



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES OCTOBER 2021

The GT conservation team received 210 new cases for England in October, in addition to ongoing work on previously logged cases. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 71 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Tyntesfield	Avon	E21/1143	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Dismantling of twentieth century open barn structure located within the curtilage of the Grade II* Home Farm Complex at Tyntesfield. Home Farm, Tyntesfield,Wraxall DEMOLITION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed removal of a barn within the vicinity of the Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden of Tyntesfield. 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. Avon Gardens Trust note that the 'open barn' is visible from the lower estate yard and on the principal visitor route from the Paradise Garden. It is a utilitarian structure of the early 20th. Century and does not relate to the earlier 19th. Century estate. It is in poor condition and has neutral significance within the landscape. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust has no objection to this application. Yours sincerely, Ros Delany (Dr) Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Ashton Court	Avon	E21/1166	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2021

				<p>Erection of a reception cabin, forest shelter and associated adventure ropes course. Summer House Plantation , Ashton Court,Long Ashton MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>Thank you for 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 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 and unregistered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The proposed development would increase opportunities for outdoor recreation within the Ashton Court estate, which is already popular for golf, mountain biking and other activities. The Trust notes that the proposed buildings and adventure ropes course would be constructed in sympathetic materials and that there is no proposal to provide associated additional services infrastructure, toilet facilities or car parking. The Trust agrees that the adventure ropes course would not be visible from the Mansion.</p> <p>However the Trust does have concerns about the proposal. Outdoor activities such as this are popular, and surely to be encouraged in appropriate locations, but the adventure ropes course is intended to be open seven days a week, 8am to 8pm (at some times of year longer than the estate is currently open), and would radically change the unspoilt character and special qualities of the Plantation. The needs of other users of the estate who are seeking quieter recreation should also be considered. Although the ropes course would not be visible from the mansion, it is not clear to what extent the course and buildings would be visible from within the park. No visualisations have been provided, which would have assisted in assessing the potential impact on the RPG. It is not clear from the plans provided whether the application boundary lies on the boundary of the Plantation, and where the buildings would be located in relation to any existing features.</p> <p>The Trust expects confirmation of whether there would be any impact on views from within the Park to be demonstrated by the submission of accurate visualisations or by clearly marking the locations of the proposed structures on the ground.</p> <p>Even if the proposal would not be visible from the wider park, the Plantation is nevertheless part of the Registered Park and Garden, and would be subject to a marked change of character.</p> <p>Bark mulch surfacing would be provided to mitigate the impact on tree</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>rooting areas, but we are concerned that in the longer term the health of the beech trees could decline due to compaction of the ground. Furthermore, the bat surveys appear to be incomplete (see paragraphs 6.1.2 and 6.1.3 of the submitted Static Detector Survey Report). Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust recognises the importance of Ashton Court estate for outdoor recreation but is concerned that the proposals have the potential to cause less than substantial harm to the character and quality of Summerhouse Plantation, and potentially to the wider estate, which is a Grade II * Registered Historic Park and Garden. The Trust therefore expects to see this harm weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Stoke Place	Buckinghamshire	E21/0265	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Installation of an England & Wales Cricket Board approved 3-lane system within a safety fenced enclosure and with surrounding security fence. The lanes are 34m in length and the overall footprint of the construction is 36m x 12.95m. The Cricket Club, Stoke Green, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4HT SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.10.2021</p> <p>In our previous response to this planning application (June 1st 2021), the Gardens Trust (GT) addressed both of the above applications as they related to the same site. We also noted that the application site sits within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Stoke Place, a mid-C18 landscape designed by Capability Brown, a Conservation Area, and that a Heritage Impact Appraisal should be carried out to accompany the proposed applications. We also suggested that a masterplan be devised for the entire site which would better explain what the applicant is trying to achieve rather than a succession of individual planning applications. Despite this, the revised plans submitted include neither a masterplan nor an Heritage Impact Appraisal. We still strongly recommend that these are produced.</p> <p>With specific regard to application PL/21/1928/FA for a storage container, the GT/Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) objected to the proposal and recommended that the planning authority refuse consent. We can see that the decision letter on the planning authority site records that this application has now been withdrawn. We welcome this decision and maintain our position that such a large structure is not appropriate in the RPG. However, we are concerned that a revised application may be submitted and again, we would like to reiterate that if it is the intention of the applicant to seek further development on this site, then a Heritage Impact Assessment and a masterplan for the entire site be submitted as part of any future planning application and that no application should be</p>

					<p>considered without these.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the application for the container has been withdrawn altogether, it would be helpful to have confirmation as to the car parking which this application was proposing to reduce in order to accommodate the container. Can the planning authority seek to confirm whether the car parking will remain at its current level and in its current position? The GT/BGT would have no objection to reducing the car parking but, equally, we note that sufficient car parking spaces will be required to meet demand and, again this should be addressed via a masterplan and a Heritage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>With specific regard to application PL/21/1480/FA for cricket nets, in our previous response as mentioned above, the GT/BGT objected to the proposals and recommended that the planning authority refuse them. We can see that the Heritage Officer also reached the same conclusions. On reviewing the revised proposals, we acknowledge that the applicant has gone some way to meet the concerns raised by both the Heritage Officer and the GT/BGT and the application for the cricket lanes has been amended as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · removal of security fencing · powdering the poles green · making the playing surface all green · reducing the height of the structure down to 3.6m · reducing the length of the structure to 32m <p>We welcome these revisions and the additional documents which explained that the proposed structure needs to meet certain standards for safety and safeguarding. Whilst we would prefer to see the continued use of traditional cricket nets which are small scale, recede into the scenery, and are demountable, we understand that traditional nets may no longer be fit for purpose.</p> <p>However, whilst we acknowledge these matters, the GT/BGT stand by our previous objection in principle to the introduction of this alien intervention in this historic landscape.</p> <p>Nonetheless, we also recognise that the Stoke Place Cricket Club is an established community facility. Therefore, if the planning authority are minded to support this revised application, the GT/BGT would ask that any planning consent contains conditions that restrict the introduction of the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · no floodlighting
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · no future applications to extend or alter the nets or to add security fencing at a later date · no advertisements or hoardings to be attached to the structure · no coverings other than temporary wet weather coverings during the playing season, However, there should not be any all year round coverings which would, in effect, present as a permanent covering to the structure. · this structure constitutes the limit of development on this site <p>Furthermore, if the planning authority are minded to support this revised application, the Gardens Trust still recommends that, when multiple works are being considered on a site of such significance, it is vital for both the applicant and those considering the application to have a Heritage Impact Assessment and a masterplan, especially the latter which would help us understand if and how the cricket club proposes to expand its facilities in the future.</p> <p>In conclusion, we maintain our fundamental objection to the introduction of the proposed new cricket net structure but recognise that such facilities may be required and will need to reach certain standards.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hartwell House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1054	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of a portion of a listed boundary wall and its reinstatement, along with a new access gate. Hartwell House Hotel Lower Hartwell Stone Buckinghamshire HP17 8NR DEMOLITION, ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Hartwell House and its estate is situated west of the town of Aylesbury and consists of the Grade II* registered park and garden. The listing states that it features an 18th century landscape park and pleasure grounds, laid out around an early 17th century country house, with remnants of an early 18th century formal layout, subsequently naturalised, possibly by Richard Woods. There are various listed buildings within the grounds along with some non-designated built heritage assets which are representative of different phases of development of the Hartwell estate.</p> <p>This application results from works relating to the construction of HS2 and, whilst we acknowledge that it is not possible to formally object on the</p>

					<p>fundamental proposal regarding HS2, we have been consulted with regard to the associated works which impact upon this significant site.</p> <p>The listing states that “The site's longest, south-east, boundary is formed by a 2m high rustic stone wall of Portland limestone adjacent to the A418 road and it forms part of the continuous perimeter of the site. The 2km long wall has large ammonites inserted near the entrance to Lower Hartwell Lane and, nearby, the date 1855 picked out in flint. This section of wall relates to the 18th century extension of the park estate and has both historic and aesthetic value’. The accompanying ‘Heritage Statement’ and ‘Design and Access Statement’ refer to the impact of the proposed works as being “slight” and of “minor magnitude”. The GT/BGT fundamentally disagree with this assertion on the grounds that the permanent loss of this section of the wall makes a significant contribution to the historic environment of the setting of both the registered park and garden (RPG) at Hartwell House as well as the wider landscape, and clearly and publicly delineates the estate boundary.</p> <p>The GT/BGT notes that the proposals are to reinstate a section of the wall re-using existing stones and we welcome the intention to number, record and store the stones for this purpose.</p> <p>We strongly support the need for a specification and method statement for the planning authority to consider prior to any formal planning decision.</p> <p>The GT/BGT has been consulted late on in this process and we can see that the National Trust (owners of Hartwell House) have previously submitted their well-considered comments in response to this application. We also understand that the Heritage Officer has also raised a number of concerns which have, now, been partially answered by the applicant.</p> <p>The GT/BGT would therefore like to support the following comments as detailed by the National Trust and the Heritage Officer. These comments are with specific regard to the RPG : The GT/BGT encourage the planning authority to ensure that the extent of wall demolished is no more than is required and that the applicant should be challenged as to the need to remove additional wall for the purposes of a haul road. These works should be kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>The GT/BGT are also concerned about the potential for additional damage to the retained wall resulting from the proposed construction works, both through accidental damage during the works and long-term damage resulting from the structural integrity of the wall being compromised.</p> <p>However, the GT/BGT does not support the proposal to construct</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>buttresses as part of the reinstatement works. This is not an architectural feature of the existing wall and should not be introduced as part of the solution. We would expect the applicant to find an engineering solution which retains the materials and appearance of the historic wall.</p> <p>Whilst the GT/BGT acknowledge that the introduction of black metal bollards is for safety and security reasons, we feel that the applicant should seek a solution that is more appropriate for this historic and rural setting. The GT/BGT support the Heritage Officer's suggestion of security bollards with a timber outer fabric.</p> <p>We also concur with the Heritage Officer's points regarding the need for a stone head for the culvert and to ensure that the entrance to Glee House remains a simple rural track.</p> <p>Finally, the GT/BGT request that we are consulted on the details relating to the proposed works and treatment of the parkland and designed landscape within the Hartwell Estate which will be damaged by HS2. As we have been notified late in these proceedings, we have not been provided with details as to how the proposals impact on this significant registered park and garden and feel strongly that our views as a statutory consultant should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/1058	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing outbuilding and part of existing garage, erection of outbuilding and single storey side/rear extension to garage Ponders, 54 Hedgerley Lane, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8SY DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and please consider this a joint response.</p> <p>Bulstrode, a Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG), is perhaps the best surviving non-Royal classic Dutch garden in the UK. William Bentinck, 1st Duke of Portland was William and Mary's collaborator and friend, who was heavily involved in the creation of their gardens at Het Loo and Hampton Court. Much of his garden at Bulstrode is still extant, in particular the western Pleasure Gardens. It is therefore a very important survivor, shown beautifully in the 1730s map/survey aerial view. When Repton worked at Bulstrode he importantly left the surviving Pleasure Grounds intact, retaining the surviving north-western trapezoidal Wilderness with</p>

					<p>its surviving two circular ponds and the Lime Avenue leading to the long canal (which might arguably be re-labelled the 'Bentinck Lily Pond' and 'Bentinck Lime Avenue').</p> <p>The application site, Ponders, sits within the RPG at the point the north and south sections meet. We note from the applicant's Heritage Impact Statement for the outbuildings that the existing buildings are not historic. It is also clear that the proposed replacement buildings have a higher ridgeline than that of the existing buildings. The GT/BGT therefore would have no objection to their demolition and replacement providing that the planning authority feels sure that the higher ridgeline does not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the RPG. As we are not familiar with the site, it is not possible for the GT/BGT to make this assessment.</p> <p>We are somewhat more concerned with the proposed construction of a new outbuilding for the storage of garden machinery. The ridgeline of the proposed new structure will be higher than that of surrounding structures and it is set into a lawned area further away from the existing and proposed garages shown in Plates 23-25 of the Heritage Statement. The site currently is a charming lawned area with established trees and hedges near to the walled garden. Whilst the style of the proposed new outbuilding (hipped roof) and proposed materials (brick) are considered to be appropriate, we do have concerns about the scale and position of the proposed new structure.</p> <p>The GT/BGT therefore object to the construction of a new structure, larger than all other outbuildings and in a currently undeveloped garden area. We do not object to the principle of a new storage outbuilding but in our opinion it should be smaller and positioned nearer to existing outbuildings. It would be helpful to have cross-sections to assess the impact of the proposed new storage outbuilding in the setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E21/1088	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration of the Grade 1 historic landscape by removal of post 1930's and post 1880's hedgerows to recreate the expensive landscape of the deer park at stowe.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.10.2021</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 colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and are glad to be able to</p>

				Stowe Historic Park And Garden Dadford Road Stowe Buckinghamshire LANDSCAPE	support the proposals. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Hall Barn	Buckinghamshire	E21/1093	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission PL/20/4441/FA (Single storey infill extension and changes to windows/door) to allow amendments to configuration of car park, provision of electrical charge points and increased extent of decking Bradbury House, Windsor End, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, HP9 2JW, MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and have no concerns about the proposals to increase the decking and resurface and demarcate the parking spaces. However, we do want to stress that this should not lead to increased lighting of this area and if additional lighting is required, your officers should ensure that it does not impact on the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Hall Barn. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E21/1162	II	PLANNING APPLICATION The installation of x2 12kW air source heat pumps Whitings Park Farm Newport Road Gayhurst Newport Pagnell ENERGY	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.10.2021 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 colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust who are familiar with Gayhurst. We have had a look at this application and cannot see any document which shows an elevation showing the position of the proposed air source heat pumps. There are assorted documents relating to previous works and assorted documents from the air source heat pump manufacturers but nothing that clearly shows what they will look like. Please could you ask the applicant to identify which document shows an elevation with the air source heat pumps in the proposed position? Once we have this information we will be able to send a more informed response. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer

Harleyford Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/1278	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of Old Estates office building into two semi detached dwellings, fenestration alterations and installation of x 4 conservation style rooflights</p> <p>Old Estate Office Harleyford Marlow Buckinghamshire SL7 2DX</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have not been able to make a site visit, so our response is based on the documentation available online plus Google Maps. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Harleyford (Grade I) was designed as a villa set in naturalistic grounds unencumbered by other structures or formal landscaping. The striking villa, of exceptional architectural quality, innovation and subsequent influence, was offset in its isolated position by a complex naturalistic setting of trees in the style of Lancelot Brown, if not actually by him. This is the basis of the national significance of the designed landscape (registered park and garden (RPG) at Grade II). The main feature was the meandering Thames, forming an Arcadian riverine setting echoing the Italian rivers such as the Arno and Tiber and emulating the watery settings so admired in the C17 works of Claude and Poussin. This is the most significant landscape phase and until recently it survived largely unaltered as a set piece within the wider England Landscape park (see HE register description). The building was the focus of the landscape and was not designed to be seen in a formal setting or with formal relationships to other features. It prefigured and perhaps influenced the setting of other similarly fine mansions which were set in picturesque informal lawns with scattered trees, such as Claremont, Surrey and Bletchington, Oxfordshire, where service and garden buildings were placed at a distance and screened. As far as is known, there were no axial buildings relating to the house at Harleyford in the immediate environs and the views from the villa were of designed Arcadian landscaping not buildings.</p> <p>The application site sits at the heart of the RPG, on the north drive as it meets the turning circle in front of both the Dower House and Harleyford Manor itself. We note the proposals to convert the old estates office building into two semi-detached dwellings. We would ask the planning authority to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the number of rooflights in the south roof pitch is minimised as they face the Dower House and Harleyford Manor and will be visible on the north front of the main house.
------------------	-----------------	----------	----	--	--

					<p>Rooflights emit and reflect light which can be damaging to the setting of the RPG, particularly given this is a three-storey building. If rooflights are permitted, use traditional conservation rooflights with an integral glazing bar and which, most importantly, sit flush with the roof slope to minimise the visual effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No additional parking space should be created - that the change of this commercial building to residential use does not result in a requirement for additional new commercial structures in the RPG. <p>In conclusion, the Gardens Trust has no objection to the principle of this conversion providing that the planning authority implements the matters we have raised above.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grounds of Thornton Manor	Cheshire	E19/0318	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retention of three marquees within the Thornton Manor Estate at The Dell, The Walled Garden and at the Lake to be used for private functions and conferences (Re-determination of planning application, updated information submitted) (GT Ref 10/0097 date 05.05.2010). Thornton Manor, Manor Road, Thornton Hough CH63 1JB. MARQUEE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.10.2021</p> <p>We understand that representations made previously by the Gardens Trust will be considered in determining the appeal. We would be grateful if our letter of 24th June 2019 (attached) can be taken into account, as having reviewed the appeal documents, we consider that our view remains substantially as stated. As you will see from our letter, it is not a positive response as claimed by Landor Planning Consultants Ltd in their Statement of Case, 3.15.</p> <p>We are keen to see a resolution of this case which results in a legally binding means of conserving the significance of the historic landscape so that it can continue to be cherished and enjoyed by visitors and is no longer at risk.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lartington Hall	County Durham	E21/1105	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of detached outbuilding, removal of existing boundary wall and minor regrading of garden. Greys Lodge Lartington Barnard Castle DL12 9BW MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBU</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Lartington Hall, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this</p>

				ILDING, DEMOLITION, LANDSCAPE	<p>response. This response is therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>We accept that a Heritage statement has been submitted in support of the application but are disappointed that any potential impact on views from the RPG is not considered. Indeed, the existence of the proposal within the RPG is not even acknowledged.</p> <p>Comparing modern-day satellite imagery with the Ordnance Surveys between 1892 and 1919 shows that Grey's Close was originally a modest estate building abutting the east wall of the walled garden, sited in the woodland belt along the north side of the Beck. Over time the house has grown considerably in footprint, now straddling the wall into the kitchen garden, and also creating, what appears to be, garden ground to the east and west of the garden wall. The woodland has been cleared away to east and south, presumably to create the garden and to open up views across the Beck to the Lartington parkland. If the proposed outbuilding is to be located to the east of the existing building line there is potential for it to be visible from the parkland, although there may be some intervening planting within the current garden to help mitigate this.</p> <p>Whilst not wishing to object to the application outright it would have been useful to have some photos of the present position on site and consideration of what the proposed building will look like when viewed from the RPG. We note the concern and objection of the Lartington PC, expressed in their letters of June and again in September, responding to the revised proposal and would therefore advise that visual analysis of the proposal and any impact on the RPG is sought before determining this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Raby Castle	County Durham	E21/1208	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of existing Gas House building to new Energy Centre with associated ancillary buildings, underground pipework, works and the creation of 2no. boreholes in addition to three replacement domestic garages. Gas House Raby Road Staindrop</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Raby Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. This response is therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>While the proposal will have a dramatic short-term impact on the designed</p>

				Darlington DL2 3AQ CHANGE OF USE, ENERGY	<p>landscape as the major service route is excavated, in the long term there should be minimal impact on the landscape, with the two kiosks at the injection and abstraction sites the only really visible elements of the scheme within the parkland. Consequently, we do not object to the proposals on landscape impact terms.</p> <p>We would however welcome a condition for further recording of the gas house and later electric power station and its immediate setting, as we feel that this is another opportunity to combine information from the Raby archives and physical remains on the ground. Donald Insall Associates provide a very good report on the building but are a bit thin on the internal layout of the surviving elements of the gas house /power station and any understanding and interpretation of how it worked. Given the proposed “replacement of concrete floors and concrete plinths” there must be scope for proper recording of these - presumably the beds for elements of the power station machinery and perhaps retaining evidence for the earlier use of the building for gas production also. The excavation required for new services within and around the building may produce further evidence of form and function. Maybe even the malt kiln and earlier road alignments? There are a few lines on the removal of “redundant electrical switchgear” to store on the estate and photography or these and “wiring” before removal, but there must be an opportunity here to relate these to the machinery and documentary evidence for the installations?</p> <p>The WSI seemingly makes no mention of proposed further recording of the gas house or its immediate setting, concentrating instead on the excavations for the major service route.</p> <p>These aspects of estate technology are generally under-recorded and it would be a pity if the opportunity was not taken to learn more about this aspect of the Raby story.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E21/0719	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Building Plot for a single detached 4 bedroom house with Garage The Smithy Mercaston Lane Kedleston Derby Derbyshire DE22 5JL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.10.2021 Thank you for sending us the applicant’s rebuttal statement regarding our original response to the above application. When an applicant submits documents with an application for Full Planning Permission (in this case the design of the dwelling) the drawings they send are the ones that define what they are wanting to build. Mr Neal seems to have misunderstood the heritage legislation and RPG designation</p>

				RESIDENTIAL	<p>(Application AVA Observations, Built Heritage Assets nos 6-9). As you will be aware, 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, states (p2) 'The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting'. It is also incorrect to suggest that there is no public access to areas of Kedleston Park that will be affected by the proposed development.</p> <p>Historic England's Settings guidance also says (on the same page as the above comments): 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.' Page 5 continues : 'The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary. It can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it.' <p>Our objections remain. We consider the proposals would be harmful to the RPG due to their proximity. The GT will not be submitting any further comment in advance of the LPA's decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Creedy Park	Devon	E21/0120	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a general purpose agricultural building. Land at NGR 282822 101624 (Creedy Park), Crediton, Devon. AGRICULTURE	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.10.2021</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust understands that the above application, to which we submitted a written objection on 23rd April 2021, is to be considered by the Members of the Planning Committee on 6th October.</p> <p>We would like to take this opportunity to confirm that our assessment and advice with regard to this application remains unchanged, and that we maintain our objection for the reasons set out in our previous letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The visual intrusion of a large agricultural building within the otherwise open parkland landscape, to the detriment and damage of its special historic interest and character;

					<p>· The permanent fragmentation and sub-division of the parkland by the introduction of a solid barrier in the form of a Devon hedge bank. We note that the applicant still does not appear to have provided the appropriate historic impact assessment. We would advise that without such information, your Authority is not in a position properly to determine this application, and we continue to advise that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact upon the historic designed landscape of Creedy Park, which is included on the Devon Gazetteer of landscapes of regional and local significance, and which forms the designed setting of Creedy House (Listed Grade II), and which relates to, and forms the designed setting of, several other Listed structures.</p> <p>We would commend the Officer's Report which accompanies this application to the close attention of members, and respectfully ask them to endorse the recommendation to refuse this adverse proposal.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could kindly confirm to the Elected Members the position of Devon Gardens Trust with regard to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E21/1140	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of residential mobile home with a dwelling TEIGNGRACE - Middlepark Yard Caravan , Teigngrace MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Stover Park, 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. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We note that the proposed development site appears to lie within the boundary of the nationally designated historic designed landscape. Having reviewed the material relating to this application on your Authority's website, we note with concern that no historic impact assessment has been produced to quantify the physical, visual or aesthetic impact of the proposed development on the historic designed landscape, or any significant element of that landscape design which may survive within the proposed development site.</p>

					<p>In the absence of such a document, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, we would advise that your Authority cannot properly proceed to determine this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Parnham House	Dorset	E21/1098	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing boiler room, utility room, conservatory, garage, walling, structures within the courtyard and detached outbuilding, erection of single storey extension, reinstatement of carriageway, gates and piers and boundary enclosure, erection of bike store. Dower House Parnham Beaminster DT8 3LZ DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.10.2021 The Dorset Gardens Trust has received this application from The Gardens Trust, the national statutory consultee. This comment therefore is submitted on behalf of both Trusts. There is no objection to the proposal, in principle, in relation to the Trusts' interest in the designated garden area of Parnham House. It may be that there are other issues relating to some aspects of the the design of proposal, particularly bearing in mind the listing of the property, but the Trusts are content that this issue is left to be considered by the planning authority.</p>
Ashburnham Place	East Sussex	E21/1161	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and change of use of existing gardener's bothy buildings and an adjoining lean-to glass house, into a restaurant, including associated internal and external alterations Ashburnham Place, Ashburnham Christian Trust Limited, Ashburnham CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATIONS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2021 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 studied the documents submitted with the application. The site of these buildings is located within Ashburnham Place which is included on the register of historic parks and gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II designation. The very brief Heritage report submitted with the application correctly states that the buildings were shown on Lancelot 'Capability' Brown's plans for the site. An extract from Brown's plan is shown in the Appendix attached. The Lean-to green house is located in area F (described on the plan as a 'Melon Ground and Stoves') while the Bothy is located on the other side of the wall in area G (described on the plan as a Rickyard). Although the walled garden doesn't have a separate listing, the design is definitively attributed to Brown, the whole complex is very large, survives</p>

					<p>intact and generally in a good state of repair. It is very rare to find all these features together and loss of even part of the walls would be significant. Moreover, the current design of the garden in the section where the lean-to greenhouse lies mirrors that of the garden in the courtyard of immediately adjacent Grade II* listed Former Stables (see Google Earth image in the Appendix). This group of Heritage Assets thus share a common setting.</p> <p>Members of SGT visited this site in April 2016 and at that time the garden in front of the lean-to greenhouse was very well maintained (see photos on Appendix). However, the Bothy is in a very poor state of repair, so the proposals would help remedy this issue. Less welcome is the opening up of a section of the garden wall between the greenhouse and the bothy. The section of wall to be removed is described as “being kept to the minimum”; however, the length removed appears to be approximately 8.5m which is substantial and will cause harm to the significance of the structures and their setting.</p> <p>Under para 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is the responsibility of the applicant to describe the significance of the site and assess the impact of proposals on that significance.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement included with this application concludes that “New internal openings have been kept to a minimum, with little of any architectural merit being lost”. This fails to reflect the points made in the preceding paragraphs. Such a large opening in the historic wall will undoubtedly result in a degree of harm. SGT suggests the harm could possibly be reduced by limiting the opening to a much smaller size, although even this could threaten the structural integrity of the top level of the wall, which will need to be properly supported (no drawings have been included showing how this would be achieved).</p> <p>Even with a reduced opening, the Planning Authority should only approve the application if there are sufficient achievable public benefits. The ambition described in the last section of the Design and Access Statement is in many ways to be commended. However, it is exceedingly brief and not supported by any detail. These proposals envisage the greenhouse will be used as the main dining area with the structure largely unchanged. However, the lean-to greenhouse was specifically sited on a south facing wall to capture the heat of the sun, making it uncomfortably hot during daylight and uncomfortably cold at night. Is it realistic to use it in the manner described?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust objects to the application being approved as submitted for the reasons outlined above.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Jim Stockwell.</p> <p>On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E21/1043	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing agricultural building and erection of 1 no. dwelling</p> <p>Barn At Shortgrove (former Byfords Farm Services) Newport Saffron Walden</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and would be grateful if you could take our joint comments into consideration when coming to your decision on this application.</p> <p>The registered landscape at Shortgrove Hall is in origin an 18th century landscape park laid out by Capability Brown between the 1750s and 1770s, overlying an early 18th century formal landscape surrounding the now demolished great house. The barns for which a Class Q consent have approval are in an isolated wooded part of the estate, away from the main residential area. Being agricultural in character, the barns are the sort of buildings one would expect to find in such an area and are complementary to it. The house proposed in this application would lead to a very evident change of use, explicitly domestic in character. Its design is unsympathetic, with a clumsy fenestration pattern and random mixture of materials. It would have a very large footprint, and one of the barns would be retained. The GT/EGT object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Margie Hoffnung</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Killigrews, Margaretting	Essex	E21/1224	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of garage.</p> <p>Construction of single storey building for garaging, storage and staff accommodation, with rooms in the roof.</p> <p>Killigrews Main Road</p> <p>Margaretting Ingatestone Essex</p> <p>CM4 0EZ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Killigrews is a grade II* 18th century house, a remodelling of an earlier one which stands on a moat enclosed by a Tudor brick wall with small turrets at the angles. Around the house on the moat, there is a long-established</p>

				DEMOLITION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	garden. Outside the moat, there is a walled garden. Killigrews is included in the Essex Gardens Trust's inventory of important gardens and landscapes in Chelmsford City district. This application is for the removal of an outbuilding adjacent the walled garden and its replacement with a similar but taller building providing garaging and service accommodation. The proposed replacement building should be neutral in its effect on the gardens and site so long as sympathetic materials are used, notably roof tiles, bricks and rooflights. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Cowley Manor	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 17.10.2021 The Garden Trust has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) of the re-consultation on this proposal. Your Senior Conservation Officer has provided the Council with a very full analysis of the issues regarding materials and detailing. On this basis, I am pleased that the use of matching natural stone is proposed, which overcomes longer term weathering difficulties, and more thought is being given to the constructional detailing. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Westonbirt	Gloucestershire	E21/1069	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Temporary gymnasium building for a 3-year period at Westonbirt School Westonbirt Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8QG EDUCATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Garden and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. This is one of a sequence of planning applications to provide better facilities for the School and improve and rationalise the School's occupancy of a site having very important cultural and aesthetic qualities. It is one step in delivering the Vision Statement for the School's redevelopment, and should be recognised as such. Bearing in mind past planning history, GGLT has no objection to this temporary structure and its location, but would wish its life would adhere to a the three year temporary planning consent, now requested. Yours sincerely, David Ball,(on behalf of GGLT)
Westonbirt	Gloucestershire	E21/1131	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Provision of	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that have

				new eight classroom teaching facility within the Walled Garden area of Westonbirt School and associated infrastructure at Westonbirt School Westonbirt Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8QG EDUCATION	<p>an impact on Listed and Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>The buildings and setting of Westonbirt School have generated a considerable amount of debate accompanied by proposals to overcome both the general decline in the quality of its setting and the school buildings themselves. The proposed demolition of the gymnasium removes a very significant blot on the landscape, and this proposal represents an important step forward in implementing the School's development strategy.</p> <p>The development of a set of new classrooms in this very sensitive setting is a potentially difficult design problem. However, with one eye on the previous use built forms used in this area in Westonbirt's heyday, and the application of a similar massing in this proposal works well. This, combined with a limited palette of pale coloured materials, and precise detailing of the buildings and landscaping should produce an a scheme that will be very successful and not compete with their wider setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Westonbirt	Gloucestershire	E21/1177	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Erection of a glazed dome in garden at Mole Manor Westonbirt Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8QT GARDEN BUILDING	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2021</p> <p>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 on its behalf.</p> <p>The sparse information continues the theme of obscurity being in some instances quite acceptable in planning terms. In this case, the proposal will have marginal impact on its immediate environment and is screened from the adjacent road.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Batsford Park	Gloucestershire	E21/1193	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Creation of a lake/reservoir at Batsford Arboretum Batsford Park Batsford Moreton-In-Marsh Gloucestershire HYDRO	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.10.2021</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that may impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>There are two strands of this scheme. The first is to provide some mitigation of surface run-off from this sloping site, and its impacts on</p>

					<p>flooding in the wider area as pinpointed by the Local Authority advisers. Secondly, to integrate this civil engineering operation into a Grade 11* parkland setting.</p> <p>The first element of the brief has largely been solved apart from possible silting and the need to manage the level of plant colonisation. However, this is a Listed park; and, in its designed setting, it has accommodated a well managed arboretum, gardens, a gardens centre and adjacent car parking.</p> <p>Although this proposal might be considered a rather utilitarian flood control and water resource, it would be hoped that this pond could be given greater prominence in the overall parkland setting. It is suggested that it may be possible to integrate the pond more fully into a wider designed landscape upgrade, particularly taking in the adjacent parking area.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Church House, Lechlade	Gloucestershire	E21/1252	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building Consent for Erection of single storey extension with internal and external alterations at The Malthouse Shelleys Close Market Place Lechlade Gloucestershire</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2021</p> <p>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 to this Application on its behalf.</p> <p>This proposal aims to create a single storey addition to the Malthouse that will extend into the Grade 11 Listed garden of Church House, which also lies within the boundary of Church House which is separately Listed; and is adjacent to the Grade 1 Church of St. Lawrence. In short, this is a very sensitive historic and aesthetic environment, that raises a series of important issues as outlined in the report of the the Council's Senior Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Key to the GGLT's response is how such a proposal to extend the Malthouse can maintain the integrity and existing character of the Listed garden. One may pray in aid the historic footprint of the now demolished thatched barn. However, this had a traditional massing and materials used in a working estate building.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to insert a substantial and thoroughly contemporary form of building and construction into what essentially would have been the "walled garden" of Church House. It is considered that this results in a mismatch of scale, colour and texture of materials; particularly the extensive areas of glazing that will be visible during the day and at night.</p>

					<p>Therefore, on this basis, GGLT would not wish to support this development proposal. However, in such a sensitive location, if any any development at all was to be contemplated, only a small scaled traditionally constructed "bothy" might be an acceptable approach.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Wimbledon Park	Greater London	E21/1002	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Cross boundary (Merton/Wandsworth) hybrid planning application comprising part full permission and part outline planning permission) for expansion of the All England Lawn Tennis Grounds onto Wimbledon Park Golf Course with the introduction of new tennis courts, tennis related infrastructure and new buildings. Full planning permission for the provision of 38 grass tennis courts and associated infrastructure, comprising of the re-profiling of the landscape and the removal, retention and replanting of trees; provision of 7 no satellite maintenance buildings; the provision of a boardwalk around the perimeter of and across Wimbledon Park Lake, lake alterations (including lake edge, de-silting and de-culverting), highway works to Church Road; new pedestrian access points at the northern and southern ends of the site; new vehicular access points; and the creation of a new area of parkland with permissive public access.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2021</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 also liaised with colleagues in the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (LHPGT), whose local knowledge has informed this joint response.</p> <p>Having made a site visit, read the huge array of documents and gained an understanding of the final built form of the proposals, it is apparent that the crux of the matter is deciding whether the irrevocable loss of some of the 'at risk' Grade II* registered parkland (RPG) to the erection of an 8000 seater stadium and associated network of pathways/other structures necessary for access and maintenance of the 38 new grass courts (the D&A part 1, page 9 states 39 new courts) is offset by the potential public and heritage benefits of the proposals. There is the added difficulty of the interpretation of the covenants entered into by Merton Council in 1993, but that is for lawyers to disentangle and not a direct planning matter. The site is Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) with a presumption against development except in 'very special circumstances.' We are fully aware that many local amenity societies are justifiably concerned about the status of MOL which is one of their core missions to protect. However, the Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee whose remit is to weigh up the planning legislation in the round and make observations to maximise public gain with concomitant heritage benefits.</p> <p>The NPPF functions on a presumption in favour of development, and the change of use of the site from a golf club to tennis courts is not a material change in terms of the Open Space requirements of the NPPF – both are sporting provision. As MOL, the site is accorded protections of an equivalence to greenbelt within the NPPF and this scheme would impact upon the MOL. However, to balance that, the proposals aim to bolster the future of a premier UK sporting venue which features annually on the international stage, and as such could justifiably</p>

			<p>Outline planning permission (with appearance, means of access, landscaping and scale reserved-layout only considered in detail) for the erection of an 8,000-seat parkland show court incorporating a qualifying player hub, guest facilities and associated event operational facilities; a central grounds maintenance hub and 2 no. players hubs.</p> <p>An Environmental Statement has been submitted with the application under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Wimbledon Park Golf Club, Home Park Road, Wimbledon Park SW19 7HR SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>be considered ‘very special circumstances’ under the terms of MOL, and an exceptional business case. Merton Council will therefore have to satisfy itself as to the public and heritage benefits of the scheme when weighed against the drawbacks.</p> <p>In the preparation of this application the AELTC has done a very thorough job to understand the landscape, including a detailed analysis of every tree. The Heritage Assessment makes clear that Wimbledon Park is a highly degraded remnant of a former Capability Brown landscape, on the ‘at risk’ register. The GT/LPHGT concurs with this assessment. Wimbledon Park is on the ‘at risk’ register due to various factors, not least the fragmented nature of the ownership. That fragmentation is very evident on site: there is currently no visual cohesion to the park which does not read as a seamless whole, as it should. There are very limited remnants of original heritage fabric too.</p> <p>It is immediately apparent upon visiting the site how hemmed in the parkland is amongst extensive urban development and how difficult it is to get a feel for the historic layout of the parkland. There is currently no visual cohesion to the park which does not read as a seamless whole, as it should. The AELTC’s proposals go some way towards considering the entire park as an artistic whole and reimposing a visual and physical integrity to the site. In assessing the application, the GT feels that the creation and opening of a new 9.4ha parkland with permissive general access out of season when the two major tournaments are not taking place, is a substantial public amenity gain. Remodelling the golf course landform, removal of its fairways, bunkers etc and restoration of many acres of land previously inaccessible to the public to something approaching its original parkland aspect, separated from the Parkland Tennis South by a new Brownian ha-ha, is another heritage gain. We are also very supportive of the de-culverting of the two brooks and the dredging and putting back to the close approximation of its original form, the extremely large lake, with significant improvements to its biodiversity value by de-silting. The new proposed boardwalk, although not following the original contours of the borders, does reinstate the opportunity to resume walks around the lake and will, without doubt, also be a very popular new public benefit. Additional heritage gains would be the opening-up as far as possible of some historic views, assessment of each of the 41 veteran trees with their own individual management plans, and the planting of many historically appropriate new trees within the parkland setting. (NB This area of Brown’s plan is</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>traditional oak wood pasture.) We also welcome the long-term landscape management plan which reunites currently disparate areas and makes future management and protection of Wimbledon Park as an historic landscape more likely.</p> <p>At present there are only limited views over the golf club through to the lake even from Home Park Road. There is no visibility whatsoever of the parkland from St Mary's churchyard to the south, and only the church spire is visible in distant views from some areas of the existing public parkland. The athletics track enclosed by leylandii and poplars with its impenetrable fencing within the bounds of the public park is a most unfortunate intrusion into the parkland setting which completely blocks easy access to the currently very limited public circuit of the lake. We note in the Leisure Services Committee Minutes of Wednesday 31st March 1993 (p960, 2nd paragraph) it was resolved that 'Wimbledon Park Golf Club be declared surplus to Leisure Services requirements and disposed of, subject to the Leisure Services Committee reservations that the lake be retained and that access be made available to the public around the lake at the earliest date ... subject to a covenant preventing the use of the land otherwise than for leisure or recreation purposes or as an open space...' We assume that the current proposals represent the 'earliest date' for public access to the lake circuit as Merton Council has not complied with this undertaking in the intervening years. The current golf course with its historically inaccurate and insensitive landform and tree planting (since 1958 accessible only to members of the golf club), hinders any clear appreciation of the historic layout and Capability Brown's original design intent.</p> <p>The degradation of this historic landscape is in large part caused by the split into 3 parts between the public park, golf course and Wimbledon Club. Whilst this application does not change that land ownership arrangement it does 'unite' the public park with a sizeable section of parkland south of the lake (subject to permissive access) via the lake walk and other new footpath connections which we consider to be both a heritage benefit and a public amenity gain.</p> <p>In terms of public amenity, provided the creation and opening of a new 9.4ha parkland with permissive general access out of season when the two major tournaments are not taking place, is firmly secured as part of the special planning conditions with the AELTC this represents a substantial increase of accessible greenspace for Londoners and would be a significant benefit.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>When considering the heritage, remodelling the golf course landform, removal of its fairways, bunkers etc and restoration of many acres of land previously inaccessible to the public to something approaching its original parkland aspect, separated from the Parkland Tennis South by a new Brownian ha-ha, is considered beneficial too. Additional heritage gains would be the opening-up as far as possible some historic views, assessment of each of the 41 veteran trees with their own individual management plans, and the planting of many historically appropriate new trees within the parkland setting. The Gardens Trust also welcomes the de-culverting of the two brooks and the dredging and putting back to the close approximation of its original form, the extremely large lake, with significant improvements to its biodiversity value by de-silting.</p> <p>The new proposed boardwalk does reinstate the opportunity to resume walks around the lake and will, without doubt, be a very popular new public benefit, but it does not follow the original contours of the borders and we believe could be pushed back to something closer to the original form.</p> <p>Our biggest concern is the erection of the new Parkland Stadium whose direct public benefit is open to question as this is a commercial development with commercial benefits. The GT has looked at the options appraisal for the siting of this structure and agrees that the site chosen is the most suitable of the three possible options. The design, with its tree grove inspiration and external green-wall cladding minimises the impact as far as possible. The Trust concurs that its placement means that it will be read as part of the core group of large buildings with Centre Court and No 2 Court. In an ideal world there would be no need for another stadium and the creation of 38 new courts would suffice. The new grass courts are surrounded by an extensive network of hard pathways, grouped with several discreet maintenance hubs and two player hubs. Whilst the extensive paths detract from the parkland appearance, it is apparent that these have been kept to the minimum necessary for the maintenance of the new grass courts and access by players and the public. We feel that the siting of the maintenance hubs, especially the main one to the south of the site, has been very carefully considered and designed.</p> <p>Since our pre-app response of 13th May 2021, the AELTC has provided greater documentation which addresses many of our concerns. Balancing public and heritage gains against the permanent loss of some Grade II* parkland, we have come to the conclusion that this is the best chance for</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>landscape improvements (as far as is now possible) of this rare, urban Capability Brown C18th parkland. At our site visit we noted that the lakeside edge near the boathouse is substantially degraded and in urgent need of attention. In reaching this conclusion, the Trust has taken note of the AELTC's intended contribution to de-silting the lake and supporting Merton Council to address this problem as part of a separate dam works project.</p> <p>However, should the local authority approve the application the GT would recommend that the planning conditions include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Clarity on dates of public access in perpetuity · Guarantees of permanent maintenance funding · A covenant to ensure the public are never charged for access during the permitted season as set out in the application documents. Without this we would be concerned that over the years, public access could be gradually diminished as competition requirements increase, or fundraising opportunities, which would require occasional closures of part of the parkland, become more frequent <p>We would also suggest that if the opportunity should ever arise in future, it would be hugely beneficial if the areas of Wimbledon Park RPG not included within the application site (ie the athletics track and Wimbledon Club), be brought back into a Masterplan to enable them to be amalgamated into a more parkland-type setting and included within a long term, unified management plan for the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wimbledon Park	Greater London	E21/1234	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Cross boundary (Merton/wandsworth) Hybrid planning application (comprising part full permission and part outline planning permission) for expansion of the All England Lawn Tennis Club Grounds onto Wimbledon Park Golf Course with the introduction of new tennis courts, tennis related infrastructure and new buildings.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2021</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 colleagues in the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (LHPGT), whose local knowledge has informed this joint response, as well as consulting other heritage and Capability Brown experts, to weigh in the balance all the heritage issues pertinent to the designed landscape</p> <p>Having made a site visit, read the huge array of documents and gained an understanding of the final built form of the proposals, it is apparent that the crux of the matter is deciding whether the irrevocable loss of some of</p>

			<p>Full planning permission for the provision of 38 grass tennis courts and associated infrastructure, comprising of the re-profiling of the landscape and the removal, retention and replanting of trees; provision of 7 no satellite maintenance buildings; the provision of a boardwalk around the perimeter of and across Wimbledon Park Lake, lake alterations (including lake edge, de-silting & de-culverting), highway works to Church Road; new pedestrian access points at the northern and southern ends of the site; new vehicular access points; and the creation of a new area of parkland with permissive public access.</p> <p>Outline planning permission (with appearance, means of access, landscaping and scale reserved - layout only considered in detail) for the erection of new buildings and structures, including an 8,000-seat parkland show court incorporating a qualifying player hub, guest facilities and associated event operational facilities; a central grounds maintenance hub and 2no. players hubs.</p> <p>An Environmental Statement has been submitted with the application under The Town and Country Planning (Environmental</p>	<p>the 'at risk' Grade II* registered parkland (RPG) to the erection of an 8000 seater stadium and associated network of pathways/other structures necessary for access and maintenance of the 38 new grass courts (the D&A part 1, page 9 states 39 new courts) is offset by the potential public and heritage benefits of the proposals. There is the added difficulty of the interpretation of the covenants entered into by Merton Council in 1993, but that is for lawyers to disentangle and not a direct planning matter. The site is Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) with a presumption against development except in 'very special circumstances.' We are fully aware that many local amenity societies are justifiably concerned about the status of MOL which is one of their core missions to protect. However, the Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee whose remit is to weigh up the planning legislation in the round and make observations to maximise public gain with concomitant heritage benefits. The NPPF functions on a presumption in favour of development, and the change of use of the site from a golf club to tennis courts is not a material change in terms of the Open Space requirements of the NPPF – both are sporting provision. As MOL, the site is accorded protections of an equivalence to greenbelt within the NPPF and this scheme would impact upon the MOL. However, to balance that, the proposals aim to bolster the future of a premier UK sporting venue which features annually on the international stage, and as such could justifiably be considered 'very special circumstances' under the terms of MOL, and an exceptional business case. Wandsworth and Merton Councils will therefore have to satisfy themselves as to the public and heritage benefits of the scheme when weighed against the drawbacks.</p> <p>In the preparation of this application the AELTC has done a very thorough job to understand the landscape, including a detailed analysis of every tree. The Heritage Assessment makes clear that Wimbledon Park is a highly degraded remnant of a former Capability Brown landscape, on the 'at risk' register. The GT/LPHGT concurs with this assessment. Wimbledon Park is on the 'at risk' register due to various factors, not least the fragmented nature of the ownership. That fragmentation is very evident on site: there is currently no visual cohesion to the park which does not read as a seamless whole, as it should. There are very limited remnants of original heritage fabric too.</p> <p>It is immediately apparent upon visiting the site how hemmed in the parkland is amongst extensive urban development and how difficult it is to</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 Wimbledon Park Golf Course Home Park Road Wimbledon Park Road SW19 7HR MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>get a feel for the historic layout of the parkland. The AELTC's proposals go some way towards considering the entire park as an artistic whole and reimposing a visual and physical integrity to the site.</p> <p>In assessing the application, the GT feels that the creation and opening of a new 9.4ha parkland with permissive general access out of season when the two major tournaments are not taking place, is a substantial public amenity gain. Remodelling the golf course landform, removal of its fairways, bunkers etc and restoration of many acres of land previously inaccessible to the public to something approaching its original parkland aspect, separated from the Parkland Tennis South by a new Brownian ha-ha, is another heritage gain. We are also very supportive of the de-culverting of the two brooks and the dredging and putting back to the close approximation of its original form, the extremely large lake, with significant improvements to its biodiversity value by de-silting. The new proposed boardwalk, although not following the original contours of the borders, does reinstate the opportunity to resume walks around the lake and will, without doubt, also be a very popular new public benefit. Additional heritage gains would be the opening-up as far as possible of some historic views, assessment of each of the 41 veteran trees with their own individual management plans, and the planting of many historically appropriate new trees within the parkland setting. (NB This area of Brown's plan is traditional oak wood pasture.) We also welcome the long-term landscape management plan which reunites currently disparate areas and makes future management and protection of Wimbledon Park as an historic landscape more likely.</p> <p>At present there are only limited views over the golf club through to the lake even from Home Park Road. There is no visibility whatsoever of the parkland from St Mary's churchyard (which lies to the south of the application site) and only the church spire is visible in distant views from some areas of the existing public parkland. A church has existed on this site since the C12 and it is the nearest point to what was the historic house and a landmark on the horizon of pertinence to the historic context. The athletics track enclosed by leylandii and poplars with its impenetrable fencing within the bounds of the public park is a most unfortunate intrusion into the parkland setting which completely blocks easy access to the currently very limited public circuit of the lake. We note in the Leisure Services Committee Minutes of Wednesday 31st March 1993 (p960, 2nd paragraph) it was resolved that 'Wimbledon Park Golf Club be declared</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>surplus to Leisure Services requirements and disposed of, subject to the Leisure Services Committee reservations that the lake be retained and that access be made available to the public around the lake at the earliest date ... subject to a covenant preventing the use of the land otherwise than for leisure or recreation purposes or as an open space...' We assume that the current proposals represent the 'earliest date' for public access to the lake circuit as Merton Council has not complied with this undertaking in the intervening years. The current golf course with its historically inaccurate and insensitive landform and tree planting (since 1958 accessible only to members of the golf club), hinders any clear appreciation of the historic layout and Capability Brown's original design intent.</p> <p>The degradation of this historic landscape is in large part caused by the split into 3 parts between the public park, golf course and Wimbledon Club. Whilst this application does not change that land ownership arrangement it does 'unite' the public park with a sizeable section of parkland south of the lake (subject to permissive access) via the lake walk and other new footpath connections which we consider to be both a heritage benefit and a public amenity gain.</p> <p>In terms of public amenity, provided the creation and opening of a new 9.4ha parkland with permissive general access out of season when the two major tournaments are not taking place, is firmly secured as part of the special planning conditions with the AELTC this represents a substantial increase of accessible greenspace for Londoners and would be a significant benefit.</p> <p>When considering the heritage, remodelling the golf course landform, removal of its fairways, bunkers etc and restoration of many acres of land previously inaccessible to the public to something approaching its original parkland aspect, separated from the Parkland Tennis South by a new Brownian ha-ha, is considered beneficial too. Additional heritage gains would be the opening-up as far as possible some historic views, assessment of each of the 41 veteran trees with their own individual management plans, and the planting of many historically appropriate new trees within the parkland setting. The Gardens Trust also welcomes the de-culverting of the two brooks and the dredging and putting back to the close approximation of its original form, the extremely large lake, with significant improvements to its biodiversity value by de-silting.</p> <p>The new proposed boardwalk does reinstate the opportunity to resume</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>walks around the lake and will, without doubt, be a very popular new public benefit, but it does not follow the original contours of the borders and we believe could be pushed back to something closer to the original form.</p> <p>Our biggest concern is the erection of the new Parkland Stadium whose direct public benefit is open to question as this is a commercial development with commercial benefits. The GT has looked at the options appraisal for the siting of this structure and agrees that the site chosen is the most suitable of the three possible options. The design, with its tree grove inspiration and external green-wall cladding minimises the impact as far as possible. The Trust concurs that its placement means that it will be read as part of the core group of large buildings with Centre Court and No 2 Court. In an ideal world there would be no need for another stadium and the creation of 38 new courts would suffice. The new grass courts are surrounded by an extensive network of hard pathways, grouped with several discreet maintenance hubs and two player hubs. Whilst the extensive paths detract from the parkland appearance, it is apparent that these have been kept to the minimum necessary for the maintenance of the new grass courts and access by players and the public. We feel that the siting of the maintenance hubs, especially the main one to the south of the site, has been very carefully considered and designed.</p> <p>Since our pre-app response of 13th May 2021, the AELTC has provided greater documentation which addresses many of our concerns. Balancing public and heritage gains against the permanent loss of some Grade II* parkland, we have come to the conclusion that this is the best chance for landscape improvements (as far as is now possible) of this rare, urban Capability Brown C18th parkland. At our site visit we noted that the lakeside edge near the boathouse is substantially degraded and in urgent need of attention. In reaching this conclusion, the Trust has taken note of the AELTC's intended contribution to de-silting the lake and supporting Merton Council to address this problem as part of a separate dam works project.</p> <p>However, should the local authority approve the application the GT would recommend that the planning conditions include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Clarity on dates of public access in perpetuity · Guarantees of permanent maintenance funding · A covenant to ensure the public are never charged for access during the permitted season as set out in the application documents. Without this we
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>would be concerned that over the years, public access could be gradually diminished as competition requirements increase, or fundraising opportunities, which would require occasional closures of part of the parkland, become more frequent</p> <p>We would also suggest that if the opportunity should ever arise in future, it would be hugely beneficial if the areas of Wimbledon Park RPG not included within the application site (ie the athletics track and Wimbledon Club), be brought back into a Masterplan to enable them to be amalgamated into a more parkland-type setting and included within a long term, unified management plan for the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Wimbledon Park	Greater London	E21/1312	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improvement of entrance from Revelstoke Road into Wimbledon Park 2. Repairing rainwater kit and cleaning brickwork, resite razor topped wire fencing, painting the bridge and setting up fixtures to allow murals to be painted 3. To join up the perimeter path by relocating the car park & extending the railway hedge. <p>PARKING, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2021</p> <p>As you will be aware, the Gardens Trust is a statutory consultee for any application which might affect a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens, of any grade, as per the one above. Unfortunately, we were unable to comment on the this application as we were notified far too late. Despite us repeatedly asking to be notified by email to consult@thegardenstrust.org Merton still resolutely sends letters to our Cowcross Street address, addressed to Emma Mills of the Garden History Society. We have not been called the Garden History Society since 2015, Emma Mills has not worked for us for at least ten years, and due to Covid our staff only occasionally visit Cowcross Street to forward mail to the appropriate person. Consequently, I only received notification about the above application this morning. Realising that the date for response was probably imminent, I immediately looked online to see that the application has already been decided. Although I have not looked at the details of this application, we would certainly have made some comment as the proposals affect the Grade II* at risk landscape of Wimbledon Park, and it is very unfortunate that we were unable to do so.</p> <p>I would be hugely grateful if you could please make it a priority to make sure that whoever is in charge of the software which sends out applications to statutory consultees, changes how the Gardens Trust is notified, and from now on always sends them by email to consult@thegardenstrust.org. Would you please be kind enough to let me know that you have set this in motion?</p> <p>With best wishes, Margie Hoffnung</p>

					Conservation Officer
Hulton Park	Greater Manchester	E21/1078	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION A FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION WORKS TO HULTON PARK AND VARIOUS EXISTING STRUCTURES AND HERITAGE ASSETS WITHIN IT, INCLUDING THE PLEASURE GROUNDS, DOVECOTE, WALLED GARDEN AND LAKES; THE DEMOLITION OF VARIOUS EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES; THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GOLF RESORT, INCLUDING AN 18-HOLE CHAMPIONSHIP-GRADE GOLF COURSE, CLUBHOUSE, GOLF ACADEMY (COMPRISING DRIVING RANGE, PRACTICE COURSE, ADVENTURE GOLF COURSE AND ACADEMY BUILDING WITH SPORTS AND LEARNING FACILITIES, A GOLF SHOP AND CAFE), A HOTEL WITH ADJOINING SPA AND CONFERENCE FACILITY, AND OTHER ANCILLARY BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES AND ENGINEERING AND LANDSCAPE WORKS INCLUDING A MAINTENANCE BUILDING, HIGHWAY ACCESSES, INTERNAL ACCESS ROADS, HIGHWAY UNDERPASS, VARIOUS BRIDGES, BOUNDARY TREATMENTS, EXTERNAL LIGHTING, PARKING AREAS AND NEW AND REPLACEMENT LANDSCAPING AND OPEN SPACE;</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2021 Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Hulton Park, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II in 2002. Since the addition of Hulton Park to the Register in 2002 further archival evidence has confirmed the layout to be the work of William Emes between 1763-4. As Emes was one of the leading exponents of the English Landscape Park this substantially increases its importance and significance both locally and nationally. Hulton Park is one of only four Registered Parks and Gardens in Greater Manchester where records indicate mediaeval origins, thus increasing its rarity and significance. Hulton Park also lies totally within the Green Belt as designated in the Bolton Local Plan. We note that this application would appear to replace 00997/17, allowed following appeal in July 2020, but with the proposed development area now substantially increased to the west and south, coalescing with the settlement of Westhoughton, whilst still including the whole area of Hulton Park RPG. The following comments are submitted on behalf of the Gardens Trust (GT) and Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) which would normally respond on behalf of the GT. Due however to the significance of this application and potential heritage impact on Hulton Park we are submitting a joint response. As you will be aware LGT has a detailed knowledge of the site following pre-application meetings and site visits undertaken in relation to application 00997/17 and that local knowledge informs this response. In addition, the comments submitted by the Gardens Trust and Lancashire Gardens Trust to the former application, dated 14 and 19 July 2017 and 4 February 2018 remain pertinent to this current application and both organisations maintain their strong objection to the application. We welcome the very thorough documentation submitted in support of the application, including now, visual analysis of the proposals within the RPG. With regard to the full application for restoration works to Hulton Park and the development of a golf course and resort etc., in broad terms we similarly welcome the restoration proposals for the pleasure gardens, walled garden, lakes and dovecote, together with the principle of a replacement focal building (hotel) on the site of the former Hulton Park</p>

			<p>HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE; AND, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE RE-ROUTING, UPGRADING AND EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY NETWORK AND THE CREATION OF NEW PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY, FOOTPATHS AND TRAILS.</p> <p>PART B: AN OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 1,036 DWELLINGS; A VILLAGE CENTRE; VILLAGE HALL; COMMUNITY ALLOTMENTS; PRIMARY SCHOOL; SHORT STAY HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, COMPRISING THE CONVERSION OF HOME FARM COTTAGE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MEWS BUILDING, CABINS AND LODGES; AND A RANGE OF OTHER RETAIL, LEISURE, RECREATION, COMMUNITY AND FOOD & DRINK-RELATED USES; HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE; THE REGRADING OF LAND TO ACCOMMODATE THE GOLF COURSE AND STAGING AND SUBSEQUENT REGRADING FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT; AND, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE RE-ROUTING, UPGRADING AND EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY NETWORK, AND THE CREATION OF NEW PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY, FOOTPATHS AND TRAILS, WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR (IN PART)</p>	<p>House. However, when assessed in relation to the overall scheme these benefits cannot outweigh the level of harm to the RPG from the golf course and ancillary development, including the scale of the proposed hotel itself, and from the residential and associated development both within and to the west and south of the RPG, within its setting. Leaving aside the hotel, much of the additional development proposed for the RPG is where none has existed historically and represents a loss in the significance the heritage asset at these locations. Both the GT and LGT consider this to be substantial harm and contrary to the National Planning & Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 200:</p> <p>200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.</p> <p>Further, the GT and LGT do not consider this harm can be outweighed by any increased public benefit which is again contrary to NPPF paragraph 201:</p> <p>201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all the following apply: a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and (c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and (d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.</p> <p>Whilst it is claimed that public benefit will arise from the new Hulton Trail, this is routed almost entirely along existing rights of way with only a very limited section crossing the RPG. In reality, the development leaves the RPG in private ownership with only small increase in public access to the historic Hulton Park through permissive paths with no certainty of the facility over the long term.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>ACCESS, AND IN RESPECT OF THE SHORT STAY HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION, LAYOUT. LAND AT AND ADJACENT HULTON PARK, MANCHESTER ROAD, OVER HULTON, BOLTON, BL5 1BH REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>We note that the proposals for a major championship grade golf resort within Hulton Park, affect to have drawn on English Heritage advice contained within Golf in Historic Parks and Landscapes in the design and layout of the course, but as stated in that document:</p> <p>The introduction of golf courses within historic parks and landscapes almost invariably alters their historic physical form and can erode their character and damage archaeology.</p> <p>The Conservation Plan similarly goes through all the motions of assessing significance of Hulton Park RPG, only to conclude that the best way of preserving and enhancing this significance, is to convert the larger part of the park to a championship grade golf course, with hotel, housing, road and other developments on the remainder and across the majority of its setting. This proposal has at its core the key aspirations for Hulton Park to become home to a championship grade golf course and hotel facility, all of which entails a sophisticated and extensive support infrastructure. The GT and LGT consider this will bring unwelcome and negative levels of change to the historic landscape at Hulton Park neither preserving nor enhancing its significance.</p> <p>With regard to the outline application for over 1,000 dwellings, school, village centre and holiday accommodation, these proposals encroach into both the Bolton Green Belt and Protected Open Land, east of Westhoughton and are a substantial increase to the development permitted in application 00997/17. Development in both these zones is contrary to policies contained in Bolton’s Core Strategy 2011 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain current Green Belt boundaries and • Ensure Protected Open Land remains undeveloped. <p>This application is not therefore in accordance with the local development plan and there are no policies which allocate any of this land for any form of development. In the heavily urbanized area between Bolton and Wigan, the three designations; RPG, Green Belt and Protected Open Space are of particular cultural, heritage and natural environmental value.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above the Gardens Trust and Lancashire Gardens Trust object to this application on the grounds of the substantial harm which will be caused to Hulton Park, Grade II Registered Park and Garden. When considering this application we would urge you to take into account the outcomes of the following case involving a RPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the appeal by City & Country Bramshill Limited against Hart District Council at Bramshill Park which concluded, where the balancing of harm
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>versus benefit is a matter of planning judgment for the decision maker, working through paragraphs 193 to 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) then in force, since updated to paragraphs 199 to 202 (2021).</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Panshanger	Hertfords hire	E21/0223	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Creation of a 173 space car park served by an existing access off Panshanger Lane together with an amenity area to include toilet and mobile catering facilities Panshanger Park, Panshanger Lane, Hertfords SG14 2NA CAR PARK</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE TO RECONSULTATION 20.10.2021 Thank you for the letter of 22 September 2021 inviting comments from Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust and authorised to comment on their behalf as statutory consultee. We raised a number of concerns and issues in our response to the original application and are pleased to note that some of these have been addressed in these current amendments, particularly regarding landscaping and screening of this area from the historic parkland. Although we support the provision of a car park and limited visitor facilities, and consider that this location would cause the least harm to the Registered parkland, nevertheless there will still be some harm as defined by the NPPF. However, we consider that our main concerns have been addressed and thus have no further comments.</p>
Moor Park	Hertfords hire	E21/1023	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey lower ground floor rear extension, rear raised terrace with lower ground floor level patio, side garage extension, provision of solar panels, alterations to fenestration and associated alterations 1 Temple Gardens Moor Park WD3 1QJ BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 02.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Temple Gardens lies within the Grade II* Registered parkland of Moor Park and I temple Gardens lies in close proximity to the pond. This pond was first laid out in the 17th century as part of a formal landscape and altered in the 18th by 'Capability' Brown to a more naturalistic style, and further enhanced in the 19th century. It is a significant part of the designed landscape and the surrounding area is key to its setting. Temple Gardens is also part of the Moor Park Conservation Area and within the Green Belt. Our comments on a previous proposal (21/0911/FUL) still pertain, viz: We have seen no hydrological study of the pond's water supply or how this will be affected by the excavation of the basement. We have grave concerns about this application on heritage grounds, in that excavation could alter the water levels in the historic pond, that this is further development within a Grade II* landscape which does not conserve and enhance it but further reduces its significance (NPPF Chapter 16). Further, this type of development within the Green Belt is inappropriate as thus is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt (NPPF 143). There is no</p>

					public benefit to be gained from these proposals but they would cause harm to the significance of the Grade II* landscape, and the Grade I mansion's setting within this landscape and also encroach on the Green Belt.
Beechwood Park	Hertfords hire	E21/1399	-	PLANNING APPLICATION New footpath Beechwood Park School, Beechwood park, Markyate, St Albans AL3 8AW	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.10.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. The proposed footpath cuts across the green lawns designed by Lancelot Brown and shown on his extant plan. As this part of the site has already been compromised by the entrance drive, car park and the existing path, as well as changes to the landscape with loss of trees and lawns, we do not consider that the new footpath would cause unacceptable changes. We therefore have no objections to the proposals as laid out in this application.
Stevenage Design Guidance SPD	Hertfords hire	E21/1220	-	LOCAL PLAN DESTGN GUIDANCE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT 2021	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.10.2021 More emphasis on heritage and setting. Addition of important heritage gardens such as the Town Centre garden designed by Gordon Patterson for the new town. Local Lists for Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest are the subject of a government initiative and also Guidance from Historic England. Herts Gardens Trust has assisted many LPAs in Hertfordshire to develop these for their area.
Pendley Manor	Hertfords hire	E21/1400	-	PLANNING APPLICATION New Trellis Fence to be added overlapping existing rear fence. Harcourt House, Pendley Farm, Station Road, Tring HP23 5QY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Whilst we have no objection in principle to trellis being added to the existing fences we are concerned at the height on elevations A and B which will double the height of the existing fence. As this proposed trellis does not extend along the rear boundary of the whole run of gardens of Harcourt and Verney Houses, it will harm the view from the southeast across the symmetrical open space opposite Harris House and Belloaks. Pendley Farm was designed as a symmetrical Model Farm in the 19th century and the current conversions to housing have kept that symmetry. We have no such concerns about the more modest trellis heights proposed on elevations C D and E.
56 Chequers, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/1225	N	PLANNING APPLICATION 1 x Lawson Cypress to fell to ground level - tree has become too large for the space 1 x Magnolia to reduce by 1.2m height and reduce width to	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. There are no documents on the WHBC website for this application so we cannot comment in detail. However, we have no objection in principle to the proposed works as outlined in your letter of 14 October.

				balance. to maintain size 56 Chequers, Welwyn Garden City, AL7 4SJ TREES	
Rowney Priory	Hertfords hire	E21/1314	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to a mixed use to use for the stabling/keeping of horses and as a residential caravan site for 4 Gypsy families, with a total of 6 caravans, including no more than 4 static caravans/mobile homes. Erection of 2 amenity buildings. zaWheelwrights Farm Rowney Lane Dane End Ware Hertfordshire SG12 0JY CHANGE OF USE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2021 Dear Sir Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust who act as statutory consultee for planning issues affecting historic designed parks and gardens. HGT is authorised by the GT to comment on their behalf. HGT has for many years researched the historic parks and gardens of Hertfordshire and has compiled Lists of Local Parks and Gardens in each Local Authority Area, in line with guidance from Historic England and in line with the recent government initiative. Rowney Priory is on the EHDC SPD Historic Parks and Gardens and on our Local List for East Herts for the following reasons: 1. its continuity of landscape history since at least the early 18th century where the outline of the estate is first seen on the map of 1728. 2. the quality of the views to and from the mansion (Rowney Priory house) and South Lodge, across the parkland, which are still extant 3. the amount of historic planting remaining which means that the earlier, picturesque landscape is still more or less intact 4. the amount of extant Pulhamite work from the late 19th century 5. the buried archaeology from the earlier priory site which could yield more information on the period 6. the grouping of buildings, many of them former ancillary buildings for the house, around the mansion at the apex of the triangular site with the absence of other built intrusions, apart from the South Lodge which was originally designed both for use and as an eyecatcher. We argued at the appeal against Refusal of permission for an earlier Planning Application (3/17/0781/FUL) that Rowney Priory is an important Local Landscape and that the then proposed single caravan would cause harm to the heritage asset, both of the landscape itself, and importantly to the designed setting of the listed house, thus diminishing its significance. Whilst harm to the landscape would be less than substantial we considered that there was substantial objection to the proposal. This is an excellent example of a small gentry estate which developed from a house on the site of an old priory via farmhouse and fields to a gentleman's estate with small parkland to the east.

					<p>As such, the high degree of survival of landscape fabric is rare in East Herts District and merits conservation, enhancement and protection through the planning system.</p> <p>This landscape is essentially an inward looking one, with no major views out to the surrounding countryside. This makes the internal views much more important as they had to provide the far ground (usually outside the landscape boundary) as well as middleground and foreground views. Here the far ground views run to the boundaries, including the area where development is proposed.</p> <p>We note that this area has not been allocated in the emerging Local Plan for development of any type. This site is also in the rural area beyond the Green Belt and as such, development is restricted according to the council's own policies, specifically GBR2, and that the recent Local Plan, including provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites, was found sound by the Planning Inspector and subsequently adopted by the council. Allocation of Gypsy and Traveller sites is located elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>We consider that the intrusion of the caravans in key views and development of the historically unspoiled corner of this historic park would be contrary to NPPF paragraph 196 where less than substantial harm should be weighed against public benefit: we can see no public benefit to this development. Historic England's GPA 3.2 The Setting of Heritage Assets also includes a section on Views which contribute more to understanding the significance of a heritage asset which those where the composition within the view was a fundamental aspect of the design or function of the heritage asset, as is the case at Rowney Priory.</p> <p>We would argue that his development would cause further harm to designated and undesignated heritage assets and support EHDC's refusal of permission and that the Appeal should be dismissed.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Kate Harwood Planning and Conservation officer Hertfordshire Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust</p>
Tacolneston Hall	Norfolk	E21/1185	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Internal alterations including installation of new lift and roof light; removal and installation of new partition walls; reinstate arch opening in orangery;</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.10.2021</p> <p>The Norfolk Gardens Trust supports this application. The proposed works will have a minor effect on the gardens and will assist in adapting the property to meet the changing needs of the residents.</p>

				removal of internal walls; new raised floor area and new stair lift to access upper garden terrace Tacolneston Hall Hall Road Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1DW BUILDING ALTERATION	
Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E21/0682	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of first floor extension to existing ancillary building Duck House Studley Roger Ripon North Yorkshire HG4 3AY BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens; Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey, at grade I as per the above application. 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. Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey was designated as a World Heritage Site (WHS) in 1986 due to its world importance, combining the ruins of a monastic site with an early water garden and designed ornamental pleasure grounds. The Duck House and its ancillary building at Studley Roger have been developed over many years. It is situated close to if not within the Registered Grade I Historic Park and Garden, at a small section of the northern boundary of the arm that stretches east towards Ripon. The documents give no indication of the registered site; it would have been useful for the Location Plan to indicate the boundary. It also appears that this planning application site is within the buffer zone of the WHS. We refer you to our letter of 8th August and have noted and support the advice from your Authority's Principal Conservation Officer and Design Officer, Ms Ann Simms. We have no further comments. Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Broughton Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1124	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Semi-permanent installation of shipping container on the LaybyWestbound A59, Broughton Skipton for the use of a take-away business. A59 Westbound Layby, Skipton,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Broughton Hall is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and

				BD23 3AD MISCELLANEOUS	<p>conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden at Broughton Hall includes significant formal gardens by William Andrews Nesfield (1793-1881) and pleasure grounds partially remodelled by Nesfield but with early 18th Century origins as does the park.</p> <p>The A59 road forms much of the northern boundary of Broughton Hall and the layby therefore is immediately adjacent to the registered boundary. We understand that it is within a gap in the hedge which allows some sight into the registered park from the layby.</p> <p>We are disappointed with the extremely brief Heritage Statement which does not identify the heritage assets let alone assess the impact of the proposal, and therefore does not meet the requirements of Para 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>It appears that the proposed site of the semi-permanent timber-clad shipping container with outdoor seating area is some distance from any listed buildings, and although opposite part of the park boundary, it is likely that the harm to the park will be limited due to trees and a hedge. We would have liked to have seen a much more accurate site plan to enable a better assessment.</p> <p>Although the timber cladding will soften the appearance of the shipping container it is essentially not a structure of any aesthetic appeal.</p> <p>Our other concern is about food and drink containers and general litter that will be generated. We trust that the operators of the take-away business will ensure that Broughton Park and the landscape are not damaged by careless customers.</p> <p>We support the proposal of Hinchliffe Heritage for an interpretation board on the application site.</p> <p>We have no objection in principle to a take-away business in this location, but we strongly suggest that the approval is not semi-permanent but temporary for say 3-5 years, so that the impact can be assessed and a permanent structure is not established.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Shirburn Castle	Oxfordshire	E16/0816	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline application for the erection of up to 100 residential dwellings	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2021</p> <p>Further to our letter of objection of 11th August this year we would like to amend our original response, as it did not make sufficiently clear that the</p>

				including vehicular access, public open space, car parking, landscaping and drainage. Land off Pyrton Lane, Watlington. RESIDENTIAL	registered park and garden (RPG) of Shirburn Castle is Grade II whereas the Castle itself is listed at Grade I. As we said before, the RPG at Shirburn will be significantly adversely affected by bringing the built form of Watlington to the very edge of the park's southern boundary. Development would also include the introduction of a roundabout at the junction with Pyrton Lane which would be floodlit in the interests of road safety. The additional traffic which this application would generate if allowed, would adversely affect the RPG and its roadside garden wall, as well as the grounds of Grade II* Pyrton Manor. The GT/OGT object to the above application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Nynehead Court	Somerset	E21/1113	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a Class A1 foodstore with associated parking, landscaping and access works on land north west of the Nynehead Road/Taunton Road/Torres Vedras Drive Roundabout, Wellington RETAIL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.10.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We were pleased to see that the application documents include a Heritage Statement that considers the impact on the historic setting of features within Nynehead Court and especially the entrance drive gate piers. Whilst we are not entirely enthusiastic about the application from a wider landscape point of view, the replacement roadside hedgerow, if trees are added, would be sufficient to address any concerns regarding the impact on the gate piers. We would urge your officers to suggest the applicant plants oak trees within the hedgerow at 10m spacings. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Sandbeck Park and Roche Abbey	South Yorkshire	E21/0970	II*	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land surrounding Sandbeck Park	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.10.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case 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

					<p>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 as 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 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 the boundaries of the New Farm. NB The paths in the Wood are included in this Description 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,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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 deciphering 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-west of the Hall.</p> <p>Compartment 36 lies next to the Lodge at Stone north of the A634.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We trust that special care will be taken in the historic areas particularly being aware of any possible impact on historic views - although we trust that these will be short-term.</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</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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.</p> <p>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>
Cannon Park	South Yorkshire	E21/1188	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of buildings to Class E retail and/or exhibition space Cannon Hall Museum Park and Gardens, Bark House Lane, Cawthorne, Barnsley, S75 4AT CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, in this case Cannon Hall at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>To gain an understanding of this application we have found the documentation inadequate. However, we have consulted the listing documents for English Heritage carried out in 1999 and the more detailed research carried out for the 2001 report by Furse on the history of Cannon Hall's Landscape and Gardens, (see reference below). They were both referenced during the successful HLF bid of 2017 -2020 which restored John Spencer's 'three pieces of water' along the Daking Brook.</p> <p>John Spencer commissioned extensive works on the Hall (listed grade II*), park and gardens with contemporary buildings (both listed Grade II) in the 1760's. The last two were executed to designs by Richard Woods (1715-93) who produced a map showing his proposals in 1760. This shows pleasure grounds on all sides of the Hall apart from the Home Farm and kitchen garden areas to the north and north east which lasted for well over 200 years. Vehicular access to the house was only from the north.</p> <p>The three rooms set into the listed Grade II kitchen garden wall, two of them the subject of this planning application (referred to hereafter as the Garden House) are much older than the early C20th use mentioned by the applicant. They are constructed of the same hand made bricks as the early C18th wall, most probably when the southern two thirds of it were demolished by John Spencer one year after his new one designed by Richard Woods was built. As a result, his new ornamental gardens could</p>

					<p>run from right next to his house all the way to the area north east of his new walled garden, intentionally separated from the deer park by a ha ha or 'green lane' shown on Woods' plan which survives (Grade II) to this day. To the west of the house was an ornamental pheasantry with birds in cages, an enormous drying green screened from the drive by banking, tree planting and an ornamental lawn with proposed gothic seat. The Garden House, a double arched building within 10 or so metres of the house, with its central recessed section, (rooms marked G5,6 &7 on plan) was the first location visitors would have arrived at after they turned east from the house. Rooms G1 – G4 are later, and appear on the 1st edition OS map for 1850. They were service buildings separated from the gardens by a linking wall, with access only to and from the kitchen courtyard and stable yard. Despite linkage and adaptation of G5 in the early C20th, it's woodwork, the two ovals shown in fig. 8g p.71 of Furse's report show that its interior joinery was of much higher status. The surrounding planting, informal in nature, with carefully directed views to the south and west over the parkland and beyond emphasises this history. It was planted with many rare trees and shrubs over the years including the ancient and rare <i>Magnolia x thompsoniana</i> planted close by, next to the south facing listed wall for its protection. This then was a charming, sheltered area for the owner and favoured guests, the early Garden House used for enjoying the wider landscape in inclement weather and the care and display of smaller potted plants with private access to the kitchen garden behind. John Spencer is known to have swapped plants with his grand neighbour the Earl of Strafford and entertained his friends there. (Furse p.10) see also fig.8d p.71 showing the portrait by Wilson of John Spencer looking outdoors from such an oval window.</p> <p>Separated by further rare and expensive trees and shrubs, the second or Hot House Garden was screened from view from the house terrace for over 160 years. A path directed visitors diagonally down to the ha ha before they encountered it. The hot house's oval lawn was surrounded each year with the tender plants displayed once all danger of frost was past. As a result, the Garden House was emptied and available for entertainment only during the summer months. Beyond again was John Spencer's shrubbery, designed for him by Richard Woods in 1760 and never removed, unique survivals from the mid eighteenth century and the 'Capability Brown' era, Richard Woods' exact contemporary. Richard Woods was the 'Master of the Pleasure Garden', (see Cowell, reference</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>below). Convincing evidence of how important and high status all the gardens east of the house have been for over 250 years. It was not until the early C20th that the current formal and open structure was created when the Spencer Stanhope family inserted a central path parallel to the kitchen garden wall (listed Grade II) whose changes of level were marked by elegant stone steps marked by low pillars. This path was flanked by two very fashionable herbaceous borders whilst the rare and now ancient magnolia was incorporated into a new parallel shrub border protected by the radiant warmth of the early C18th brick wall behind. Vehicular access has now replaced the 1920's vista, removing the stone steps to allow cars right up to the hot house within the last 30 years, a tarmac surface replacing the gravelled path. We consider that the proposed change of use will exacerbate this loss of heritage since access is proposed right up to the building's door.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned by the increasing loss of the eastern gardens and the urbanisation of an area so close to and within the Curtilage of a Grade II* listed building and part of the significant pleasure grounds. We consider that daily vehicular access can only deter visitors to Cannon Hall from enjoying all the benches in front of the hall in what has been a pedestrian space for at least 300 years. We consider this will further damage the earliest garden area and as a result we wish to object to this change of use as we believe it causes unnecessary harm to this property.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p>
Great Barr Conservation Area Appraisal	Staffordshire	E21/1061	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the proposed revisions to the boundary of Great Barr Conservation Area and the accompanying draft appraisal document. I am replying on behalf of TGT and the Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two trusts.</p> <p>As the draft appraisal document notes the key heritage significance of the present conservation area lies in Character Area A, namely the grade II listed Great Barr Hall and its surrounding designed landscape encompassed in the grade II registered park and garden. This rightly formed the basis of the original 1976 conservation area designation. Although sadly neglected today the historic interest of the majority of this area remains apparent and still fully warrants the recognition and protection of conservation area status. The extensive area of adjacent farmland as far as and including Barr</p>

					<p>Beacon included in the 1996 extension to the conservation area, while forming part of its semi-rural setting, does not have any historic connection to core heritage estate or overriding intrinsic heritage significance. In the circumstances its inclusion within the conservation area could be seen as a misuse of designation to protect open countryside.</p> <p>The Trusts support the consultants' recommendation to revise the conservation area boundary effectively back to its 1976 extent by excluding the surrounding farmland and Barr Beacon (Character areas B, C, and D), together with the new development along Nether Hall drive. The Trusts support the proposed minor northward extension to protect the setting of Merrions Wood.</p> <p>The Trusts are however very disappointed by the lack of emphasis on the historic parkland in the document. The heritage significance of the designed landscape is recognised by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. While this is acknowledged in the draft appraisal insufficient analysis is offered of the surviving landscape features and their condition. The scant and superficial proposals for opportunities to reuse the parkland cut harmfully across rather than work with its historic layout and features. If the deterioration of the listed hall and chapel is now beyond realistic or economic repair, it will be all the more important to safeguard and restore the historic landscape as the principal heritage interest of the site. Such restoration should be based on accurate historic research. Your Council should hold copies of several studies produced in the 1990s which could form the basis of such an initiative: it is unfortunate these are not referenced in the appraisal text.</p> <p>The Trusts strongly advocate therefore that the draft appraisal document be reviewed to give greater consideration to the high significance of the historic parkland and its features. We recommend that a separate Conservation Management Plan should be produced to guide its reclamation and restoration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman</p>
Hampton Court	Surrey	E20/1915	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Development of part three, part four-storey buildings to create 78 residential units (C3) and ground floor unit (317 sqm) within</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2021 The Gardens Trust was regrettably not consulted about the original application (2019/2005) which the above appeal relates to. Had we been consulted as statutory consultees as we undoubtedly should have been, we would have objected strongly. We attach a copy of our letter to the</p>

				<p>Building A for offices (B1) with associated car parking, cycle parking and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings.</p> <p>Units 1 & 2 Hampton Court Estate, Summer Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey KT7 0RG</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, PARKING, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>Planning Inspectorate for your reference.</p> <p>However, since the application has subsequently been allowed at Appeal, we are writing again to urge your officers to do everything possible to ensure that the critical tree line/cover which at the moment screens the development from Hampton Court Palace, is maintained. This is problematical since we understand that the trees are not owned by the applicant, therefore their health and condition is beyond their control. We would ask that your officers ascertain whom they belong to and devise some way in which this vital cover can be maintained in perpetuity. As we said in our response, should these 'trees succumb to disease or become dangerous and need felling, the resultant harm would be enormous and evident for many decades, which would be disastrous for such an internationally important site. It is unclear to whom the land on which these trees stand belongs and whether any provision has been made to ensure continuity of replanting.'</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E20/1681	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a general purpose farm building for agricultural and forestry use.</p> <p>Spring Bank Cottage The Avenue Wynyard</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Wynyard Park, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the additional documents and are disappointed that, in addition to being relocated southwards as per the re-consultation of 28 July 2021, the building has again been increased to the size originally submitted on 11 February 2021. We have been assured by Naomi Teasdale of George F White that the building will not be visible from critical viewpoints across the park but would still advise that screening should consist of a substantial 10m tree belt planted on at least the south and east sides of the barn. We note that some trees are now included in planting proposed along the northern perimeter but the species are not specified, nor is the species composition of the evergreen hedge. Ideally, the tree and hedgerow planting should be native species reflecting the composition of the surrounding woodlands to help the building blend into the landscape. We would therefore advise that further details of the proposed</p>

					landscaping are requested. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Valley Gardens, Saltburn	Tees Valley	E21/1229	-	PLANNING APPLICATION EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING CAR PARK (189 SPACES) CAT NAB CAR PARK SALTBURN BANK SALTBURN-BY-THE-SEA PARKING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.10.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) 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 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 (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The response is therefore submitted on behalf of both the GT and NGT. We note that the Cat Nab Car Park lies immediately east of the northern end of the registered park and garden (RPG) and although brief mention is made of the Valley Gardens in the Design, Access & Heritage Statement, there is no recognition of their status as a Heritage Asset. This is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 194 (July 2021) which states that an applicant seeking planning permission should 'describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting...'. However, we accept that the proposals are likely to have only impact on the RPG and have no further comments to add at this stage. We 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. Yours faithfully, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
West Dean	West Sussex	E21/1051	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of production facilities buildings for a temporary period of 5 years. Weald And Downland Open Air Museum A286 Town Lane To The Grove Singleton PO18 0EU MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2021 Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) regarding the above application. The Gardens Trust (GT) - is a statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications. Representatives of SGT have carefully studied the documents submitted with the application. The site of these buildings is located within West Dean Park which is included on the register of historic parks and gardens

					<p>maintained by Historic England with a Grade II* designation. The buildings will be clearly visible from the adjoining field and from the higher ground to the south, and may also be visible viewed through the registered park from the West Dean House area. However, SGT accepts the low profile and subdued colouring will reduce any harm to less than substantial.</p> <p>The application seeks approval for a lengthy period of five years and does not provide for any planting to screen the buildings from view. Given there will be some limited visual harm to this sensitive site, SGT suggests consideration should be given to planting a shrub/tree screen and restricting the approval to a shorter period than five years.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust. Copy to: The Gardens Trust</p>
Borde Hill	West Sussex	E21/1120	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Rebuilding of failing section of Ha-Ha wall and lowering of existing raised track level. Borde Hill House Borde Hill Garden Borde Hill Lane Haywards Heath</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.10.2021</p> <p>Mid Sussex District Council Submitted by e-mail to: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk</p> <p>FAO Deborah Lynn</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2nd October, 2021</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mid Sussex DM/25/3395: Rebuilding of failing section of Ha-Ha wall and lowering of existing raised track level. Borde Hill Garden</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; the GT has brought this application to the SGT's attention. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with the application. These remedial works will not affect the significance of Borde Hill Garden but they will help preserve the Ha-Ha and the setting of the House and Garden. SGT therefore supports the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.</p>
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E21/1026	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extension to existing building Tropical World Princes Avenue Roundhay BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Roundhay Park, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it</p>

					<p>in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposals will impact on the significance of Roundhay Park and we do not have any objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E21/1086	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building application for installation of blinds to Lady William Gordon's Room (First Floor)</p> <p>Temple Newsam House Templenewsam Road Halton</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Temple Newsam registered grade II with the house listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The application is for blinds where lux levels are damaging objects in the rooms and the interior. We support this proposal and are pleased that the design of the blinds specified include an inner vision blind with a perforated fabric that allows people to see through the blind to the gardens and landscape as in the earlier application 20/08534/LI.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p>
Greenhead Park	West Yorkshire	E21/1174	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Partial redevelopment of Greenhead college including demolition and making good, erection of 2 and 4 storey buildings, reconfiguration of parking and access arrangements, reconfiguration of sports provision and other associated external works (Within a Conservation Area)</p> <p>Greenhead College, Greenhead Road, Huddersfield, HD1 4ES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Greenhead Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Greenhead Park is the significant public park in the centre of Huddersfield formally opened in 1884. Greenhead College, covering a fairly large area, (the former Greenhead High School for Girls), lies on rising ground immediately south east of the park on Park Drive South, part of the park's</p>

				<p>DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>perimeter road constructed in 1882.</p> <p>We were pleased to be consulted and offer advice on the proposals in our letter of 2nd September to Ms Anne Hargreaves, Director of Avison Young: Our point 1: regarding a landscape plan. We are pleased to see the planting strategy plan including retention of existing trees, proposed ornamental planting, woodland planting, wildflower planting, green roof and new trees round the student hub. Our concern would be with the maintenance of these areas; which although they are commendable, will require a considerable degree of maintenance both for the first three to five years until the areas are established, and then a schedule of monitoring and maintenance thereafter with commensurate funding allocated specifically for these areas. This is particularly so for all the herbaceous planting ie ornamental planting shade, ornamental planting sun, and woodland herb layer. A flowering lawn can be quite difficult to establish and maintain; eg needing mowing only after flowering (say late July into August depending on flowering species in the mix), to allow seed to fall. It maybe that monitoring and maintenance by students overseen by interested staff could be part of the approach. The green roof, presumably a wildflower biodiverse roof, will be a beneficial addition but some maintenance will be required to keep it in good condition. This includes cutting it back in about July, depending on the season, to reduce the vigour of the grasses and allow sufficient light for the flowering plants to compete with the grasses again the following spring. Allowing flower seed to be shed is also important.</p> <p>Regarding the impact of the proposed development on Greenhead Park and the Conservation Area, the existing boundary trees are important and we trust that there will be a tree replacement strategy for any that fail. We are pleased to note the permeable elements of the hard landscaping and support the introduction of permeable and green surfaces as much as possible, and also the retention of vegetation and additional buffer planting.</p> <p>Our point 2: regarding provision for cycling and security for cycles on the College site. We are pleased to note that there is some provision but query whether 30 cycle spaces for 2600 students and a commensurate large number of staff will be anything approaching a sufficient number.</p> <p>Our point 3: there is likely to be an increasing need for electric charging points.</p> <p>Due to the location of Greenhead College, there will inevitably be some</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>impact on the Registered Park and Garden and its listed buildings particularly the grade II listed Conservatory (c. 1930-31) and also the grade II listed Boer War Memorial and the recent Sikh Memorial that are sited at the eastern end of the park, to the north of the proposed development. However, we are pleased to note that the new building is proposed to be four storey, and will sit one storey below the former school building which will minimise the visual impact on the Park. The student hub will also act as a green buffer between the building and Greenhead Park.</p> <p>We have no objection to the redevelopment of Greenhead College and are pleased to note the pre-application discussions, and overall, the considerations that have been taken into account.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---