. We therefore consider it would result in significant harm. We acknowledge</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>that the revised proposed layout removes the footprint from the green belt around the site, which is an improvement. However, the height, bulk and outline of the proposed buildings will have a strongly negative impact on the quality and coherence of the rest of the listed park and country park beyond and therefore will greatly diminish its significance as a whole. What matters in assessing whether a proposal might cause harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear (Para 200), significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its alteration or development within its setting. In our opinion, this application fundamentally alters the design profile of the RPG and as such causes harm which is very high on the register of less than substantial harm.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. 'The way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by ... our understanding of the historic relationship between places' (p2). The close relationship between the layout of the business park on both sides of the Stockley Road, is severely compromised by the extremely different nature of the current proposals. We also are very concerned by the 'visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point' (p11) of the proposed buildings, and instead of the design being inward looking as currently, the 'sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy' (p11) has been replaced by something very obtrusive and alien to the setting of the Grade II RPG. The proposed landscaping is sympathetic to the existing planting elsewhere within the RPG, but the sheer scale of the proposals means that any mitigation is limited.</p> <p>The GT and LHPGT strongly object to the current proposals which fail to respect the design intent of the original masterplan, forming a crucial element to the significance of this RPG.</p> <p>If the Council is minded to support the project we observe that a year's defect maintenance contract followed by reliance on the occupiers to manage the site, is a very limited guarantee of horticultural quality (Para 6.5 D&amp;A). We would strongly recommend that this be extended to ensure a high calibre of horticultural expertise is maintained.</p> <p>We are also anxious that the Urban Greening Score (UGS) for the new application is as high as possible. It is currently referred to as 0.41 for the site. Unfortunately, they do not give a baseline of what the UGS currently is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>for Stockley Park. The London Plan sets interim targets for predominantly residential and commercial development and excludes development in use classes B2 and B8 (the site is B8 class development). A borough that anticipates a significant proportion of co-located industrial/ residential applications may look to set a new target for this mix of use classes. This application is set within an RPG so we are anxious that your officers request that the target score be set as high as possible as per the Urban Greening Factor Guidance :</p> <p>(<a href="https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/urban_greening_factor_lp_g_pre-consultation_draft.pdf">https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/urban_greening_factor_lp_g_pre-consultation_draft.pdf</a>)</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
<p>Gunnersbury Park <b>RECONSULTATION</b></p>	<p>Greater London</p>	<p>E21/0929</p>	<p>II*</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Details of Condition 7 (hard and soft landscaping) submitted pursuant of planning permission 00885/A/P21 dated 28/06/2021 for erection of a part single storey rear extension and a part rear infill extension to the building to allow for the change of use from a Bowls Clubhouse to a Cafe/Restaurant. Installation of entrance gates in the eastern corner of the site, and alterations to the existing landscaping at the site including the provision of new surfacing, planting and other golf course specific features BOWLS GREEN AND PAVILION GUNNERSBURY PARK POPES LANE EALING W3 8LQ BUILDING ALTERATION, SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021 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. In Sarah Scannell's letter dated 28th June 2021, Paragraph 7 specifically stated : 'Prior to commencement of any above ground works, full details of the finalised hard and soft landscaping proposals for the site, including planting plans and screening along the boundaries, shall have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter in perpetuity. Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the site.' The Gardens Trust regards the current submission as unsatisfactory in so far as its requirement to meet Condition 7, and the project should not be given permission to proceed any further until this is remedied. There is only one relevant drawing attached to this application on your website and it appears to be the same one as in the original application, to which the GT responded on 2nd June 2021. In that letter we commented that 'the borders (surrounding the grassy central bowls lawn) had been sensitively planted with an interesting mix of mature shrubs and herbaceous perennials, which although currently somewhat weedy could easily be brought back into better condition. We have compared this with the landscaping proposals for the pitch and putt course, where unimaginative low maintenance shrubs have been chosen for the proposed</p>

					<p>landscaping. This is particularly noticeable as elsewhere within Gunnersbury the excellent Head Gardener and his team have put in extremely carefully considered and visually appealing planting schemes.’ The landscaping plan shown with the above application seems to have done away with these existing borders and the northern and eastern sides of the pitch and putt course are now simply hedging which lies next to the garish pitch and putt course and its plastic grass.</p> <p>We urge your officers to request that any landscaping retains the existing planting which could be easily rejuvenated, as well as surrounding the site with hedging for screening. We would strongly object to the removal of the current borders.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Merton Local Plan	Greater London	E21/0944	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2021</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (commonly known as the London Gardens Trust – LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (GT), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the county gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of the GT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT’s Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). We wrote to Merton on 31st August - see attached. Without a full response we are proceeding on the basis that this is a Regulation 19 consultation.</p> <p>LGT has now been alerted to some additional material considerations which we would like the inspector to consider during independent examination of the plan:</p> <p>We support the CPRE’s feedback that there are contradictions and inconsistencies relating to Wimbledon Park which make the policies unimplementable – reference 09 Wimbledon Merton Local Plan Reg19 July21.pdf Wimbledon: Policy N9.1 – Surrounding Neighbourhoods Policy</p>

					<p>N9.1 q and Site Allocation Wi3</p> <p>Proposals for the All England Lawn Tennis Club (AELTC) promote the development of Wimbledon Park but this site is protected Metropolitan Open Land so cannot be developed. The Plan contains no proposal to remove the MOL status – which would of course require substantial justification.</p> <p>The inclusion of Wimbledon Park in the Site Allocation introduces a presumption of development, contrary to the MOL protection, and is inappropriate. Any reference to expansion into, or development of, the park, should be excluded from references to proposals relating to the All England Lawn Tennis Club. Wimbledon Park should be excluded from any maps relating to Site Allocations or proposals for the AELTC, to ensure consistency with the MOL designation.</p> <p>Please note there are important inconsistencies with the maps and commentary. On the basis of our previous feedback and the above we believe the Plan is unsound.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you ensure that all our comments are passed to the inspector</p> <p>Kindly acknowledge safe receipt of these comments.</p> <p>Helen Monger</p>
Embley Park	Hampshire	E21/0845	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a building for storage purposes relating to the showman's yard (Part retrospective).</p> <p>Land South West Of Halls Wood, Gardeners Lane, East Wellow, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2021</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 unfortunately not been able to make a site visit, so these comments are entirely based on our study of the somewhat limited online documentation. The Heritage Statement (HS) (Paras 3.4 &amp; 3.5) does refer to the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Embley Park, and states that 'the site is unseen from any public vantage point' (3.4). Your officers will be aware of HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). On page 2 of this publication it says : 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity' and also (p2) 'The</p>

					<p>contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.’ The application site lies right in the middle of the RPG and as such is in a sensitive location. The online drawing of the building is difficult to size from an online picture, despite a scale being shown, and it would have been helpful to have this drawing annotated with ridge height, length, breadth etc so that it could be properly sized from a small image. Two public comments indicate that it is very large and visible from neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Two more paragraphs within the SHA on page 4 are also relevant here : ‘Because the contribution of setting to significance does not depend on public rights or ability to access it, significance is not dependent on numbers of people visiting it; this would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting, constraints on access such as remoteness or challenging terrain, and the importance of the setting to a local community who may be few in number.’ Also : ‘Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.’ Clearly the quiet and tranquillity of the woodland setting is disturbed by vehicle movement and as there is already a travelling showpeople settlement close by, this adds to the cumulative change within the RPG which is to be regretted.</p> <p>We have concerns about lighting which is not mentioned, and we would hope that there is no light spill which could adversely effect the RPG. In addition, it is located within a wooded area and although there is already hard standing there, we would not want to see the loss of any more trees. From the description of the items to be stored here, and the seasonal nature of their usage, it would seem more appropriate for these large items to be placed in an industrial storage unit which would avoid the necessity for such a large building within the RPG.</p> <p>Your officers will obviously know the site well and will be able to judge to what extent this structure may adversely affect the setting and significance of the RPG so we would ask that you bear our comments in mind when coming to a decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Conservation Officer
Rous Lench Court	Hereford and Worcester	E21/1083	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 4 bay barn Rous Lench Court Rous Lench Evesham WR11 4UJ MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has been alerted to the above application by colleagues in the Hereford &amp; Worcestershire Gardens Trust. As a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens we are surprised and concerned that Wychavon &amp; Malvern Hills District Council failed to notify us about these proposals.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation for a further storage building at the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Rous Lench Court. As is made clear in the documentation, the proposed structure would sit next to an existing barn erected in 2005. Successive changes of ownership have brought with them a string of new buildings sited within this fragile and precious heritage asset. There is now private housing in the walled garden, the coach house and stables have been converted into holiday accommodation, a very large storage building was approved in 2005 for the storage of lawn mowers and other equipment, and later approval was given for a manège in the same part of the park.</p> <p>The new buildings are in an area which is very visible as you climb the hill from Rous Lench village and the impact of cumulative development is a problem. A public right of way immediately passes the area where the new building is to be erected. Your officers will no doubt be aware of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. On page 2 it states : 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change' and on page 12 : 'Cumulative assessment is required under the EU Directive on EIA. Its purpose is to identify impacts that are the result of introducing the development into the view in combination with other existing and proposed developments.'</p> <p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) makes it clear that whilst the two oak trees (T2 &amp; T3) selected for removal if this application is permitted, are both listed as category B, four out of seven of the trees examined have already had their roots damaged by soil scrape, compromising their healthy and longevity. It is of concern that so little care was taken when examining them in preparation for this application. The AIA also says that space around the building on the western side of the</p>

					<p>barn in relation to oak T1 is tight. Tree T1 is noted as the best example of all the trees surveyed. Should this application be permitted we would request that your officers insert a condition requiring that all the surveyed trees be suitably protected.</p> <p>The GT/H&amp;WGT object to the above application. In our opinion this additional building has a negative impact upon the setting of the II* RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/0915	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Residential development of nine units comprising six terraced houses, two semi-detached houses and one detached house, together with associated landscaping and parking</p> <p>Land To Rear 28 To 34 North Cottages Napsbury St Albans Hertfordshire</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. Napsbury Park is Grade II on the Historic England's Register, is within the Green Belt and covered by a blanket TPO. This park was laid out by William Goldring as informal parkland near to the hospital buildings but with farm, kitchen gardens and orchard to both feed the residents and to contribute to their therapy. It is one of only 2 known public landscapes by him and the only surviving complete hospital one.</p> <p>The area of this particular application lies on former allotment ground and just north of the important orchard planted on a grid plan which is overgrown but largely intact.</p> <p>We consider that development on this site would harm the Registered park, adding a high density of housing to a rural area which is remote from transport and retail facilities, The adjacent historic orchard, of which the original varieties are known, would also lose significance in the removal of its original setting.</p> <p>We object to this inappropriate development</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation &amp; Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Ashridge	Hertfords hire	E21/0923	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing house and seven outbuildings. Construction of new part two storey, part 1 1/2 storey, part single storey new dwelling and one new outbuilding.</p> <p>Thunderdell Ringshall Road Ringshall Berkhamsted</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 06.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, who comment on behalf of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee.</p> <p>Although Thunderdell is just outside the Registered area of the Ashridge park, it is part of the historic parkland and contributes to the significance of the RPG.</p> <p>The house was built in the 1930s after the estate had been sold and broken up. Due to the high significance of the landscape, much was bought by the National Trust and those properties which were built had covenants to</p>



				Hertfordshire HP4 1LU DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	help preserve the heritage value. This house is late Arts and Crafts and ideally should be retained as par of the history of the landscape. The proposed design does not recognise this heritage at all but should not cause harm to the Registered park due to the wealth of trees screening it. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/0973	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Ash tree (1) and 1 x Oak tree (2), reduce 2 x Oak trees (3, 4) by 33% 17 Roundwood Drive Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JZ TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 06.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The property lies within the WGC Conservation Area and within the historic Sherrardspark Wood and form part of the character of the area. Whilst we recognise the need to manage trees with pruning, and felling, if essential, no evidence of expert assessment of the condition of these trees necessitating the proposed works, has been included with this application. Expert opinion from either an independent aboricultural specialist or from the WHBC Tree Officer, should be sought as to the appropriateness of the proposed works in relation to the health of the trees and/or safety issues surrounding them. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/0985	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell 1 x Cherry tree (A1), 1 x Silver Birch tree (A2) and 1 x Fir tree (A3). Reduce 1 x Oak tree (B1) by 3m and lift crown by 2m 3 Woodland Rise Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LE TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objection to the proposed tree works provided tat the work is in line with expert arboricultural advice. It is not clear in this application whether such advice has been sought and taken. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
The Garden House, Cottered	Hertfords hire	E21/1024	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of detached garage and garden store/workshop building. Garden House Cottered Buntingford Hertfordshire SG9 9PZ MAINTENANCE/OUTBUILDING/ST	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objection to the proposed garage and welcome the screening proposed between the garage and the historic garden layout. We are aware of the number of mature trees along the drive and around the garage area, for which there should be a protection plan put in place during construction.

				ORAGE	Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/1027	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 x rear dormers with juliet balcony including raising of roof ridge by 400mm 56 Mymms Drive Hatfield AL9 7AF BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We do have concerns that the dormer windows to the rear of the property will cause a degree of harm to the setting of the adjacent Registered park of Gobions, through excess glare and the raising of the roofline. However, other properties in this stretch of Mymms Drive also have dormer windows overlooking the parkland. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E21/1033	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Two storey side and two storey rear extension. Single storey front and single storey side extension. 26 East Park Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 9EX BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. On the basis of the information in the application and our knowledge of the landscape and its history of Pishiobury Registered park, we have no objections to these proposals. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
94 Woodhall Lane, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/1070	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Fell rear mixed section including Holly, Elder and Laurel trees 94 Woodhall Lane Welwyn Garden City AL7 3TR TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE; 25.09.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are concerned that the proposal it to fell a mature mixed hedge rather than prune. All three species can be severely pruned and recover. The loss of a hedge in this position would adversely affect the green space at the rear of Raymonds Plain/Woodhall Drive. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/1082	II	PLANNING APPLICATION H1 Thuja Hedge to reduce height by approximately 3m, T1 Crab Apple to reduce crown by 30%, T2 Ash Crown to reduce by 25% and T3, T4 and T5 lime crown to reduce by 20% and remove dead wood	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.09.2021 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 the area, we have no objection to the proposed tree works. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust

				The Vicarage 48 Parkway Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HH TREES	
Island Planning Strategy (IPS) Development Plan	Isle of Wight	E21/0761	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021</p> <p>These comments are submitted by the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust. We are a charitable incorporated organisation whose purpose is to record, enhance, conserve and restore the parks, gardens and designed landscapes on the Isle of Wight and to educate the public as to the arts and sciences associated with these.</p> <p>We are a member of The Gardens Trust our national body who are statutory consultees for any planning applications affecting the nine nationally registered parks and gardens on the Isle of Wight which are: Norris (Grade I), Osborne (Grade II*), Nunwell, Appuldurcombe, Northcourt, Swainston, Ventnor Botanic Gardens, Westover, and Woodlands Vale (Grade II). We provide comment on their behalf on such applications using our extensive local knowledge of these sites. We also comment on development proposals impacting on Local Listed sites. We have an active programme of research and study and have detailed records in our inventory for sites on the island known to have designed landscape interest.</p> <p>Draft IPS section and/or paragraph Section 4: Environment Comments</p> <p>We welcome the decision to reorder the new draft to show environment before the following sections on economy, transport etc. We hope that this reflects a change towards a truly sustainable approach to strategic planning on the island with the recognition of the importance and need for conservation and protection of environmental factors making them front and centre to policy and decision making.</p> <p>Policy EV1 : Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment We welcome this policy and its position at the start of policies relating to the environment.</p> <p>However, we retain our concern that the wording includes reference to 'balanced judgement' in relation to non-designated heritage assets. We do however note that this in line with the revised National Planning Policy Framework (Sect 16 para 203) so accept that it may be justified.</p> <p>4.12 We welcome the emphasis on 'sense of place' to which historic designed landscapes/parks and gardens contribute.</p> <p>4.13 We would ask that this is amended to state 'nine registered historic</p>

					<p>parcs and gardens' as there are many more Local List and non designated examples of parks, gardens and designed landscapes on the island of historic merit.</p> <p>4.14 We welcome this clear statement highlighting the importance of historic parks and gardens and their contribution to character.</p> <p>4.16 We welcome the stated commitment to continue to review Conservation Areas and the Local List but note that this is stated as being subject to resources. We would like to see a firm commitment to undertake a review on a regular basis with a minimum period of time being stated. This will ensure that other aspirations and policies can be fully realised as without the capture of information through review, sites of note may not be fully and correctly considered in the planning design process.</p> <p>4.17 We welcome the referencing of Historic Landscape Characterisation as this was a significant concern in our comments on the earlier draft.</p> <p>EV5 Trees, woodland and hedgerows: We welcome and support this policy.</p> <p>EV6 Protecting and providing green open spaces: We welcome this policy. Frequently, public parks, open and green spaces are located in, or have their origin in historic designed landscapes, and we would like to see reference to this within the explanatory text perhaps within 4.57. We would also suggest that reference is made to 'designed landscapes' specifically as this term is increasingly being used in relation to such spaces and would suggest inclusion of a definition glossary. Perhaps the definition in the Designed Landscapes HEAP (2015) could be used: "landscapes created to provide aesthetically pleasing settings for private houses, institutions and facilities"</p> <p>We would like to see the role of the Isle of Wight Council in managing parks, gardens, open spaces and green spaces emphasised in this section. This request we feel is justified by reference to the commitment to creating sustainable, strong and healthy communities (para 5.1). Management of parks, gardens and open spaces is vital to conserving their heritage and amenity value.</p> <p>EV9 Protecting our landscapes and seascapes Aim d: we welcome reference to Historic Landscape Characterisation in this aim. Aim e: we wish to see reference to Historic Environment Actions Plans</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>(HEAP) in this section for completeness and parity with the BAP and Local Geodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>4.81 We would like to see a similar link to the HEAP documents via this hyperlink in the same way as the BAP is linked to documents. The link in question is Archaeology - Service Details (<a href="http://iow.gov.uk">iow.gov.uk</a>)</p> <p>4.82 We question why there is a downplaying of the HEAP in terms of its influence by the inclusion of 'In some cases' within the text. We would ask for this unnecessary distinction to be removed as it implies a lack of parity between these documents and perhaps suggests that BAP and LGAP are always relevant in all planning matters, but HEAP is not.</p> <p>E10 The Bay Tourism Opportunity Area</p> <p>8.105 We would wish to see specific reference to the importance of the early C20th design influences in the area of Sandham Gardens, IW Zoo and Dinosaur Isle. There is no specific reference to Browns Golf Course in the document which we believe is an significant omission and requires amendment. We would wish to see this important cultural and historic designed landscape aspect of Sandown Bay referenced and where possible incorporated into aspirations to improve the gardens and open spaces in the area.</p> <p>This also applies to other key public open spaces in The Bay.</p> <p>E11 Ryde Tourism Opportunity Zones</p> <p>We welcome the continued aspiration to create a vibrant and attractive environment through a green corridor linking Western and Eastern Gardens and the town with the beach. We have recently provided our thoughts on the proposals for the Ryde Interchange and the impact on the public realm of these to the Isle of Wight Council as we felt this already demonstrated a missed opportunity to progress the above stated aim. Our view is that there is a need for a clear design strategy approach as a masterplan to feed into any planning applications which come forward in this area to ensure there is a cohesive and consistent approach. We would wish this to include a respect for and reference to the strong late C19th and early C20th character of the local built and designed landscape environment epitomising when Ryde was in its heyday from a tourism perspective and allowing this to be recaptured rather than omitted in future approaches.</p>
Ventor Botanic Garden	Isle of Wight	E21/0842	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission is sought for the onshore elements of the	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021 Thank you for contacting the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust and requesting our input on the proposed addendum to the existing Environmental Impact

			<p>Perpetuus Tidal Energy Centre (PTEC). Accordingly, the application is for: - Construction of a substation / control room (including outdoor transformer compound and welfare facilities) with parking and turning arrangements. Planning Portal Reference: PP-10101353 5.</p> <p>Description of the Proposal - Construction of a landfall for marine electricity export cables from sea including possible use of transition pits for the junction of marine and onshore cables. - Intertidal/foreshore trenching including temporary removal of coastal protection to allow cable installation, followed by reinstatement of the coastal protection; - Construction and installation of an underground cable route taking exported electricity from the landfall to the substation; - Construction and installation of an underground cable route and the possible use of Horizontal Directional Drilling to bring export cables to land and onwards to the substation. - Enabling works including - Possible reinforcement or alteration of access roads within the onshore area; -Creation of temporary laydown/construction areas; -Construction of temporary security site fencing/provisions; - Possible tree and scrub clearance;</p>	<p>Assessment for the Perpetuus Tidal Energy Centre at Flowers Brook, Ventnor.</p> <p>We are pleased to comment on planning matters where these have a direct impact on a nationally registered park and garden or sites of designed landscape importance on the local list or the settings of these. The location of the planned onshore works is not within a nationally registered site but is part of the or Loca List boundary for Ventnor Park. It is a long standing and valued public open space providing an important link between Ventnor Park (including the coastal area through to La Falaise Car Park) and the Grade II registered site of Ventnor Botanic Garden to the west. We will confine our comment largely to the current EIA relating to Archaeology and Cultural Heritage but will also briefly mention landscape character.</p> <p>Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</p> <p>The methodology and scope of the current document produced by Wessex Archaeology in 2014 is comprehensive and we would agree with the assessment that there are no overriding archaeological and cultural heritage constraints which are likely to prohibit the development. We would also concur with the conclusion that there is archaeological interest in the on-shore site evidenced by the potential for buried features to be affected and a watching brief will be needed. We also welcome that the significance of the wider HLC has been recognised and whilst it is acknowledged that the area is much changed from its mid C19th to early C20th character we would agree that this particular proposal will not have a significant additional impact, as the public open space and designed landscape features of Flowers Brook will remain unaffected after the completion of the works and the removal of the temporary compound. There is a direct association the former Steephill Castle estate in relation to elements of the designed landscape on this site and we have provided information (a copy of our inventory record for Flowers Brook) to the consultant working for the applicant. Our records clearly demonstrates the designed landscape history and ongoing cultural value of this site to the local community and its potential group value with other similar public realm areas in Ventnor.</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>We have also taken the opportunity to review the SLIVA and information in Vol 2 Chapters 16 and 17. We would concur with the findings of the original EIA and do not see the proposal as having a significant long term</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>-Site levelling/ landscaping; and - Foundation excavation Permission is therefore sought for the final design of the substation / control room and cable route options / methodology in this full planning application. The substation / control room will use existing road access from Steephill Road, Ventnor. Flowers Brook, Steephill Road, Ventnor, Isle Of Wight PO38 1UF ENERGY</p>	<p>impact on the setting or landscape character of Flowers Brook. However, we do have some reservations of the use of the main open space as a temporary compound for the planned works and wonder whether this might be better sited within the land owned by Red Squirrel Limited to the north east. In this way there is no detriment to the open space and its continued use. If this is not possible then we would wish for the area to be returned to its current condition.</p> <p>Finally, from the information provided and from an impact on the setting of the public open space element of Flowers Brook, it is our opinion that the location of this within the existing Southern Water compound is acceptable. This is due to it being read with the existing building when viewed from the open space and coast path and also its proximity to the existing screening provided along Undercliff Drive.</p> <p>Mitigation In terms of any potential additional mitigation, if this is possible, a payment towards ongoing management, restoration and enhanced interpretation of the remaining designed landscape components (brook, bridge, pathways, pond) would be a useful addition and help to off set the additional development and short term inconvenience of the use of the open space for the temporary compound. Perhaps this could be negotiated as part of any planning consent.</p> <p>Thank you once again for consulting us. With best wishes John Brownscombe Chairman Isle of Wight Gardens Trust</p>
Waldershare Park	Kent	E21/0976	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to Gypsy/Traveller Site for 8no. pitches with 1no. static, 1no. tourer, 2no. parking spaces and dayroom per pitch (part retrospective) Land North Of Eastling Down Farm Cottages And East Of Sandwich Road Waldershare CT15 CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) whose local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and the site lies directly opposite a former drive to Waldershare Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. The considerable changes which these proposals would bring about, adversely affects the setting of this former park entrance. We are also in agreement with the Woodland Trust and the guidance from Natural England to which they refer. The proposed site is adjacent to</p>

					<p>ancient woodland which could be subject to potential damage and detrimental impact from a change of use to a Gypsy/ Traveller Site. The GT/KGT therefore object to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Burghley House	Lincolnshire	E21/0975	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land to the E, SE, S of Kennel Cottage</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust about the above Felling Licence Application which affects Burghley House, an historic designed landscape of national importance, included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>We have liaised with our colleagues in Lincolnshire Gardens Trust and from the very limited information available we assume that these are routine thinning operations in the overall management of the woodland. On that basis we confirm we have no further comments to add. If the thinning is for a different reason/purpose we would be grateful if you could advise further. Thank you for your help.</p> <p>With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Courteenhall	Northamptonshire	E21/0919	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Earthworks to form three lakes and two bunds Location Stonepit Field, east of Northampton Road, Courteenhall, EARTHWORKS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2021</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 Northamptonshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We were very interested to look at the proposals for three new lakes within the Grade II registered park and garden of Courteenhall. Repton produced a Red Book for the estate in 1791 and his plans included ponds in the lower part of the park which were never realised. The proposed lakes lie on the western side of the RPG and the siting of the new water bodies has been governed by natural topography.</p> <p>We were surprised that the application documents did not include either a Heritage Statement or a Heritage Impact Assessment, especially as the applicant has looked into the ecological aspects in some detail. We would have expected the documentation to consider the heritage impact equally closely and to contain images showing current and proposed views from</p>



					<p>within the park, from the main house, public footpaths, and around the bund which is to be created from spoil etc. We would suggest that your officers request the applicant to provide these so that a greater understanding can be gained as to how the lake proposals may affect the RPG.</p> <p>Whilst in principle we have no objections to the scheme, we would like to reserve judgement until we can better understand the heritage impact of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Castle Howard	North Yorkshire	E21/0858	I	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Proposal to thin an overgrown clump of trees adjacent to the main avenue, between the Obelisk and Pyramid Gate, to try to allow the better trees to form a more original feature</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2021</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 Castle Howard, which is registered grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>As we noted in our letter of 1st July for a previous thinning licence, Castle Howard is a designed landscape of monumental scale developed from c.1678 and decisively important for the development of the English Landscape Style from the mid-18th Century.</p> <p>We understand that the thinning licence is for the Double C Clump to the western side of the main avenue between the Obelisk and the Pyramid Gate. The clump was originally mature oaks that were blown down in a storm. The area was replanted and has become overgrown with willow and alder scrub. It is proposed to remove much of the scrubby regrowth and allow the better trees to grow on. This will restore the formality of the clump.</p> <p>The proposed thinning will improve this part of the historic designed landscape and we have no objection to the work.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E21/0972	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission for</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.09.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has been made aware of this planning application</p>

				Retention of a 360m2 Marquee and 150m2 Catering Tent for a Duration of 5 Consecutive Years to Continue to Provide Function and Catering Facilities   Middleton Lodge Kneeton Lane Middleton Tyas Richmond North Yorkshire DL10 6NJ MARQUEE	<p>within a historic park and garden by Historic England (HE). Middleton Lodge is on the HE Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II and as such the GT is the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development. 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>Middleton Lodge was designed by John Carr of York and built between 1777 and 1780 with the grounds being laid out at a similar time. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and walled kitchen garden. The marquee and catering tent are situated in the formal gardens close to the east/northeast elevation of the house. We are surprised that we can find no mention of the RPG in the Design and Access Statement. The Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028, adopted 9th December 2014 lists the RPG at Middleton Lodge under Core Policy CP12: Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets, at 4.12.16.</p> <p>We note that Temporary Planning Permission for the marquee and catering tent was granted on 28th November 2016 and that this application is for a further five years. We do not have any 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</p>
Newby Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/0994	II*	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land South of Lodge Lane	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2021</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 Newby Hall, which is registered grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The park at Newby Hall probably has 17th Century origins and a map for landscaping the park was drawn by the notable designer Thomas White in 1766. This was partially executed. The proposed felling relates to the avenue of trees either side of the road that forms the south eastern Registered boundary that runs from south of the principal entrance (from</p>

					<p>Skelton-on-Ure) to where the road curves west to become Mulwith Lane. Thank you for answering my queries and sending further location images; all of which have been hugely helpful. We find giving responses to Forestry Commission consultations generally quite difficult as we receive such limited information in the first instance. As you appreciate, as consultees for historic designed landscapes, in order to give what we hope are helpful responses, we need to look at any impacts of the proposed work on the historic design and planting, reciprocal views within the registered boundary and within the setting of the registered park and garden, historic structures etc. So, it is very useful to have more detailed information regarding the current condition of the woodland compartments in question, the species proposed for thinning/felling, the planting patterns - particularly at the woodland edge, - which may change the appreciation of the views, and of course the proposal details.</p> <p>We much appreciate the following information that you have sent us: Currently the avenue is made up of silver limes, with the occasional common lime (probably later in-fill) and a couple of young ash with ash die back. The trees are not veterans. The silver limes are in poor condition, with most showing low vitality and a number of the trees are in very poor structural condition. From a tree safety point of view there are at least four, which require almost immediate removal as they are in such poor condition. There are a couple of very large trees which could possibly be retained, but as they have grown up with the mutual shelter and support of the rest of the avenue, it would require a significant crown reduction to retain them. This would be around 25 to 30% of the canopy area and the resulting tree would have limited amenity value. As a result, pollarding the remaining trees has been discounted.</p> <p>The estate replanted the main avenue (Lodge Lane) nearby, and which runs towards the main entrance lodge (from Skelton-on-Ure), around 20 years ago, with what appear to be common lime clones on around a 5 m spacing in parkland guards. The result is excellent and the owner would like to repeat something similar with this avenue.</p> <p>We also understand from your informative reply that the owner would like to replant on a closer spacing to recreate the closer towering avenue which they currently have, so you have suggested rather than replanting with silver limes that seem to have struggled here, to replant with a common lime clone with a more upright growth form. We agree with your suggestion of increasing diversity on the estate by trying a different</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>clone/variety to the ones planted in large numbers at Newby. We wonder if the recent experience of replanting the lime avenues and the clones/varieties that have been used at Castle Howard, would be a helpful indicator.</p> <p>We consider that the proposal will improve this part of the historic designed landscape at Newby and we support the work.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E21/1037	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a new adventure play area and new visitor building together with associated works and landscaping Blenheim Palace Blenheim Park Woodstock PLAY AREA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021</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) who have made a site visit and are very familiar with the site and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The LVIA provides a detailed understanding of the history, evolution and significance of the walled garden together with a detailed assessment of potential impacts and mitigation options. The photomontages provided in the LVIA by HLM from various viewpoints give an indication of potential impacts when trees are in full leaf. It was noted from the Arboricultural Report by Sylva Consultancy, that the scheme proposes felling a number of trees and planting other and so the visibility of the play area will fluctuate especially in initial construction phases.</p> <p>The GT/OGT considers this is a well-researched and thought-out proposal which could bring positive benefits in generating greater use of this rather under-used and forgotten area of the slip garden. We would suggest however, that the height and colour of the adventure play equipment and the new visitor building are mitigated to better blend in with the site. We also suggest that the eaves of the new kiosk are in a colour and material to minimise its impact in views over the top of the stone wall and that a watching brief is kept to record any garden archaeology uncovered during the course of the works.</p> <p>With these provisos, the GT/OGT have no objection to the submitted proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E21/1126	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of stable with associated works. Land North West Of North Lodge Blenheim Park Woodstock Oxfordshire MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021</p> <p>The above application has been brought to the attention of the Gardens Trust (GT) by our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT), who were also not consulted. We are very concerned that you should have failed to consult us as you will be aware that the GT is the statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting any grade of site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the OGT who have made a recent site visit as well as being very familiar with Blenheim. Their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The location of the proposed development lies within the Grade I Registered Historic Park &amp; Garden (RPG) of Blenheim as well as the Blenheim World Heritage Site. The HE Register description notes that 'The Great Park to the north is largely arable land with woodland clumps, bisected from north to south by the Ditchley Drive and from west to east by the Roman Akeman Street with the remains of Grim's Ditch in the north section'. The location of the proposed stable block lies a short way to the north of Akeman Street and would be visible from a section of this route, which is a public right of way. North Lodge itself and the adjacent ancillary buildings lie within a well-defined wooded enclave in the Great Park, to the west of the Grand Avenue. They are largely screened from view by trees in this enclave. The proposed stable block lies just to the west of the existing group of buildings in an area which is currently open in character. We note that some tree planting is proposed in the vicinity of the stable block which would partially screen it in views across the park. This part of the Great Park is characterised by a clear distinction between open arable land and woodland planting in the form of belts and clumps of trees.</p> <p>We are concerned that the current proposal appears to depart from this well-defined distinction by extending built form into a currently open landscape. We would like to have seen more details with the application regarding the effectiveness of the proposed screening and an explanation of the historical development of the woodland planting in this part of the Great Park, including the design by Capability Brown of the woodland belts. There is a lack identification of the significance of the site relative to the WHS, particularly the Brownian landscape phase, as well as assessments of the impacts on identified significance, which is contrary to the NPPF Paragraph 194.</p> <p>The GT/OGT therefore submits a holding objection pending further</p>
-----------------	-------------	----------	---	--	--

					information. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E21/1127	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Extensive renovation works to reinstate the derelict fire damaged cottage back into a residential dwelling Fisheries Cottage REPAIR/RESTORATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021 The above application has again been brought to the attention of the Gardens Trust (GT) by our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT), who were also not consulted. We are very concerned that you should have failed to consult us a couple of times recently for applications affecting the Grade I registered park and garden at Blenheim as you will be aware that the GT is the statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting any grade of site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Please could you make absolutely sure that in future we are not missed off any consultations? We have liaised with our colleagues in the OGT who recently made a site visit and whose local knowledge informs this joint response. We welcome the proposal to repair the fire-damaged Grade II listed cottage, to remove unattractive later additions and to bring it back into beneficial use. Currently the cottage is completely derelict and surrounded by a hoarding. There are several mature and semi-mature trees densely grouped on the north side of the cottage which block views between it and Blenheim Palace. The area between the cottage and the Queen Pool, outside the hoarding, is overgrown and has a neglected appearance. The information submitted does not adequately explain the significance of the setting of the cottage. We would expect a heritage statement for such a sensitive location to explain the historical development and significance of the area surrounding the cottage, including the significance of any views. The cottage is prominent in some views, especially from the path which passes the site on its east side. This path is heavily used by visitors to Blenheim and returns on the west side of the cottage. Our second concern is the design of the proposed single-storey extension on the east side of the cottage. This is shown with a sloping metal (Rheinzinc) roof and large glazed windows on the south elevation. This extension and its roof would be prominent in views from the footpath on the east side of the cottage. We note from the Design & Access Statement that there have been discussions regarding the design involving the District Council and Historic England. Nonetheless, we have reservations about the

					<p>appropriateness of the contemporary design and materials in this highly sensitive historic landscape.</p> <p>We note that the application is accompanied by an arboricultural report by Sylva Consultancy and by an ecological report by BSG.</p> <p>Despite the welcome proposals to repair The Fisheries, due to the lack of identification of the significance of the site relative to the WHS, and particularly the Brownian landscape phase and assessments of the impacts on identified significance, contrary to the NPPF Paragraph 194, the GT/OGT would like to submit a holding objection until the additional information requested has been provided.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hawkstone	Shropshire	E21/0871	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of 1No single storey guest accommodation building following the demolition of the existing staff accommodation</p> <p>Lyle Cottage, Hawkstone Park Hotel, Weston Under Redcastle, Shrewsbury, Shropshire.</p> <p>DEMOLITION, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2021</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 Shropshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and are surprised that the applicant has proposed a thatched roof for the new cottage. This is not a roofing material generally found in Shropshire and as such we do not support this design. We would suggest the applicant appoints an architect to design something more contemporary, low key and on the same footprint as the existing structure.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lilleshall Hall	Shropshire	E21/0941	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of Condition 5 of TWC/2020/0391 (Demolition of west elevation lean to extension. Replacement of 1no. window to first floor west elevation. Removal and repair of roof, repairs to plinths and finals, replacement of rain work goods and relocation of TV ariel.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2021</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 studied the online documentation and liaised with our colleagues in the Shropshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>From what is available on-line it seems also that some or all of the original application (we were not consulted) may be retrospective. It is therefore difficult to understand what effect the variations of conditions added to a</p>

				<p>Removal or repair of retaining walls, installation of pedestrian iron gate and railings and replacement of vehicle access gates and posts. Repairs to existing property brickwork and decoration. Installation of a gas storage tank. Proposed internal works including new WC in previous store room, installation of a new gas boiler, new kitchen and bathroom fittings, installation of 2no. wood burning stoves, installation of underfloor heating and slabs, re-plastering of ground floor walls and blocking up of an internal door way. Removal of internal security bars from ground floor windows and first floor windows. Installation of new skirting and flooring, repairs to 8no. doors and replacement of 3no. doors (Part-Retrospective) (Listed Building Application) to allow for use of imitation cast iron rainwater goods to be used in place of the cast aluminium that were previously approved Golden Gates Lodge, Pave Lane, Chetwynd Aston, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 9LQ DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>granted application for alterations, including partial demolition, to a Grade II Listed Building (one of the main lodges to Lilleshall Hall), might mean for the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) when the original application plans are not available. Historic England (HE) also appear not to have not been consulted. So that we can assess what harm if any, this may cause to the Grade II RPG at Lilleshall we would appreciate seeing the original application plans so that we can assess what changes are proposed. We would very much appreciate clarification on this and also whether you have consulted with HE.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lilleshall Hall	Shropshire	E21/0942	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to burial ground. St Mary's Church, Sheriffhales, Shropshire</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.09.2021 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 Shropshire</p>



				MISCELLANEOUS	<p>Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This application relates to an extension to an existing extension to a burial ground. The field in question is adjacent to the south approach to the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Lilleshall and will be visible from Sherrifhales Lodge, probably designed by Charles Barry in 1835. The new burial ground will be visible from both the lodge and the RPG so we would have certainly expected to have seen a Heritage Impact Assessment contained within the documentation.</p> <p>We would like the applicant to provide an assessment of the impact upon both heritage assets. We also would suggest that the applicant enhances the screening on the west and south sides of the proposed area, as we do not consider the proposed hedgerows sufficient mitigation. We would also suggest that these hedges are broken up by additional tree planting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Patshull Hall	Shropshire	E21/0950	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a two storey side extension 2 Brewers Lodge, Stanlow, Wolverhampton, Shropshire, WV6 7HZ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2021</p> <p>Thank your consulting us on the above application, which was forwarded to us also from the offices of The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee in planning matters relating to historic parks and gardens which are included on the Historic England Register of Parks &amp; Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England and we are acting on its behalf in this matter.</p> <p>Brewers Lodge is a modest estate building at the periphery of Patshull Hall Park, which is included at Grade II on the National Heritage List. The building itself, although not Listed, would be classed as a 'non-designated heritage asset'. It occupies a key position at the southern approach to Patshull Hall itself and the nearby Patshull Lake. Any changes to the building will thus impact negatively upon the approach to and hence the setting of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Patshull Hall.</p> <p>We are concerned at the impact of the proposed alteration and in particular the creation of what would be in effect a second competing 'gable', which we feel would greatly unbalance the existing main front of Brewers Lodge.</p> <p>If the proposed 'dormer' window is held to be absolutely necessary, we would wish this to be moved to the rear side of the proposed extension and replaced on the main front by a pair only of Conservation Rooflights made by the Conservation Rooflight Company, i.e. not Velux or other</p>

					<p>make.</p> <p>At present therefore, we object to the proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Christopher Gallagher for Shropshire Parks &amp; Gardens Trust &amp; The Gardens Trust</p>
Sandbeck Park and Roche Abbey	South Yorkshire	E21/0970	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION</p> <p>Felling Licence Application</p> <p>Land surrounding Sandbeck Park</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.09.2021</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 Sandbeck Park and Roche Abbey, 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>Sandbeck Park and Roche Abbey are on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade II*. The fourth Earl of Scarborough engaged Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in 1760 but as he was himself noted for his great taste for the fine arts, particularly architecture and planting, it is likely that he contributed to Brown's designs for the landscape. The fourth Earl incorporated elements of the 17th Century park and there have also been 19th Century alterations. Later, on the west side of the Hall a double avenue of limes and chestnuts planted in 1919 to commemorate the Armistice of 1918 is aligned with the west front in an area of open pasture which is shown on the 1724 map ss open land marked as 'Lawn'. The Upper Lake at Sandbeck Park, lies close to the Hall and east lawn but situated to the north east and was probably the subject of Brown's first contract with the Earl. The dam head embankment is at the eastern side separating it from the Lower Lake; the two lakes forming a sinuous and pleasing feature in the park and an important part of the designed landscape.</p> <p>Brown's work at Roche Abbey was undertaken as part of the second contract of 1774 which specified that he was to 'finish all the valley of the Roach in all its Parts, According to the Ideas fixed with Lord Scarborough (with Poets feeling and Painters eye) beginning at the head of the Hammer Pond and</p> <p>'continuing up the valley towards Loton...in the Morn as far as Lord Scarborough's Ground goes, and to continue to Water and Dress the valley up by the present Farm House untill it comes to the separation fixed for</p>

					<p>the boundaries of the New Farm. NB The paths in the Wood are included in this Discription and every thing but the Buildings.'</p> <p>This Felling Licence Application covers virtually all the woodland in the historic designed landscape including parts of the scheduled monument known as Roche Abbey Cistercian Monastery, (LEN: 1019059). Of the compartments that fall within the scheduled monument, compartment 14 (part) is within the registered park and garden and also its setting; similarly, 15c is within the setting and 15b within the registered boundary. As the response from Historic England noted, the standing, buried and waterlogged remains all contain important information regarding the monastery and the wider environment. We concur with the guidance from Historic England and do not object to the felling in these areas as long as it is undertaken in line with the guidance.</p> <p>The following compartments fall with the Registered Park and Garden: 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2c, 3b (part), 4, 5a, 14 (part), 15a, (part), 15b, 24a, 24b, 25, 26a, 26b, 34, 36, 43.</p> <p>The following compartments are in the setting of the registered site: 3b (part), 5b, 15c.</p> <p>This consultation, due to its extent and our somewhat lack of experience, has been a complex one for the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust to analyse and therefore to give considered advice. However, I am are very grateful to Ciara for sending through species and felling codes and spending time with me decipherring the schedule and discussing the proposals for the compartments on the telephone which has been most helpful.</p> <p>Areas of notable historic designed landscape where there are woodland compartments included in this application are:</p> <p>On the north side of the lakes, North Field is bounded to the north by a shelter belt with ride called North Walk (FC compartment 26a).</p> <p>On the north side of the A634 at Four Lane Ends, the entrance lodge and gateway (listed grade II) leads to a drive constructed in 1773 as an avenue leading to the Hall (compartments 24b and 24a).</p> <p>On the east side of the designed landscape there is an entrance gateway (by James Paine listed grade II*) on Malpas Hill. This leads to a drive laid out in 1766, through compartment 4,(New Whin Covert) with part of compartment 3b and 2c alongside the registered boundary.</p> <p>Compartments 26b and 25 lie north and south respectively of another entrance and lodge (probably also Paine, listed grade II) about 400m north-</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>west of the Hall.</p> <p>Compartment 36 lies next to the Lodge at Stone north of the A634. Compartments 1a, 1b and 1c (Union Wood) lie alongside the drive from Malpas Hill and south of Lord's Meadow.</p> <p>Compartment 2a (Folds Wood) lies south of the lakes and Sheepcote Meadow and east of Lord's Meadow and includes the disused ice house. We trust that special care will be taken in the historic areas.</p> <p>We understand that there is ash dieback on the estate mainly to the north and having the schedule explained we understand that the brown boxes on the schedule refer to thinning (T) up to a maximum of 30% of trees to be removed across the compartment with regenerative felling (RF) if the percentage is higher. Although there are a large number of compartments included in this Felling Licence Application, we understand that it is thinning work that will continue the existing good stewardship for the future of the woodland at Sandbeck and Roche Abbey and will not adversely affect the Registered Historic Park and Garden. We have no objection to the proposals, and thank you for your most helpful advice.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Wentworth Woodhouse	South Yorkshire	E21/1007	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of the estate from a private residence to use class Sui Generis, opening to the public for house guided &amp; non-guided tours, garden visits, weddings, events, education workshops, ancillary cafe within the mansion house &amp; location filming. Change of use of Camellia House to a cafe and event space (use class E) &amp; associated facilities &amp; services including changing place pod, bin store, 4 No. disabled car parking spaces &amp; new landscape setting to Camellia House. Demolition of teaching accommodation and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021</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 Wentworth Woodhouse, 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>Wentworth Woodhouse (Listed Grade I) is the magnificent centrepiece and focal point within a hugely impressive Grade II* Registered Park and Garden. The surrounding parkland and the wider landscape with its assemblage of highly significant buildings many listed grade II* all combine to form an almost unparalleled historic landscape design in England. The Camellia House, Listed Grade II*, north west of the Ionic Temple (Listed Grade II*) and to the south west corner of the former baroque garden, began its life as the early 18th Century garden buildings, which</p>

				<p>provision of a new car park to the North West of the stable block to serve the estate together with temporary coach parking on former tennis court to the East of the main house at Wentworth Woodhouse Cortworth Lane Wentworth</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>formed part of the Menagerie created there. It has gone through two changes since then, following the fashions of the time; the Camellia House being a remodelling by Watson and Pritchett in 1812 of an early 18th Century greenhouse.</p> <p>We understand that the demolition of Lady Mabel College Teaching Accommodation will enable the provision of a new 190 space car park (or 205 spaces according to one report) to the North West of the Stable Block to serve the Estate together with Temporary Coach Car Parking on the Former Tennis Courts to the East of the Main House. The Stables, Riding School and Mews (Listed Grade I and II) were built in a style, and of a quality, that offered an appropriate compliment to the Mansion. They are of exceptional significance in relation to their physical stature, design as a set piece by a national architect of great note, and their substantial survival. They were designed to form an aesthetic part of a substantial remodelling of the gardens and wider landscape.</p> <p>The documents refer to the Masterplanning process in which the programme prioritised the development of the Camellia House subject to external funding timescales, to create a sustainable visitor attraction and commercial entity to ensure Wentworth Woodhouse is preserved and made accessible for the nation and future generations. This will support the continued opening of the House and Gardens whilst other areas of the Estate are developed.</p> <p>We support the aims of the Wentworth Woodhouse Preservation Trust to sustain this nationally important heritage but unfortunately having not had sight of the landscaping masterplan, our comments are only made in response to the car parking facilities identified in this planning application. Car parking is a concern for such a significant historic site. We understand that there were proposals to create a car park by exchanging land with or renting land from the Fitzwilliam Estate.</p> <p>We have the following comments to make on the car parking:</p> <p>Main Car Park</p> <p>As noted above this is to be situated adjacent to the Stable Block and Riding School and at the pedestrian entrance to the site. It is hoped that this will not intrude on the garden and that it will not be visible in the garden vista from the baroque façade of the mansion, or from the walk from the Camellia House to the Riding School/Stable Block.</p> <p>We assume that this car park is exclusively for visitors to the historic site, and that it is not also intended to cater for the commercial occupants of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the Stable Block and Riding School.</p> <p>There will need to be careful and sympathetic detailing/landscaping/planting/surfacing of this car park so that parked vehicles and this whole new area do not negatively impact the heritage assets.</p> <p>There may be a need for overflow parking and how will that be accommodated?</p> <p>We query how visitors will reach the front of the mansion and how will they be given the amazing experience of seeing the great Palladian facade across the lawn in front of it. Will there be a courtesy bus between the two?</p> <p>We note that the text of the application refers to temporary coach parking on the former tennis courts to the east, however we don't seem to have seen any documentation for this aspect of the application and are therefore unable to comment.</p> <p>Camellia House</p> <p>We understand about disabled access and the importance of making the site accessible for all, however we remain concerned about the proposed disabled car parking, Changing Places Pod etc outside the Camellia House. It would be preferable for all cars to be in the main car park and for buggies to take disabled visitors to the Camellia House. This would minimise the intrusion of vehicles in the garden and in the garden vista from the baroque front of the mansion. However, if this parking is deemed absolutely necessary, it should not be visible from the historic Camellia House. Like the bin store, it should be carefully screened from harmful impact on the Camellia House.</p> <p>It is important to appreciate that the rear of the early 19th Century Camellia House is, in fact, the façade of the earlier, 18th Century, garden building which is a very important landscape feature.</p> <p>Stables/ Riding School</p> <p>While the façade of the Stable Block has a spectacular relationship with the park, the façade of the companion Riding School has a discrete relationship with the garden. Any proposed service parking for the Riding School should not intrude on the historical relationship between architecture and the garden, or on the garden vista from the baroque façade of the mansion, or from the walk from the Camellia House to the Riding School/ Stable Block.</p> <p>In the applications absence of parking for the commercial occupants of the Stable Block and Riding School, our assumption is that this must be in the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>courtyard of the Stable Block. If so, access would presumably have an impact on the wrought iron gateway from the park and thus on the visitor's view of the building's façade.</p> <p>We assume there will be future planning applications for these buildings. Once again, it would have helped to have seen the landscape masterplan proposals now so that an understanding of the plans for the whole site could have been reached.</p> <p>We have the following additional comments to make on the proposals for the Camellia House:</p> <p>We support the sympathetic hard landscaping treatments, the new grass path and existing fountain to the south of the building that is to be restored.</p> <p>We have no objection to the removal of the small number of trees.</p> <p>We remain concerned about the necessity for the Changing Places Pod which seems, along with the disabled car park, and new bollard lighting to be an intrusion into the historic area of the Camellia House. In the proposals there is provision for male, female and an accessible WC within the rear area of the Camellia House and there is level access throughout.</p> <p>The Camellia plants are important in the history and significance of Wentworth Woodhouse. They need to be carefully looked after in the future including being well-watered during the summer months after flowering so that the flower buds for the following year are laid down and then in the winter when they are dormant being kept at a cool ambient temperature. What arrangements have been made to ensure that any heating system that is incorporated into the Camellia House will have no ill effects on the camellias? If necessary, advice could probably be sought from those who manage the camellia collection at Chatsworth or Sheffield Botanical Gardens.</p> <p>We look forward to being consulted on further proposals as they develop.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
<p>Kentwell Hall Melford Hall Trinity Hospital <b>RECONSULTATIONS</b></p>	Suffolk	E20/1883	II* II* II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition and replacement of existing logistics space totalling 10144m2, new construction of a 1890m2 Biomass Boiler Building and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) with amendments to the above application. We have not been able to undertake a site visit and have therefore had to rely on the verified views/CGIs requested and now provided, to ascertain what level of impact the new facility would have on the various heritage assets mentioned in our letter of 24th May 2021.</p>

				<p>bridge link, alterations to existing logistics building to accommodate a new chocolate production facility, construction of a new 155m2 Waste Water treatment building, new gatehouse and 2no. weighbridge offices, and other associated works.</p> <p>GCB Factory And Premises, Lower Road, Glemsford, Sudbury Suffolk CO10 7QS</p> <p>DEMOLITION, BIOMASS, MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>Without the benefit of a site visit, we therefore concur with the comments made by your Heritage and Design Officer Thomas Pinner as it is apparent that he has looked closely at the additional documentation and has been able to respond constructively on the basis of his local knowledge.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Local Plan	Surrey	E21/1059	N/A	<p>LOCAL PLAN</p> <p>Submission consultation</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.09.2021</p> <p>The Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) is an educational charity that since 1991 has raised awareness of and sought to protect Surrey's rich heritage of historic parks, gardens and designed landscapes. SGT is a member of the Gardens Trust, a statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, and works with them to respond to planning consultations.</p> <p>The comments below relate to Chapter 6 Environment, Policy EN 6: Heritage Assets. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment sets the context for Local Plan policies and the subsequent consideration of planning proposals. Proposed Policy 9 does not accurately reflect NPPF paragraph 200 which distinguishes between grade I and II* registered parks and gardens and those that are grade II when substantial harm to or loss of their significance is identified.</p> <p>Proposed Policy16 does not accurately reflect NPPF paragraph 203 in respect of non-designated heritage assets which refers to the "scale of any harm or loss". The proposed policy refers to the "scale of the alteration or loss", which seems to be something different.</p> <p>Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Valley Gardens, Saltburn	Tees Valley	E21/0961	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND REPLACE WITH A NEW EXTENSION WITH</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Valley Gardens, Saltburn, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by</p>



				<p>ROOF TERRACE ABOVE; INTERMEDIATE FLOOR LEVEL EXTENSION AS STAIR ENCLOSURE AND ALTERATIONS TO ENTRANCE AT FRONT THE SPA HOTEL SALTBURN BANK SALTBURN BY THE SEA TS12 1HH DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this response. Although a brief Heritage Statement is included amongst the documents submitted, we are disappointed by its cursory nature and the fact that no acknowledgement is made of the historic designed landscape, despite the Spa Hotel being located within the registered boundary. This is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 189 which states that an applicant seeking planning permission should 'describe the significance of any heritage assets affected'.</p> <p>The Valley Gardens were laid out in phases between 1860 and the early 20th century by the Saltburn Improvement Company with the Concert Room Buildings (or Assembly Hall), now the Spa Hotel, designed by Alfred Waterhouse being built between 1884-85. This was one of the many ongoing improvements and facilities introduced into the gardens over the course of their development in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. On this occasion we accept that the proposed works are likely to have only minimal impact on the gardens and as such constitute 'less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, Valley Gardens as defined in NPPF 196.</p> <p>We have no further comments to add at this stage but would emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals. If you have any further queries, please contact us, and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Spa Gardens, Royal Leamington Spa	Warwicks hire	E21/0900	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Display of 10x Monoliths (MO) and 14x Fingerposts (FP) within Leamington. Address: Various sites in Leamington: Jephson Gardens, Willes Rd, Warwick St/Kenilworth St, Regent Grove, Royal Spa Centre, Jephson Gardens, Clarendon Avenue,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.09.2021 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.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation for the proposed new monoliths and finger posts within the town. The locations for the monoliths and fingerposts are logical and sensible. Whilst we have no objection to a revamp of the wayfinding markers in time for the</p>

				Pump Rooms , Parade, Newbold Terrace, Bath St, Spencer St, Lower Av, Sayer Close, Packington Pl, Railway Stat SCULPTURE/MONUMENT	forthcoming Commonwealth Games in 2022, the proposed new finials are far less distinguished than those they are due to replace, which are discreet and elegant. We would prefer that the new monoliths and finger posts were not adorned with the over-fussy circle designs, but that the current finials were retained. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Denmans Garden	West Sussex	E21/0987	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application with all matters reserved, apart from access, for up to 69 No dwellings with access, parking, landscaping & associated works. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan. Land at Bayards Level Mare Lane Eastergate PO203RZ MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.09.2021 The site lies some 800m to the SE of Denmans Garden, which was added to the HE Register of Historic Parks and Gardens in 2020. Registration is a 'material consideration' in the planning process, and also triggers specific elements of national planning policy, including consultation with the Gardens Trust. Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust (GT) (a national statutory consultee), and works closely with the GT on planning matters; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted and also visited the site which is a considerable distance away from the registered area of Denmans Garden. The intervening field and road boundaries are strong with mature trees. Denmans Garden itself has similar screening on its eastern margin. Hence the proposals are unlikely to affect the significance of Denmans Garden and for this reason SGT does not object to the application, but neither does it support the application. However, the peace and tranquillity of the Denmans Garden would be adversely impacted if there were further development to the west of the current site, or if changes to road signage or layout leads to more traffic along Denmans Lane, Fontwell. Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.
Netherton and South Crosland Neighbourhood Forum	West Yorkshire	E21/0856	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.09.2021 Thank you for notifying the Gardens Trust (GT) regarding the above Neighbourhood Plan application. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, and is authorised by the GT as Statutory Consultee, to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.

					<p>The Netherton and South Crossland plan area touches Beaumont Park which is on the Historic England Register of Parks &amp; Gardens at Grade II. Whilst we can advise on Beaumont Park and its setting, we have no comment to make on this plan for the Netherton and South Crosland area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E21/0999	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To erect a pergola on the patio in the garden 14 Aysgarth Court 3 Clifford Drive Menston GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Listed Building, HE ref 1240191; and set within the grounds of High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>High Royds Hospital was built as a mental hospital by West Riding County Council, and it was opened in 1888. It had been designed by the County Surveyor, Vickers Edwards. Edwards adopted an “echelon” layout for the wards – only the second such building in England. Constructed around the centre of its 100ha site the Hospital enjoyed a generous boundary of fields and trees.</p> <p>The hospital closed in 2003 and it has been progressively converted to residential use since 2007 to the present day. Many of the hospital buildings are in close proximity with each other, and the success of the residential conversion relies heavily upon the careful management of not only the massive formal volumes and facades, but also the intervening spaces. The landscaping of these spaces between buildings has generally been carefully, and intimately designed.</p> <p>14 Aysgarth Court is a dwelling which has been formed at the end of a pre-existing, large building with an iconic symmetrical façade. The small space beyond it is defined by an adjacent, substantial original wall. This small space has been given over to a public footpath between a pair of small, low, clipped hedges. The south front of No 14 also plays a role in the symmetry of the host building and its patio (upon which the pergola is proposed to be erected) opens immediately onto a very large, open grassed area. From the application form the proposal is described as a grey aluminium frame with a grey louvre roof. We have not noted the height.</p>

					<p>In our opinion the proposed pergola of grey aluminium with a grey louvre roof, will adversely impact upon the adjacent public footpath and it will damage the symmetry of the host building. A large part of the success of the conversion of High Royds heavily relies upon the careful design and management of the spaces, between the constituent buildings – this proposal would contravene that goal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E21/1040	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land East of Bower Hill	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2021</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 Bretton Hall, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Bretton Hall is a unique heritage asset combining as it does a number of listed buildings including the mansion; pleasure grounds of late 18C and early 19C, parkland of the 18C with earlier origins and links with two notable landscape designers/gardeners, Richard Woods (1716-93) and Robert Marnock (1800-99); and the Yorkshire Sculpture Park laid out on part of the pleasure grounds and parkland.</p> <p>The subject of this application is Compartment 22a which is the western portion of the historic Bella Vista Plantation that is bisected by the Beaumont Drive and is situated just within the north/northwest boundary of the Registered Historic Park and Garden. We note that on the Operations and Restocking Maps it is notated as deciduous woodland. However, we understand that it is currently mainly coniferous with some sycamore and an understorey of Rhododendron ponticum.</p> <p>Thank you for answering my queries and particularly to Ciara for our very helpful telephone conversation.</p> <p>The Bella Vista Plantation has an interesting history. The stepped gothic folly called Bella Vista stood in the eastern portion of the Plantation, on high ground (c.500ft) above the mansion and was probably constructed c.1770. By the time of the 1810 estate map it is shown to have a spire, (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, BEA/C2/MPD/17a, see reference below),</p>

					<p>and by the end of the 18th Century it was functioning as a lodge. The significance of Bella Vista is indicated by one of the bedrooms in the mansion being called the Bella Vista room. The building was used by the military during the Second World War and it then fell into disrepair and was demolished soon after.</p> <p>I have looked at the early Ordnance Survey maps and found that the Bella Vista Plantation is shown much as it is today. The 1st Edition 6":1mile surveyed 1849-51 and published in 1854 indicates the woodland as mixed coniferous and deciduous with the folly with a pond to its east in the eastern portion ie east of the drive. The 25":1mile (map CCLXII.NW) surveyed in 1891 and published in 1893 is similar but the plantation is shown as deciduous. The largely deciduous trees to the south are more scattered in the parkland enabling the reciprocal views between the mansion and Bella Vista folly. The later 25":1mile maps of 1930, published 1932 and the 1948 map published 1949 both show Bella Vista Plantation as mixed woodland.</p> <p>Thank you both for the details of this application:</p> <p>There is to be the clear felling of Japanese Larch, Corsican Pine and Sycamore – the latter less than 10% of the compartment. It is a relatively even aged stand and 20% understorey of Rhododendron ponticum will be removed (as part of the higher tier agreement) along with the larch to protect the estate from Phytophthora ramorum. The felling will be carried out by hand using chainsaws and winch outside of nesting times. There are some mid storey Oaks that have regenerated within the compartment and these will be protected and retained in the new planting. The lower area of the compartment has some mature Beech.</p> <p>The restocking (essentially for commercial purposes) will be 50% Grand Fir and 50% Douglas Fir at 2m centres (2,500/ha). The planting design will keep the species separate so that the Douglas Fir does not shade out the Grand Fir and there will be 10% open space.</p> <p>The historical and OS map evidence indicates that the Bella Vista Plantation, with its folly and on high ground behind the mansion, was significant in reciprocal views from the later 18th Century and would have been a feature of the landscape design that was carried through into the 20th Century. It seems possible that the Japanese Larch (introduced 1861), Corsican Pine (an earlier introduction at c. 1759) and Sycamore may have been planted in the 1950's with the Beech and Oaks indicating remnants of earlier planting that would probably have been part of the historic patina</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>of design.</p> <p>Douglas Fir (introduced c. 1827) and Grand Fir (introduced c. 1831) would not have been in any original planting nor of course the Japanese Larch. The Scots pine (<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>) are historically a good landscape design species particularly for their picturesque qualities which may well have been the case in Bella Vista Plantation. In our opinion the edges of the plantation facing down the park towards the mansion and alongside the drive are the most sensitive locations and if it is possible in terms of depth of soil and aspect, it would be helpful to include some Scots Pine here along with some more Beech to strengthen the existing mature Beech. We strongly support the protection and retention of the latter along with the Oaks.</p> <p>Overall, we have no objection to the proposals, trust that the historic dimension will be recognised and thank you for your helpful advice.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--