



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES NOVEMBER 2021

The GT conservation team received 260 new cases and re-consultations for in November. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 66 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Ashton Court	Avon	E21/1357	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed removal of a section of the boundary wall to create a gap (approx 900mm x 650mm) near the junction of Longwood Lane with the B3128, to allow Pedestrian access to the estate grounds. Boundary Wall To Ashton Court Estate, By Junction Of Longwood Lane And B3128,Failand BOUNDARY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed removal of an upper section of the boundary wall that surrounds Ashton Court Estate and the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden. 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 this is an amended application. We were not privy to the original application which may have explained in more detail as to why a gap of 650mm is needed in the boundary wall. Open access for pushchairs, wildlife, bikes etc. seems to be a questionable action at a busy road junction. Considering the information that you have provided, we are unable to comment on the proposals, other than that the effect on The Historic Park and Garden will be minimal by the removal of an upper section of the wall. Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust

<p>Oaklands Oaklands Drive, Almondsbury</p>	<p>Avon</p>	<p>E21/1419</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of condition 5 to allow access from Oaklands Drive and variation of conditions 2 and 3 to amend the approved block and site plans attached to permission P21/00954/RVC (formerly P19/11955/RVC and T18/4625/F). Demolition of existing building. Erection of care home with 26 no. nursing bedrooms and 15 no. assisted apartments (Class C2), parking, landscaping and associated works Oaklands Oaklands Drive Almondsbury South Gloucestershire BS32 4AB ACCESS/GATES, DEMOLITION, MEDICAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting the grounds of the former Grade II listed Oaklands House which are on the council's register of Historic Parks and Gardens in South Gloucestershire. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust note that this latest amendment to the approved plans of changing the entrance facility will in fact necessitate the removal of a mature Cedar of Lebanon tree; category B2, 21m. high, 2 stem trunk, in excess of 40 years old. This corner of the original garden has already lost pools, a bridge, and flowering Japanese trees. As we sadly observed on a site visit for the first planning application: PT18/4625/F, back in the autumn of 2018. Many of the original features that Hiatt Cowles Baker had instigated, one of which was restored by Avon Gardens Trust in the 1990's, have already been lost. To allow trees to the south of the proposed entrance to be removed, although not specifically stated for removal, as in this application, is counter to the agreed Landscape Masterplan – 124/PA/01J; and will remove a significant tree screen barrier that would otherwise expose too much of the new building. In conclusion, we therefore neither support or object to the removal of condition 5 to allow access from Oaklands Drive, but object to changes to the landscape approved plan 124/PA/01J, which will allow construction over a root protection zone to allow access from an un-named road to the south of the site. Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
<p>Lily Hill Park</p>	<p>Berkshire</p>	<p>E21/1422</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Prior approval for change of use from B1 (offices) to C3 (residential) to form 33 No. flats. Lily Hill House Lily Hill Road Bracknell Berkshire RG12 2SJ CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2021 The Berkshire Gardens Trust has been notified of this development as the proposed development lies within a local park of historic interest. Lily Hill Park dates to 1817, and is an example of 19th-century emulation of the 18th-century English Landscape Park tradition. In 2002 to 2007 Lily Hill Park was restored using funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund. We have reviewed the information provided, and with the local knowledge of two of</p>

					<p>our members, we do not wish to raise any objections to the proposed change of use but we do feel that great care should be taken with any external ancillary changes such as to the car parking arrangements, any fencing or other boundary demarcation, ancillary facilities which might impact on the historic and open space value of the park and the extant relationship between the House and the surrounding parkland.</p> <p>Lily Hill Park is one of a number of public parks in the Borough that are of particular historic interest. Berkshire Gardens Trust are currently undertaking an extensive research project to identify and record historic public parks across the County. These not only include those recognised at national level but also those of local value of which Lily Hill Park is a prime example. Our objective is to raise awareness of their historic interest and significance and help prevent inappropriate development which can easily and unwittingly damage an irreplaceable asset to the Borough.</p> <p>One of our members has undertaken more research into the park and we would be very pleased to share with you. This can be found on our website: https://www.berkshiregardenstrust.org/lily-hill-park</p> <p>Lily Hill Park Berkshire Gardens Trust</p> <p>The Berkshire Gardens Trust exists to identify, understand, appreciate, and promote the conservation of historically significant designed landscapes in Berkshire. Designed Landscapes naturally include gardens and also parks, cemeteries and institutional landscapes such as college grounds.</p> <p>www.berkshiregardenstrust.org</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Bettina Kirkham</p>
The Royal Estate, Windsor: Windsor Castle and Home Park	Berkshire	E21/1467	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey side extension to butchery, canopy to shop entrance, service yard enclosure and relocation of the horticultural area.</p> <p>Royal Farms Windsor Farm Shop Datchet Road Old Windsor Windsor SL4 2RQ</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. Home Park is a Grade I Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The former stables, now the Windsor Farm Shop is considered a curtilage listed building. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right.</p> <p>The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.1 One of the key activities of</p>

					<p>the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the approved scheme (20/00592) is considered unviable by the applicants as the gabled roof forms for the extension would provide a more coherent west elevation than the more linear and block form of the proposed building extension. That said it is the visual effect of the proposals on the registered park that the BGT is considering here.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the proposals will not directly impact on the significance of Home Park. The views into and out of the Park will be minimally affected by the changes in rooflines and the screening of the rear of the building next to the entrance gates. In conclusion it is challenging to support an objection to the proposals as they will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset when weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (in accordance with NPPF 2021 p202).</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin Planning Advisor to the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1853	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 130 dwellings, associated access and parking, landscaping and amenity space and the change of land from agriculture to use as sports pitches/recreational open space and informal open space. Land West Of Moreton Road And Castlemilk, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for sending the views document with regard to the above application. In one particular view, No3 from the Bourbon Tower, we are unable to locate the full extent of the width of the proposed site and so request a wire frame. This should confirm vertically where the rooflines are in relation to the major tree line and horizontally the exact length and position of the development. Considering the scale of the development and significance of Stowe we believe that this essential.</p> <p>Until we have this information we cannot amplify our original response from 17th March 2021.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for sending the views document with regard to the above application. In one particular view, No3 from the Bourbon Tower, we are unable to locate the full extent of the width of the proposed site and so</p>

					<p>request a wire frame. This should confirm vertically where the rooflines are in relation to the major tree line and horizontally the exact length and position of the development. Considering the scale of the development and significance of Stowe we believe that this essential.</p> <p>Until we have this information we cannot amplify our original response from 17th March 2021.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Langley Park	Buckinghamshire	E20/0959	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission with all matters reserved (except for principal points of access) for the phased development of a screen industries global growth hub of up to 750,000 sq ft (70,000 sq m) comprising: - A visitor attraction of 350,000 sq ft comprising a series of buildings, - 350,000 sq ft of film production buildings (including sound stages, workshops, offices and an external film backlot), - An education hub (25,000 sq ft), - A business growth hub (25,000 sq ft), - Associated parking and servicing, - Green Infrastructure. Land South Of Pinewood Studios, Pinewood Road, Iver Heath, Buckinghamshire, SLO 0NH. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, VISITOR ATTRACTION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) about the above application. We can see that the amendments include numerous documents relating to such diverse matters as the environment, bats, habitat etc, and some are over 50+ pages long, amongst a list of 620+ documents. Whilst we appreciate the effort that has gone into looking at these aspects in such detail, my time is very limited and colleagues in the Bucks Gardens Trust are volunteers and therefore do not have the capacity to go through all of these on the off chance that there is some reference to the designed landscape of relevance to the GT/BGT.</p> <p>In our previous response, we specifically requested that the applicants commission a Heritage Impact Statement as we had concerns about the impact of the proposals upon locally significant Heatherden Hall and Black Park and Grade II Registered Langley Park. In the absence of such a document, our position remains the same as in our previous letter. If a Heritage Impact Statement does exist, we would be very grateful if we could be directed towards it. To aid your officers when considering the application, and the applicant when assessing the impact of the proposals, we are attaching our recently completed Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust reports on Black Park and Heatherden Hall.</p> <p>Originating as a medieval deer park, Black Park was landscaped in the 1740s as a detached hunting park for the 3rd Duke of Marlborough. It originated as a hunting park for the historic Langley Estate with its boundaries defined by 1607 separating it from the adjacent Langley Park which surrounds the mansion. Black Park then developed from heathland as a detached hunting park and was landscaped during the mid-C18 by the 3rd Duke who also owned the adjacent Langley Park. Langley Park was developed for the 4th Duke by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in the 1760s</p>

					<p>alongside his work at Blenheim Palace and he may have influenced elements of the layout of Black Park. In any case the two parks were linked by an early C17, or earlier, avenue retained by Brown, giving access directly from Langley Park to the hunting ground of Black Park but this has been disrupted by the C20 dual carriageway (A412) which also cut back the south boundary with the loss of the C18 or early C19 ice house. The extensive Black Park, which never had a focal building, remains intact. Heatherden Hall, now part of Pinewood's existing complex, comprises complex formal and informal gardens for a mid-late C19 villa which was substantially enlarged in the early C20 when the gardens were re-designed with the addition of a lake, fountain and grotto by the notable landscape firm James Pulham & Sons. The house and gardens were retained as the core of the renowned Pinewood Film Studios, which opened in 1936 as a country club and for film locations. The garden retains much of the historic character and detailed layout established by the 1930s including hedges, sculpture, mature ornamental trees and other planting.</p> <p>The setting of Black Park and Langley Park remains surprisingly rural and this enormous development will have a large effect on both together with that of Heatherden Hall.</p> <p>We look forward to either being directed towards a Heritage Impact Statement or to the applicant providing one as it is not possible to assess these extensive proposals without considering the impact on these significant designed landscapes. This should consider the immediate visual effects on the adjacent Black Park and Heatherden Hall, and the more distant Registered Langley Park, together with the effect of noise and night time light emission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.11.2020 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 response. The application is extensive, and we recognise the need for the large</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>production studio buildings and the need to position these in close proximity to the existing production area.</p> <p>We note that the southern boundary, including the proposed Uxbridge Road entrance to the application site and one of the car parks, is across the road and close to the northern boundary of the Grade II Registered Langley Park. The application site also runs parallel to Black Park on its western boundary, and is in close proximity to the garden surrounding Heatherden Hall on the northern boundary of the application site. While neither of the latter two sites are Registered they are of local to regional significance, although their settings are already compromised to a degree by the current studio development.</p> <p>We cannot see any specific reference to the landscape heritage impact on these three aspects of the proposals, and the various options appear to demonstrate the potential for substantial impact on parts of some/all of these three landscapes. Given the proposed scale of development, it is difficult to assess the levels of impact and their likely effect, whether damaging or not. Our main concern is for the setting, and to prevent tall and intrusive structures looming over the adjacent designed landscapes in visually damaging materials and/or form.</p> <p>If there is a heritage impact statement, we have yet to identify it and it would be helpful to have a direct reference to it if the applicant is able to direct us to this amongst the numerous documents online. If such a document has not been commissioned, we strongly recommend that an objective historic impact assessment is required from the applicants, carried out by appropriately experienced consultants which addresses levels of significance and of effect on the significant elements of the heritage assets.</p> <p>We recognise that this application is in its early stages. At present we do not have sufficient information to be able to comment on whether the scheme is acceptable but would be pleased to review it once the information requested above is supplied. Should this scheme be approved we would urge that permission is conditional upon adequate screening being provided if necessary to mitigate the impact. We understand that the existing shelter belt around the Heatherden Hall gardens is adequate at present and ensures it remains an oasis within the studio complex, although we recommend it is fortified to ensure its depth and longevity.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Conservation Officer
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E20/1116	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New Design Technology & Engineering Building for Stowe School. Accommodation to include workshops, teaching rooms and staff facilities, with associated landscape works to immediate surroundings. Stowe School, Stowe Park, Stowe, Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE (CALL-IN) 04.11.2021</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council North Area Planning Committee (The Committee) passed a resolution to approve this application on 29th September subject to minor outstanding technical matters which are unlikely to alter the decision (see Appendix 4). In doing so they set aside the recommendation of their planning officers who had undertaken the exceptional step of employing an independent expert consultant to give them a second opinion.</p> <p>Two national specialist bodies, the Georgian Group and Historic England (HE) – the government’s own adviser on the historic environment - objected to the application as did the Gardens Trust (GT), which is the lead statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting all sites on HE’s Register of Parks and Gardens. The Gardens Trust objected to this because it will cause a high degree of harm to the historic fabric and character of one of the most important registered parks and gardens (RPG) in Europe: Stowe Landscape Garden, which is Grade I and, undoubtedly, of international significance and influential worldwide. None of the objectors raised any objection to the principle of a new design and technology building. They all accept that this is a public benefit, but the simple point is that it does not have to be provided in this location.</p> <p>The reasons why the application should be called in are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal causes an unacceptably high level of damage to an area of the highest importance within an internationally significant park. The Committee accepted there was a high level of harm in the category of ‘less than substantial harm’. 2. All the expert opinion which commented objected to this site on the grounds of the high degree of damage the proposal will cause to the designed landscape. This included historic environment stakeholders, the statutory consultees, and expert advice sought independently by the planning authority. The resultant conclusions of the authority’s officers are clearly set out in their report dated 28th September 2021 (Officer Report) and presented to the Committee (attached). The reasons for refusal recommended by the authority’s officers are extracted from the Officer Report and set out in Appendix 2 for ease of reference. 3. The applicant’s assessment of level of damage to the historic environment is highly inaccurate in its flawed appraisal of the effect, unrealistically minimising the effect and damage inflicted.

					<p>4. The decision of the Committee was perverse. It disregarded the weight of the expert and professional advice to refuse the application and failed to consider or debate the issues to a sufficient degree to reach an informed and reasoned decision as is evident from the recording of the meeting and the transcript (attached). This appears to fly in the face of the two primary statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Sections 66(1) and 72(1) (see Appendix 3). Both of these require the decision maker to have special regard, or pay special attention to, heritage matters.</p> <p>5. In this case the degree of justification required to allow such a level of damage to such an important heritage asset was inadequate. The Committee was unable to give adequate discussion to the so-called public benefit that, '... mitigation and wider restoration benefits, were sufficient to outweigh the harm identified'. All these matters had been considered by the professional officers, their expert adviser and statutory consultees, all of whom found the public benefit to be minimal and in no manner compensating for the damage caused. See recording of the meeting : https://buckinghamshire.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/600674/start_time/445000 and the transcription attached, also Appendix 4, Committee Decision Resolution and Reason.</p> <p>We refer you to our letters of 25 November 2020 and 03 August 2021 (attached) which set out in more detail our main objections, identifying the high level of harm to the significance of this nationally and internationally significant designed landscape. We present supporting information in Appendix 1 below. Unfortunately, the GT (and the other objectors) were not notified by council officers of the meeting and so were not represented. The Committee appears to have been influenced by the fact that the objectors were not present although we would have certainly appeared had we known of the meeting.</p> <p>In conclusion we believe that in the exceptional circumstances of this case the harm to the heritage far outweighs the public benefit of the proposal in the minor mitigation and restoration benefits and ask you to call-in this planning application for your own determination as it raises issues of national significance in relation to the conservation of the historic environment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Peter Hughes, QC</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/0786	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of three barns and erection of commercial building with ancillary offices and visitor areas. Creation of parking and associated works Barns 2 3 & 4 The Bail Silk Street Waddesdon Buckinghamshire HP18 0JY DEMOLITION, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, PARKING</p>	<p>Chair, The Gardens Trust GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021 Thank you for reconsulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The proposals have been revised to address a small element of the issues that we raised in our previous letter dated August 12th 2021. The rooflights have been reduced from 24 to 16 across the four pitches of the new commercial building. While this slightly mitigates the impact of light reflection and emittance within the Grade I registered park the revised arrangement remains fundamentally damaging. Please ensure that if any rooflights are to be provided they must be non-reflective to mitigate their impact to some degree. In our previous response, we also asked that the applicant prepare a Heritage Impact Statement (HIA) in order to identify the level of heritage damage in this extremely sensitive part of the Grade 1 Registered Park alongside the most important historic drive. Until this fundamental appraisal document is provided the full effect of the proposals cannot be adequately assessed. We wish to reiterate our objections to the substantial glazed entrance on the south elevation and continue to query the need for the entrance to be glazed. The glazed area is where the office is situated and there will be considerable light emittance during the darker months when the office is internally lit as well as considerable reflection from such a substantial glazed area throughout the year Two large signs on the north elevation also remain although they are not shown as written signs. We maintain our objection to both and ask that, even if signage is not completely eliminated, that the visual effect of signage is greatly reduced. In conclusion, while the number of rooflights has been reduced we cannot see any other revisions which address our other concerns previously raised. Therefore, we reiterate that the lack of a rigorous HIA means that we are still not fully able to appraise the effect these proposals may have on this nationally and internationally RPG at the heart of its park. We once more</p>
-----------------	-----------------	----------	---	--	---

				<p>request a rigorous HIA followed by a site visit after the HIA has been submitted.</p> <p>Until we have this information, we continue to object to the scheme.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development above affecting a Grade I Registered Park listed by Historic England (HE). We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>While aspects of the proposals have been revised we reiterate and amplify the issues that we raised in our letter of August 12th 2021.</p> <p>We asked for a rigorous Heritage Impact Statement (HIA) in order to identify the extent and level of heritage damage in this extremely sensitive part of the Grade I Registered Park alongside the most important historic drive. This has not been submitted although the change of use from agricultural to commercial use is a significant alteration of the character in what should have the character of a rural park. Until this fundamental appraisal document is provided the full effect of the proposals cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>Given the extent of further redundant farm buildings within this large farm complex, it is likely that further proposals for re-use of the other buildings will arise which may also change use from agricultural. In addition to the HIA, it is essential for a masterplan for the entire complex to be provided so that the effect of this redevelopment and any future changes can be assessed together rather than in a piecemeal manner.</p> <p>Therefore, although minor mitigation alterations have been submitted with the latest documents, we reiterate that the lack of a rigorous HIA means that it is still not possible to appraise the full extent the effect these proposals may have on this nationally and internationally significant RPG at the heart of its park. We again request a rigorous HIA, in the context of a masterplan for the whole complex. Until we have this information, we continue to object to the scheme.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Conservation Officer
Wycombe Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E21/0795	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of lighting columns suitable for multi sport play Wycombe Abbey School Abbey Way High Wycombe Buckinghamshire SPORT/LEISURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2021 Thank you for sending the Gardens Trust (GT) the revised plan for the lighting columns. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and we would be grateful if you could take our joint comments into consideration when coming to your decision. We are glad to see that the school have reduced the height of the proposed lighting columns from 10m to 8 metres. We appreciate that they cannot increase the number of columns as we suggested as it would create too many structures on the court area and are pleased that the applicant is willing to paint the columns dark green. The lights will only be turned on when necessary, will not be automatic and they are happy to limit the use between set time periods during the year and set times during the day. We would ask that the redundant existing lighting is removed. Whilst they are not proposing to introduce any new tree or hedge screening at present, we appreciate that they will revisit this as they develop their landscape restoration masterplan which we look forward to seeing in due course. The GT/BGT warmly welcome the amendments the applicants have made to the proposals and we give them our support. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E21/0931	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of agricultural building Mentmore Park Farm Mentmore Buckinghamshire LU7 0QN AGRICULTURE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021 Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have again liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our additional comments into consideration when deciding this application. Further to our response of 20th September 2021, the additional documents submitted do not seem to indicate any alteration to the aspects of the scheme which we previously voiced concern over. We would like to reiterate our earlier advice from that letter. Regardless of the subsequent and extant permission for a building on this site, these two new applications continue the unwelcome, incremental increase of industrial scale sheds at the edge of the Grade II* Mentmore registered park and garden (RPG) and in an exposed part of it. Inspection of aerial photos since

					<p>the mid-C20 shows clearly the scale of this continued development which, although Mentmore park is large, has become entirely out of keeping with its historic setting in both scale and character.</p> <p>We also set out our comments with regard to screening in an even earlier letter dated 5th October 2019 where we said : ‘We would advise a narrow belt of mixed trees in the field along the outer (west) side of the present clipped hedge parallel with the Cheddington road and continuing in the field wrapping around the south side of the buildings. It should be informal, in two staggered rows, and comprise a mixture of suitable, historically appropriate species (ideally immune to currently prevalent pests and diseases) which should include a mix of something like sycamore, Scots pine, common oak, field maple and walnut. Initially we suggest these be planted at final mature spacing, interspersed with poplar as a nurse crop that will be removed once the main species are maturing. The trees will need management to ensure they achieve an attractive form. We suggest that AVDC tree officer advises on the practical detail of choosing and mixing species, siting, spacings, pruning during maturing, etc. and ensures completion of this.’</p> <p>Mentmore is a Grade II* RPG, and so it seems extraordinary, given its acknowledged importance, that the applicants still have not provided an adequate views assessment or Historic Impact Assessment. We would urge your officers to ask them to provide this so that you will be able to make a suitably informed judgement when deciding this application.</p> <p>We therefore continue to object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1251	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erect replacement Pole Barn Little Yeat Farm Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire HP18 0QH MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT/BGT note that the proposal is for a replacement pole barn at Little Yeat Farm in Woodham. Little Yeat Farm sits adjacent to the former North Drive for Wotton Underwood and the drive and a little land either side therefore falls within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG).</p>

					<p>On reviewing the application documents, we were surprised to note that the Design and Access Statement makes no mention of the fact that the application site is adjacent to the North Drive of the RPG at Wotton Underwood. It is also factually incorrect in the section 'Application Site and Surrounds' where it states (2.2) that 'Due to the intervening distance and topography, no setting of any historic asset is affected by the proposal.' The erection of any new structures in this setting will undoubtedly affect and probably damage the character and setting of the RPG. Whilst the North Drive is no longer used as an access to the mansion, it is part of the significant designed landscape covered by the Grade I status.</p> <p>There is no development of any form in the field relating to this application. The North Drive is lined with trees and the field has small trees and hedges delineating the boundary with woodland to the north. There are no built structures until the North Drive reaches Ham Lodge and the A41. Therefore, any development in the setting of this section of the RPG will be damaging but especially within this currently undeveloped field. It is confusing that the application is for a 'replacement pole barn' although none of the documents submitted as part of this application appear to identify where the existing or previous pole barn (the one being replaced) was or is situated. A 'replacement' barn would be in the same or very nearby position to an existing one whereas this application appears to be for a new agricultural barn in a new position. Is the proposed 'replacement' pole barn intended to replace one of the former agricultural buildings at Little Yeat which are subject to a separate planning application for conversion into three residential dwellings? Please clarify.</p> <p>There is no Landscape Character Assessment or Masterplan. Given that the application site is adjacent to an RPG of the highest rating, we urge the planning authority to require these assessments to be provided to inform decision making.</p> <p>We do not object to the replacement of agricultural buildings. However, in this instance, the existing agricultural building may be converted to residential use and the intention is to push the agricultural site onto undeveloped land within the most immediate setting of an RPG.</p> <p>We object strongly to this application and recommend that the planning authority takes into consideration the group of applications relating to this site to ensure that the development does not push further into the wider landscape and damage a highly significant designed landscape. This is to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>protect against inappropriate overdevelopment of this site.</p> <p>As noted above, we are aware of other applications for works on the same site and, whilst the application site was similarly not within the RPG, it is so close to it, it is unfortunate that the GT/BGT was not consulted on these (two of which are as follows);</p> <p>20/03714/APP - Alterations to existing milking parlour and addition of solar panels on cattle shed and 21/02144/APP - Determination as to whether prior approval is required in respect of transport & highway impact, noise, contamination risk, flooding and locational considerations for the conversion of agricultural barn into three residential dwelling (Class Q (a) and (b) - (19/01133/COUAR). Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) of 19/01133/COUAR. Little Yeat Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire HP18 0QH</p> <p>Please ensure that you consult us on both applications because of their potential damage to the setting of the registered park and garden.</p> <p>In conclusion, we strongly object to the principle of a new structure in the application site due to its damage to the fabric and setting of the RPG. Due to the numerous applications relating to this site we urge the submission of a Landscape Character Assessment and a Masterplan as part of any consideration of this or any other planning application. The site must be considered as a whole.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The application is for a replacement pole barn at Little Yeat Farm in Woodham. Little Yeat Farm sits adjacent to the former North Drive for Wotton Underwood and the drive and a little land either side therefore falls within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG).</p> <p>With regard to this specific application, the Gardens Trust have responded previously with a letter dated November 9th 2021. We noted the fact that</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the Design and Access Statement makes no mention of the fact that the application site is adjacent to the North Drive of the RPG at Wotton Underwood. It is also factually incorrect in the section 'Application Site and Surrounds' where it states (2.2) that 'Due to the intervening distance and topography, no setting of any historic asset is affected by the proposal.' We also noted the lack of a Landscape Character Assessment or Masterplan and urged the planning authority to require these assessments to be provided to inform decision making across all the current planning applications on this site.</p> <p>This supplementary letter to is to address one of the comments we made in our previous letter that the application is for a 'replacement pole barn' although none of the documents submitted as part of the application 20/02967/APP appeared to identify where the existing or previous pole barn was or is situated.</p> <p>On reviewing one of the other applications (20/03714/APP) we noted drawing number 96 from the architects which does show the position of the existing pole barn which is proposed to be demolished to create parking spaces as part of the conversion of a barn into three residential properties. As we have previously mentioned, it is extremely regrettable that the Gardens Trust was not consulted about that application prior to the LPA issuing a decision.</p> <p>We note that the existing pole barn did sit adjacent to other agricultural buildings as might be expected on an agricultural site. The buildings, even modern structures, would therefore be appropriate within this setting and would read as a farm complex. However, as the complex is now to be partly converted to residential, it is becoming partly redundant for its original agricultural function hence the proposal to erect a new pole barn elsewhere on the site and separated from the complex.</p> <p>As we stated in our previous letter, there is no development of any form in the field affected by this application. The North Drive is lined with trees and the field has small trees and hedges delineating the boundary with woodland to the north. There are no built structures until the North Drive reaches Ham Lodge and the A41. Therefore, any development in the setting of this section of the RPG will be damaging, but especially within this currently undeveloped field.</p> <p>We would like to reiterate that we do not object to the replacement of agricultural buildings. However, in this instance, by proposing to convert the existing agricultural building to residential use, thereby breaking up the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>existing farm complex, the proposals advocate pushing the agricultural site onto undeveloped land within the most immediate setting of an RPG. We would therefore like to reiterate our strong objections to the principle of a new structure in the application site due to its damage to the fabric and setting of the RPG. Due to the numerous applications relating to this site we urge the submission of a Landscape Character Assessment and a Masterplan as part of any consideration of this or any other planning application. The site must be considered as a whole. In addition, as this application relates to approved plans, we ask you to ensure minimal fenestration on the elevations facing the RPG to prevent significant reflection and light emittance which would further damage the setting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hall Barn	Buckinghamshire	E21/1407 E21/1411	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to the west wing of the main house including replacement of the existing bituminous felt roof covering and roof structure, replacement of existing rooflights, removal of existing oil tank enclosure from the roof, formation of new external doorway from existing window opening, new external steps, walls and balustrade Hall Barn, Windsor End, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, HP9 2SG BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust who are familiar with the site. This formal application follows on from a pre-application enquiry made by the architects, Andrew Townsend Architects to which the Gardens Trust already responded on September 17th 2021. Hall Barn is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) with the first landscape park and woodland created by the poet Edmund Waller between 1651-1687. Further works were carried out by his grandson Edmund between 1715-30 with influence from John Aislabie. We have reviewed the formal application, in particular the excellent Heritage Impact Statement, and note that the proposals will not damage the RPG as the proposals consist of minor alterations and improvements to the building and alterations to the 1960s landscaping around the house which have a low impact on the character of the earlier landscape. As long as the local authority is satisfied that the proposed alterations fit with the current character of the terrace we have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer Margie Hoffnung</p>

					Conservation Officer
The Meades 32 Germain Street, Chesham,	Buckinghamshire	E21/1425	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Detached single storey garage with mezzanine floor for home office. The Meades, 32 Germain Street, Chesham, Buckinghamshire, HP5 1LH, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust regarding the above planning application. The Gardens Trust have forwarded the application to the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and requested that we respond to you directly. Whilst we note that neither the application site nor the Meades Water Gardens are part of a Registered Park and Garden, we also note that this is a significant local open space which reflects and preserves the historical development of the area. The Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust would therefore encourage the planning authority to weigh the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the Meades Water Gardens from the perspective of views into and out of the Water Gardens as well as the impact of increased traffic and noise in the immediate vicinity. If these combined impacts are considered detrimental to the Meades Water Gardens, we would encourage the planning authority to either refuse consent for the planning application or seek changes to the proposals which would mitigate the impact on this significant local asset. If revisions are made to the proposals, the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust would be grateful to be informed so that we might review them. We cannot find any reference to the Meades Water Gardens on the Bucks Local Heritage List and would recommend that it is considered for inclusion. Yours sincerely Joanne Mirzoeff On behalf of the Bucks Gardens Trust
Nantwich Walled Garden	Cheshire	E18/1503	N	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of 6 x 2 bed dwellings with restoration of listed structures and creation of new vehicular & pedestrian accesses. The Walled Garden, off Kings Lane, WELSH ROW, NANTWICH. WALLED GARDEN, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2021 I comment on behalf of The Cheshire Gardens Trust in my role as Planning Responses Coordinator. We have considered the latest iteration of the design for housing within the walled garden and write to object to this application which is totally inappropriate and which will, if permitted, cause significant harm to an irreplaceable heritage asset within Nantwich Conservation Area. Our objections are as stated in our letter dated 6th February 2019, a copy of which is attached below. We are grateful to the Nantwich Walled Garden Society for bringing this application to our notice, an application which has a material impact on the

					<p>significance of the Walled Garden which is of national importance, listed Grade II. Cheshire Gardens Trust has identified the Walled Garden as being of local and county importance.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust works with The Gardens Trust as the national statutory consultee. For further information see http://thegardenstrust.org/planning-leaflet.html and http://www.cheshire-gardens-trust.org.uk/?Aims</p> <p>We write to object to this application, which will cause significant harm to an irreplaceable heritage asset within Nantwich Conservation Area.</p> <p>We have visited the site previously and are aware of the planning history. The significance of Nantwich Walled Garden lies in its survival as probably the oldest walled garden in the historic county of Cheshire, a space that once contained a high-status garden as evidenced by documentary records and its remaining substantial walls, reflecting the wealth and standing of the owner, Thomas Wilbraham.</p> <p>Our objections are as follows:</p> <p>The impact of building within the walled gardenThe Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment describe the history of the walled garden but only analyse the significance of the walls and the impact of the proposals on their significance.</p> <p>Little consideration is given to the space enclosed by the walls which is the Walled Garden.</p> <p>The significance of a walled garden lies not simply in its enclosing walls but more importantly in its role as a sheltered environment for horticulture. In this instance, the surviving walls represent considerable investment and are evidence of the high status of the garden. The negative impact of filling this garden in whole or in part with housing is damaging. Contrary to the applicants claim that the proposed development will cause less than substantial harm, if permitted it would cause substantial irreversible harm and as such is contrary to NPPF (July 2018) paragraph 194:-</p> <p>194. 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.</p> <p>Substantial harm to or loss of:</p> <p>a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;</p> <p>It is also contrary to Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030, 13.61 "Once lost or altered, features of the historic environment cannot be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>replaced”, and Policy SE 7 The Historic Environment: “...The character, quality and diversity of the historic environment will be conserved and enhanced. All new development should see to avoid harm to heritage assets...”</p> <p>Condition and ownership of the walls</p> <p>The ownership and repair of the Grade II listed walls is crucial to this application. It is imperative that ownership of the walls is confirmed and that with guidance from Historic England a priced schedule of repairs is prepared prior to a decision on this planning application.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact states: “it is recognised that due to the intervention required to repair and restore the walled garden a level of viability to the proposed scheme is required.” (2.7)</p> <p>The issue of viability is not addressed in the submission. It is our view that the cost of wall repairs and restoration will be considerable and cannot be sustained by the proposed development.</p> <p>Proposed design of the garden</p> <p>There is no justification, appropriate explanation, basis or detail for the garden design shown on the site layout. There must be a clear rationale for the design with details of appropriate materials and planting, and clarity regarding responsibilities for future management, maintenance and public access.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust objects to the present application. If permitted it would cause irreversible harm to the significance of the Walled Garden, listed Grade II, in contravention of NPPF and Cheshire East’s own planning policies and procedures. This planning saga has been going on for over 10 years during which time the Walled Garden has become further overgrown and the condition of the walls has deteriorated. The opportunity to repair the walls and reinstate a garden was lost with the first adjacent housing development, and now the economic case for repair supported by a small development is not justified. The erection of a residential development within the walled garden is not the appropriate mechanism to fund the repair of the garden walls.</p> <p>We urge Cheshire East Council to work with Nantwich Town Council, the applicant, Nantwich Walled Garden Society and the local community to find a viable future for this site.</p> <p>Consideration must include ownership, the ability to access external</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>funding, and the development of appropriate and sustainable proposals for the garden as a public green space.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Cheshire Gardens Trust Planning Responses Coordinator</p>
Warrington Local Plan	Cheshire	E20/1679	N/A	<p>LOCAL PLAN Consultation Town Centre SPD and house extensions SPD.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee regarding consultation on the Warrington Draft Local Plan. With Lancashire Gardens Trust we commented on the previous version of the Local Plan in 2019. A copy of our letter is attached. We are disappointed that our contribution is not reflected in the latest draft plan suggesting that Warrington Borough Council does not recognise the important of its historic designed landscapes and the contribution that they make to the quality and character of the Borough as a place to live, work and play. These non-designated heritage assets are irreplaceable, and require recognition in accordance with NPPF 16, 20, 184 and 189.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Grosvenor Park	Cheshire	E20/1854	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of one detached dwelling Redcliffe 9 Lower Park Road Chester Cheshire CH4 7BB RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this revised application, which has a material impact on the significance and setting of a number of heritage assets in Chester.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust and its object is "To promote the appropriate action for any or all of the following: the restoration, enhancement, preservation, conservation, protection and understanding of designed landscapes that may exist or have existed in and around the pre-1974 historic county of Cheshire." In furtherance of this objective, we liaise closely with the Gardens Trust regarding planning applications and consultations. For further information we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/</p> <p>We write to express our concern regarding this application which if permitted would cause minor harm to the significance of the setting of</p>

					<p>Grosvenor Park a historic landscape designed by Edward Kemp which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II*, listed buildings and their settings, and on the landscape character of the Queen's Park Conservation Area and the setting of the Chester City Centre Conservation Area.[1] The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration. The significance of No 7 and No 9 Lower Park Road lie in their ownership and development by the Frost brothers, prominent businessmen in 19th century Chester; the layout of the two gardens as an integrated design by Edward Kemp, Superintendent of Birkenhead Park, and illustrated in his influential book "How to lay out a small garden"; for the originality of the design for two modest plots enabling the 'borrowed landscape' of one to contribute to the setting of the other and encompassing a sandstone cliff face of the River Dee; for</p> <p>"The quality of exterior and interior and their relation to the contemporary garden make this item probably the most complete example of a C19 suburban house in Chester." (Listed building entry); for the survival of original plant material including trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders; for their contribution to the character and quality of the Queen's Park Conservation Area, to views from the Groves and boathouses on the north bank of the River Dee, and to the principal view from Grosvenor Park taken from the belvedere, all of which lie within Chester City Centre Conservation Area; for being an important part of the collection of Kemp's work in Chester which includes Grosvenor Park and the Lead Works.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the changes that have taken place to both No 7 and No 9 Lower Park Road, to development within the Queen's Park Conservation Area as a whole, and other developments permitted and proposed within the locality, these properties still retain much of original character and integrity. We acknowledge that change has occurred, but past development is no justification for permitting further change that adds to the cumulative negative impact on heritage assets.[2] We appreciate that the applicant has reduced the scale of the proposed dwelling so that it is comparable to the existing modern garage at No. 7. Our main concerns are that if permitted the proposal would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Result in the loss of a flight of garden steps which are part of the Grade II listing and part of Kemp's design. It appears that these steps could be retained within the proposed layout. · Result in loss of space and infilling between properties, space which is important to the understanding of Kemp's design and the historic
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>character of the Queen's Park Conservation Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Result in minor change to one of the key views (8) identified in the Chester West and Chester Local Plan(part 2) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies, the view from the Belvedere in Grosvenor Park, through additional built development visible from this viewpoint. <p>The authority must be aware of the cumulative negative impact of infill which, if permitted, will gradually change the character and quality of the Queen's Park Conservation Area and its appearance in key views from Chester City Conservation Area and Grosvenor Park. Change that will include increased building density, loss of green space, and limited opportunities to sustain tree cover.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Tilstone Lodge	Cheshire	E21/1242	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an Agricultural shed within residential curtilage Tilstone Lodge Nantwich Road Tiverton Chester Cheshire CW6 9HS MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.11.2021</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application. The proposal will have a material impact on the significance of the historic designed landscape of Tilstone Lodge which is identified by us as being of local importance.</p> <p>We have no objection in principle to the erection of an agricultural shed for the purposes outlined but do object to the proposal for an agricultural shed in this location which will have a negative impact on established trees bounding the garden, and due to visibility, may cause harm to the significance of the Lodge and its setting.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust and its object is "To promote the appropriate action for any or all of the following: the restoration, enhancement, preservation, conservation, protection and understanding of designed landscapes that may exist or have existed in and around the pre-1974 historic county of Cheshire." In furtherance of this objective, we liaise closely with the Gardens Trust regarding planning applications and consultations. For further information we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at http://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/conservation-publications/</p>

					<p>We have visited the site (on the PRO) and in 2018 completed a Research and Recording report on Tilstone Lodge, available at Cheshire Historic Environment Record and Cheshire Archives and Local Studies. The significance of Tilstone Lodge is not only that it is a well-preserved example of a small Regency country house designed by Thomas Harrison, but that its parkland laid out by John Webb remains remarkably intact complete with lake, enclosing tree belts, parkland trees, drives, lodges and an extensive range of stables and outbuildings, some from an earlier farmstead. The gardens include a large walled kitchen garden and significant 19th and 20th century plantings. The Tollmache family who commissioned and lived at Tilstone Lodge went on to build a new home, Peckforton Castle. Subsequent owners included Sir Harold Bibby of the Bibby Line and his wife, Lady Marjorie Bibby who undertook notable 20th century development of the gardens.</p> <p>The location of the proposed agricultural shed is within the garden curtilage and within an enclosing belt of trees shown on historic plans since the 1841 Tithe map. The First Edition Ordnance Survey indicates these trees to be a mix of deciduous and coniferous species. While the present trees in the vicinity of the proposed shed may not be original plantings, they follow the design and mix of species, providing definition and enclosure to the gardens within the wider designed landscape.</p> <p>Construction of the proposed shed, if permitted, would take place within the root protection zone of a cedar tree and necessitate the removal of lower branches, both of which would have a detrimental impact on the tree's health and appearance, and be contrary to Cheshire West and Chester Adopted Development Plan policies ENV 2 Landscape and ENV 5 Historic Environment. A young beech tree would be similarly affected. The boundary trees enclosing the garden are an integral part of the designed landscape and should be conserved.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement states that the proposed agricultural shed, 6.3m high to the ridge, would be screened by the walled garden and intervening greenery in views from the Lodge. We consider that the building will be visible from the Lodge, notwithstanding the screening provided by hedges, walls and evergreen trees, and impinge on the easterly view across the gardens and into the wider landscape, a designed view that extends to the Pennine hills. The visibility of an agricultural shed in this setting will be detrimental to the significance of the Lodge and gardens.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					information is submitted. Yours faithfully Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust
Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan	Cheshire	E21/1440	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan. We are responding on behalf of Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT), which exists to promote awareness, understanding and conservation of historic parks and gardens, which in planning terms are 'heritage assets'.</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust works with The Gardens Trust as the National Statutory Consultee. For further information see The Planning System in England and the Protection of Parks and Gardens available at http://thegardenstrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/PLANNING-DOC-Finalinteractive-4_7_19-2.pdf</p> <p>We have considered the Plan and our comments are as follows:</p> <p>Registered parks and gardens Historic England maintains the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest; these are historic designed landscapes in England and Wales of national importance. We understand that there are no Registered Parks and Gardens in the area of the NP.</p> <p>Unregistered parks and gardens CGT volunteers have researched many sites in Cheshire East. The Historic Environment Record holds our research and recording reports and our draft lists are available on Cheshire Gardens Trust website www.cheshire-gardens-trust.org.uk/ The Conservation Officers in Cheshire East are also aware of this work.</p> <p>From our research to date we are aware of one unregistered historic designed landscape in your area, Abbeyfields, for which we completed a research and recording report in 2011. We consider that Abbeyfields and its associated designed landscape merit separate mention in Policy HC1 Historic Environment for their significant contribution to the landscape character and quality of this "Area of Separation" Fig. 3, between Ettiley Heath, Sandbach Town and Wheelock Village.</p> <p>This non-designated heritage asset, designed by John Webb, includes a lake, walled garden, stable yard, ornamental garden, mature trees (covered by tree preservation orders) and woodlands (also covered by Woodlands or Group Tree Preservation Orders) within the remnant parkland.</p>

					<p>Landscape character</p> <p>As well as their intrinsic importance as a heritage asset, historic designed landscapes make a significant contribution to local character. The National Planning Policy Framework states that this is a key component that Neighbourhood Plans should conserve and enhance. We are pleased to see the importance of landscape character and green spaces recognised in the Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We welcome any contributions to our research and would be pleased to hear from local people if there are sites of historic designed landscape interest within the Sandbach area that we are not aware of.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, please contact the writer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Warrington BC Local Plan	Cheshire	E21/1441	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2021</p> <p>RE: Consultation on Warrington Draft Local Plan</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee regarding consultation on the Warrington Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>With Lancashire Gardens Trust we commented on the previous version of the Local Plan in 2019. A copy of our letter is attached. We are disappointed that our contribution is not reflected in the latest draft plan suggesting that Warrington Borough Council does not recognise the important of its historic designed landscapes and the contribution that they make to the quality and character of the Borough as a place to live, work and play. These non-designated heritage assets are irreplaceable, and require recognition in accordance with NPPF 16, 20, 184 and 189.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Tabley House	Cheshire	E21/1505	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Part conversion, part demolition and replacement of existing	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2021</p> <p>Tabley Hall, Grade II, a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) is a member</p>

				<p>redundant farm buildings to create a mixed use development consisting of a public house, flexible commercial office space and children's nursery. Villa Farm, Chester Road, Tabley, Cheshire WA16 0EX DEMOLITION, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, EDUCATION, CATERING</p>	<p>organisation of the Gardens Trust (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. For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org Homepage - The Gardens Trust 22.11.21. Plant Nurseries in England – Armstrongs Nursery of Hants. This talk is the fourth in our online series on Mons@6. Part of the programme Plant Nurseries, Hunters & Pioneers £5 each or all 7 for £28.... www.thegardenstrust.org . This document (p5) makes clear the distinction between designated and non designated heritage assets in the planning system, and the importance of non designated heritage assets in local plans. We have not been notified of previous planning applications relating to this site. While we do not object in principle to the reuse and repurposing of the existing house and associated farm buildings, we do object to this application which involves extensive rebuilding and landscaping in an urban manner which we consider to be totally inappropriate in this historic setting. We are aware of the site and are familiar with Tabley and its wider estate. Significance In brief, the significance of Tabley Park lies in the time depth of the historic landscape, home of the Leicester family for 700 years, site of their medieval moated manor house with island garden, Palladian mansion by John Carr of 1767 (Grade I) and 17th century family chapel (Grade I). The park is traversed by the route of the historic road to Knutsford which was replaced by a new road north of the park, Tabley Lane, c1770. The contract for which survives dated 1769. The Peacock Lodges on Tabley Lane (listed Grade II) flank the north entrance, and together with other features such as the Folly Tower and Gothick boathouse add to the character and quality of this well documented historic designed landscape, recorded by artists such as Anthony Devis and JMW Turner. Tabley Park forms part of a much wider estate landscape which is identified under Cheshire East Landscape Character Assessment as part of LCT 5: Wooded Estates and Meres. Villa Farm also lies within this area. A building in the location of Villa Farm is shown of Greenwood's County Map</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>1819, suggesting that the original property may have been constructed when Tabley Lane was constructed.</p> <p>Impacts on Significance</p> <p>While Villa Farm is not, except in winter, directly visible from Tabley Park, it forms part of the historic and rural estate setting of Tabley, is part of the estate landscape, and a non designated heritage asset that contributes to local landscape character experienced by people passing everyday on Chester Road and Tabley Lane and stopping at the adjacent traffic lights. If permitted, the proposed development will diminish the quality and character of the historic landscape due to urbanisation resulting from the design of the buildings and landscaping, areas of car parking and vehicular movements.</p> <p>Cheshire East Landscape Character Assessment LCT 5 identifies 'forces for change' which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Continued pressure for development · Erosion of built environment character through incremental development <p>We consider that the proposed development is contrary to Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy Policy PG 6 Open Countryside as it does not meet the criteria for permitted development.</p> <p>For these reasons we object to the current proposals.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Tarn Lodge Estate	Cumbria	E20/1490	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting Of 2no. Holiday Lodges & 2no. Pods Together With Landscaping, Newt Ponds, A Sealed Foul Water Drainage System, Access Track & Parking (Revised Application). Land to north of Tarn Lodge Farm, Heads Nook, Brampton. HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust on the above application which affects the historic designed landscape at Tarn Lodge. We have studied the additional documents submitted, the reptile and radar speed surveys and confirm we have no further comments to add. The Gardens Trust maintains its objection to this application for the reasons detailed in our letter dated 25 January 2021.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Courtlands/Lympstone Manor	Devon	E21/1335	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting of six shepherds huts with</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust thanks you for your further consultation and</p>

				<p>external decking, 3 boiler houses/log stores, one with decking area, and associated infrastructure (retrospective application) Lympstone Manor Hotel Courtlands Lane Exmouth EX8 3NZ HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>additional information relating to the above retrospective application. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust, and responds to consultations on proposals affecting sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in the County of Devon. The Trust also responds to consultations relating to sites, such as Courtlands/Lympstone Manor, which are of regional and local significance, and which are included on the Devon Gazetteer.</p> <p>We have reviewed the additional information on your website, and note, in particular, the changes in relation to Huts 01 and 03, which are welcome. These changes notwithstanding, we must advise that we do not consider that, on balance, the concerns raised in our consultation response dated 7 June 2021 have been adequately addressed. We refer, in particular, to our comments with regard to the impact of the shepherd’s huts on the Lady’s Walk:</p> <p>The Lady’s Walk is an integral element of the historic landscape setting of the Listed house; it contributes to the setting of the heritage asset and has intrinsic historic significance. On balance, we consider that the shepherd huts and associated infrastructure do not accord well with the historic and aesthetic concept of the Lady’s Walk; and therefore, they must be considered to cause a degree of harm to the Lady’s Walk. Most importantly, they have a negative impact on the way in which the Lady’s Walk is experienced by reason of the introduction of activity and noise into an area which has a character of retirement, privacy and reflection.</p> <p>We note and commend to your attention the compelling analysis of the issues relating to the impact of the proposed shepherds’ huts contained in your Conservation Officer’s report (6 October 2021) and the Conservation Officer’s response (11 November 2021), with which we are in complete agreement.</p> <p>We further note with great concern the advice of the Environment Agency (21 November 2021 – “Advice for the LPA”) which indicates that should your Authority be minded to approve this retrospective application, “Ground levels must be raised where the huts are situated and along the access and egress route” in order to render them safe from potential flooding. Clearly such an intervention would have a seriously adverse impact on the historic designed landscape (and, by extension, the setting of the Listed heritage asset), and would be a course of action to which we would strongly object.</p> <p>While appreciating the applicant’s investment in the designed landscape</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>and setting of the Listed building, we must conclude that our previously expressed concerns with regard to the appropriateness of this development in this location have not been adequately addressed, and that, on balance, the shepherd huts and associated development in the form proposed in the revised documentation would be damaging to the historic designed landscape and setting of the Listed building.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Rousdon	Devon	E21/1545	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of paddock to a cemetery, including a pet cemetery, construction of flint wall, columbarium and internal access path Land At St Pancras Church Rousdon CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application, which affects the historic designed landscape at Rousdon. This landscape has been identified by Historic England as being of national significance, and is included on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We apologise for the delay in providing our response to your consultation. We have, however, given the information relating to the application on your website careful consideration, along with other material relating to the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We note the content of the Design and Access Statement and Statement of Historic Significance (April 2021) and the response of Historic England to your consultation on this application (19 May 2021). · We note the presence of concrete pads on the proposed development site, indicating that it has been the subject of previous development. We also note that the proposed cemetery adjoins the existing historic churchyard associated with the former parish church to the east. <p>Taking these factors into account, along with the proposed use of flint walling which will harmonise with the existing adjacent historic walling, and the retention of existing trees on the site, we conclude that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the designated historic designed landscape, and therefore do not object to the proposal.</p>

					<p>We would advise that your Authority may wish to consider exercising some control, by means of appropriate condition, over the scale and height of any memorials which may be proposed to be erected in the cemetery, in order to ensure that such memorials do not cause any adverse visual impact on the surrounding historic designed landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Kingston Maurwood	Dorset	E21/1313	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 3 No. dwellings with associated landscaping and works Maurward Close Dorchester DT2 8PU RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.11.2021</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 been unable to make a site visit and have therefore had to rely entirely on the online documentation to respond to this application.</p> <p>From the supplied information it was difficult to ascertain with any accuracy what sort of visibility the proposals would have from within the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Kingston Maurward. Visibility was mentioned in several places but the Landscape & Heritage Assessment (Fig 5.1) did not identify any specific views relating to the application site. Equally, the photographs in the KMHP Heritage Statement at Maurwood Close showed views (plates 3, 4 & 5) across the interior of the site looking east and west and towards the existing houses in a southerly direction but nothing from the RPG properly showing visibility. A wire frame outline would have been helpful here especially as the new housing is on higher ground than the RPG to the south.</p> <p>The houses themselves are around 9.25m tall at their highest point and comparable heights for the existing houses in Maurward Close were not immediately apparent from the documents. The new houses are slightly larger than the existing properties and from the photos would appear to be similar in height although we cannot confirm this. We were glad to see that the existing trees are to be retained around the perimeter of the site in The Landscape Practice's Mitigation and Planting scheme but we would ask your officers to consider asking the applicants to thicken the boundary planting with succession planting in mind. Plot A would appear to have 3 extremely large specimen trees planted on its western and south-western boundaries. The 2 x Tilia 'Green Spire' and Quercus coccinea splendens are</p>

					<p>all large trees (the former H10 x 5m, and the Quercus H20 x 10m) which will entirely overshadow the garden in years to come. Perhaps slightly smaller trees might be more suitable here?</p> <p>We would be grateful if your officers could bear our comments regarding visibility in mind when assessing this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Woodchester Park	Gloucestershire	E21/1444	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of four play elements to the existing 2.7km play trail through Marmontsflat Wood. Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Gloucestershire, GL10 3TS.</p> <p>PLAY AREA</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2021</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks and gardens, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond in its behalf.</p> <p>GGLT has already been consulted on this proposal to replace the play trail through woodland adjacent to Woodchester Park Mansion, and within the Listed Park.</p> <p>With sensitive people management, this proposal will have a marginal impact on its location, it is wholly reversible, and will bring enjoyment to the visitors.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Wormington Grange	Gloucestershire	E21/1495	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restore main access drive in line with historical route, replacement greenhouse and gardeners store, repair and stabilisation to rear yard wall, restoration of formal gardens and the installation of a swimming pool and tennis court</p> <p>Wormington Grange, Wormington, Broadway, Gloucestershire WR12 7NJ</p> <p>ACCESS/GATES, GARDEN BUILDING, LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) about the proposed changes to the parkland surrounding the Grade II* Wormington Grange. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Gloucestershire Gardens & Landscape Trust who have researched the site thoroughly and are familiar with its development.</p> <p>Whilst the parkland and surrounding designed landscape are not on Historic England's register, they are of local significance, especially given the work of Dawber and Jewson, and provide the setting for the mansion. Dr Felus's detailed reports give as clear an indication of the various changes over the centuries as we are likely to get at present, given the dearth of documentary evidence, and the proposals, especially with regard to the rerouting of the drive, echo the most significant part of the original design intent, which reached its zenith in the 1820s.</p> <p>There are two major changes proposed. The first is to move the drive back to something akin to the original route, whose original line can be accurately plotted due to Lidar and which was almost certainly rerouted to</p>

					<p>its current position due to a landslip. This re-routing would appear to have been for necessity rather than by design, unlike the original route which had been carefully plotted to give 'peeps' of the mansion when driving through the treed 'sleeve' in the first half of the route, as well as a clear view of the lake further along culminating in the final appearance of the house. The GT/GGLT has no objection to the drive reverting to something resembling its original route, even if there is a slight detour nearer to the house in order to avoid moving the existing gate piers. The ridge and furrow has already been compromised by the line of the original drive, and whilst perhaps some additional small disruption may be experienced due to draining/technical requirements, as long as a careful archaeological brief is maintained, we feel this is an acceptable compromise. We understand that the relatively young plane trees along the more recent drive have been removed, and as some older trees remain along the line of the original drive, that would help a new drive bed in. Should your officers permit the proposals for a new drive, we would like to see the lake vista opened up again if at all possible.</p> <p>The second major change is to the service yard which has undergone numerous iterations over the past couple of centuries. We support the repair and rebuilding of the walls and the installation of a new greenhouse as the existing one is not significant historically. If the whole area is being redesigned as a working kitchen garden, an up-to-date greenhouse is a necessity. Our largest concern would be the creation of a new entrance on the north-eastern side to allow vehicular access. This is a shame as the wall there is the more architecturally important. However, if you balance the effect of this, with cars being parked here instead of at the front of the house, the thinking behind this intervention is clear. The wall on the western side which is to be lowered to give greater visibility to the formal gardens beyond also retain their original placement. We neither object to or support the change in height and would suggest that your officers consider this in relation to the planting of the revamped formal gardens beyond.</p> <p>We have no objection to the tennis court and swimming pool which have been discreetly sited.</p> <p>The gardens and parkland have undergone numerous changes over the years. The GT/GGLT feel that the current plans sensitively adapt the site to provide the facilities required by the current owner. The house and grounds clearly require substantial investment and on balance we feel that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the proposals are sympathetic to the setting and spirit of place, whilst bringing the gardens into the 21st century and providing yet another interesting layer of history to this important site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Victoria Tower Gardens	Greater London	E18/1437	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of the United Kingdom Holocaust Memorial and Learning Centre including excavation to provide a basement and basement mezzanine for the learning centre (Class D1); erection of a single storey entrance pavilion; reprovision of the Horseferry Playground and refreshments kiosk (Class A1); repositioning of the Spicer Memorial; new hard and soft landscaping and lighting around the site; and all ancillary and associated works. (The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which may be viewed with the application documents). The Victoria Tower Gardens, Millbank, London SW1P 3YB. VISITOR ATTRACTION, EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2021</p> <p>As you will be aware the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust has leave for a s.288 Appeal at the High Court which is not due to be heard until the end of February 2022. We note that a series of documents have been sent to WCC by the Applicant and validated, with an indicative date for decision of 24 December 2021 on the planning portal.</p> <p>I realise the Applicant is eager to proceed at the earliest opportunity. I acknowledge that some of the conditions could be agreed in principle, in advance of Court proceedings to avoid future delays. However, there are several submissions which propose works starting in the park sooner than the conclusion of the Court proceedings. Approval by WCC would therefore enable works to take place in the park inappropriately and we advise against any such decision. In particular, the Trust believe that WCC should reject the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21/05587/ADFULL - Construction Logistics Plan - Condition 31 <p>This suggests that work should start in January 2022 including dismantling elements of the playground and moving the Spicer Monument. These would be wholly inappropriate and detrimental to the historic landscape if the Court ruled against the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21/07454/ADFUL - Tree protection method statement - Condition 8 and 9 <p>This suggests root cutting to enable secant piling for the underground area envisaged as part of the proposals. The health of the trees should not be put in jeopardy unless the building works are definitively to go ahead -a matter that will not be clear until the court process is over.</p> <p>The Trust has raised additional points with The Royal Parks about the method statement, in relation to their role and responsibilities and is awaiting their comment. However, one point to note is that the AMS says that 10-20 cm is the distance required between the outer edge of the secant piling and the location of root cutting;</p> <p>this is a relevant figure as VTG is filled ground, albeit a long time ago, which implies that there will be some space needed to avoid root tearing. What is unclear is the extent of 'associated infrastructure' where root cutting will</p>

					<p>also go on. There is also the question of the 3 large fins outside the Basement Box which will need to have deep foundations.</p> <p>Further, tree roots are going to be compressed across most of the area shown on the Logistics Plan which is highly undesirable for the health of the trees already being put under stress. It would be helpful for future reference to know what measures WCC would expect to see to reduce the compression and preserve the health of the trees should the project go ahead.</p> <p>The Trust urges WCC to postpone consideration of the Conditions discussed above until the Court process is over so that there is a better overview of the whole delivery of the project.</p> <p>The Trust also has grave reservations about other aspects of the proposals as currently presented as follows and recommends these are rejected as presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21/05892/ADFULL - Condition 26, the Flood Risk Evacuation Plan linked to 21/06052/ADFULL - Monitoring Action Plan - Condition 25 <p>The Trust would not ordinarily comment on this but is concerned by the seriousness of the risks that have been brought to its attention by a professional engineering advisor.</p> <p>VTG is on a stretch of the river at risk of a breach flood. The site is also at risk from surface water flooding having insufficient drainage during sudden and heavy downpours made more likely by climate change. With the proposed building in the park and extending of hardstanding, the Trust foresees that the area is likely to be at even greater risk from flooding than it is at present. The Plan only considers a flood emergency response during design and construction. It should also address the longer-term prospects of flooding whilst the Learning Centre is in operation with visitors present. This links with the Monitoring Action Plan - Condition 25 which TTIS and SVTG comment on.</p> <p>The speed of inundation in the event of a breach, or due to sudden downpours with the wide shallow entrance slope, its highest point already below ultra-high tide level and heading down to an underground display area, is likely to lead to very dangerous rapid and forceful water flows through funnelling, making it almost impossible for occupants to leave safely. It is the reason why London borough policy prevents bedrooms in residential properties being placed below ground in this area.</p> <p>The plan suggests Green Park as an appropriate designated evacuation point – this is unrealistic and unviable, and risks lives at any phase during</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21/06410/ADFUL - Strategy for Maintaining Flood defences - Condition 22 <p>In view of the gravity of the flooding risks discussed above, the possible vulnerability of the wall collapsing should not be left to chance, it seems inadvisable for work to repair the wall to be postponed and should take place at the outset of the project as part of the enabling works.</p> <p>The Trust notes the following applications, and has no comment to make at this stage, though queries the necessity to agree these now when other matters have yet to be resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21/06255/ADFULL- Archaeological Remains - Condition 36 • 21/05769/ADFULL- Land Contamination - Condition 16 • 21/05659/ADFULL - Profile and Condition of Substrate - Condition 10 • 21/05666/ADFULL - Air Quality Assessment - Condition 15 • 21/05482/ADFULL - Fire Escape - Condition 34 <p>The Trust is working alongside TTIS and SVTG and supports their comments. We would be grateful for confirmation that WCC will postpone any further consideration of the works proposed at Victoria Tower Gardens until after the Court proceedings are concluded.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Monger Director</p>
Trent Park	Greater London	E21/0548	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of a temporary haul road to facilitate construction of water infrastructure at Cockfosters Reservoir involving new fencing and Improvements and maintenance works to existing woodland car park within Trent Park. Trent Park Cockfosters Road Barnet EN4 OPS.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2021</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Trent Park and Trent Country Park * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>The haul road has the potential to do lasting harm even though it is meant as a temporary installation.</p> <p>We understand the road is required due to the Grade II listed gates and bollards at the present West entrance, but we have concerns regarding the</p>

					<p>proposals and to this intrusion within a listed park, albeit temporary. The planning documents give no analysis of the impact on the park which is a designated heritage asset in its own right. The installation needs to avoid permanent alteration of the landform profile of the park and the subsequent restoration needs to repair any level changes and deal fully with compaction from the heavy traffic.</p> <p>No details are given in the application of any cut and fill required so we assume reprofiling of the park is not relevant. However, there is also a lack of detailed information regarding the restoration, only a promise to return the park to its present condition. Since its present condition is not stated in landform terms it is hard to pin down what the site will look like once works are finished. The area of influence should be left as though the works had never happened – however this requires a better understanding of the land profile as is.</p> <p>We request the restoration be conditioned to ensure it happens and to a high standard.</p> <p>Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we be of any further help,</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Wimbledon Park	Greater London	E21/1002 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 Grounds onto Wimbledon Park Golf Course with the introduction of new tennis courts, tennis related infrastructure and new buildings.</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</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.11.2021</p> <p>Further to our response of 30th September, both Chris Laine at Historic England and the Gardens Trust, have been contacted by John Phibbs, author of ‘Capability Brown : Designing the English Landscape.’ Mr Phibbs has made a valid point regarding the topography of the golf course landscape, which I am quoting for reference :</p> <p>‘... there is an assumption, perhaps not clearly expressed, that when the golf course was created the ground levels were irredeemably changed and therefore that nothing of the topography as it was in Brown’s day, survives. This is not the case. The park has a generous scattering of trees that pre-date the golf course and any changes of level would be obvious in their vicinity. I have not seen any evidence of this kind, whether it be trees buried or trees isolated on mounds. On the contrary I did notice one mound and some fragmentary earthworks that were associated with pre-golf trees. Earthworking for golf seems to have been limited to tees, greens and bunkers. ... I did not see an earthwork survey which would have verified the argument I give above. Since there was no earthwork survey,</p>

				<p>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>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>one might be misled into concluding that there were no earthworks and hence that the shape of Brown's landscape had been lost.' It would seem sensible to ask AELTC to commission an earthworks survey to establish what earth-working was done by the golf course and how much of the original Brownian levels can be re-established. This would be a heritage gain if achievable.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Canons Park	Greater	E21/1406	II	PLANNING APPLICATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.11.2021

	London			<p>Three storey upward extension to provide 21 no. self-contained dwellings at 14th, 15th and 16th floor. Communal roof garden. Re-cladding of the existing building. Associated condenser unit enclosure at roof level and canopy above roof garden. 8 no. existing parking bays converted into 2 no. disabled parking bays, cycle store and refuse/recycling store. Cycle stands</p> <p>Premier House 112 Station Road Edgware HA8 7BJ</p>	<p>Unfortunately, Barnet did not consult the Gardens Trust regarding the above application. The London Gardens Trust, looks at such applications on behalf of the Gardens Trust. Unfortunately, I have not had time to fully consider the impact of the proposed additional floors on Premier House. I can confirm that there is a potential for impact on views from the registered park and conservation area.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement from Bridges Associates shows a map on page 15 which shows clearly that Canons Drive is on a clear alignment with Premier House which does, potentially, terminate the view, along the drive from the registered park and garden. Whether the increased height of the building increases its impact on this view is moot, and I have not had time to investigate further at such short notice.</p> <p>I am sorry I cannot give you a clear comment but without further checking the elevation of the park in relation to Premier House I cannot be sure of the impact.</p> <p>I thought the Heritage Assessment from Bridges was, within its remit, very thorough. On pg 24 they show the view from the gates of Canon Drive, but this is on the same plain as Premier House. The issue is whether the longer views do in fact show more of Premier House and it is quite feasible it will be highly visible from the park end of Canons Drive given the terrain. This could be a significant change in character.</p> <p>Please can you keep me informed of the outcome of tonight's planning committee and ensure we are informed of future applications potentially impacting on registered parks and gardens in your borough.</p> <p>Kind regards Rose Wakelin Principal Conservation Officer</p>
Embley Park	Hampshire	E21/0845	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a building for storage purposes relating to the showman's yard (Part retrospective).</p> <p>Land South West Of Halls Wood, Gardeners Lane, East Wellow, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>Further to our letter of 9th September, we would only like to repeat our comments regarding lightspill which do not seem to have been addressed in any of the most recent documentation online. Otherwise our comments remain as before.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>

					Conservation Officer
Witley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E21/1405	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of Stables to provide DIY Livery facilities (retrospective) Witley Park Farm Worcester Road Great Witley MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.11.2021 Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust and The Gardens Trust commented on the previously refused application 20/02050. I see no reason to alter the comments made at the time. There is too little information submitted with the application considering the site is within Witley Court Historic Park and Garden a designated historic asset.
Sufton Court	Hereford and Worcester	E21/1406	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed installation of a photovoltaic solar farm with associated infrastructure including inverters/transformers, battery storage and substation with client and DNO switching equipment with underground connection to the adjacent Dormington substation. Land to the west of Clay Hill Pit, Dormington, Herefordshire, HR14EP SOLAR	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2021 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 Herefordshire & Worcestershire Gardens Trust (H&WGT) whose local knowledge informs this joint response. The solar farm is probably not visible from the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Sufton Court but it is very visible from Backbury Camp (Historic England Scheduled Monument – list entry number 1003534) and therefore seriously damages John Evelyn’s ‘British Elysium’ and the vale of ‘ravishing beauties’, which he so admired. See Garden History Vol 19, No 2 (1991) pp 105-127 https://www.jstor.org/stable/1586888?origin=crossref article by Peter Goodchild. This view is of international importance. The GT/H&WGT therefore strongly object to the proposed solar farm on this sensitive site and urge your officers to refuse it. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.11.2021 The Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust was included in a letter sent by the national Gardens Trust on 14th November to Herefordshire Council opposing the solar array planned for a site next to the Dormington electric substation. Whilst the HWGT is fully conscious of the necessity to find benign sources of energy, this particular site, chosen, no doubt, because of the proximity of the sub-station, will compromise a landscape which has been celebrated in the past as an ‘elysium Britannicum’ –a British paradise. The reference is to Garden History 19/2 (1991) pp. 105 -27. The ground-breaking article is by Dr Peter Goodchild, an internationally famous scholar. Garden History is the principal voice for the discipline of garden history in

					<p>English speaking world. The reference was given without any explanation in the Gardens Trust letter. In the following paragraphs I will try to summarise as briefly as possible what this article says.</p> <p>Today the late Georgian mansion of the Hereford family, Sufton Court, stands on a hill in its own parkland immediately to the east of the village of Mordiford, but this situation was created in 1789- 90 when the architect, James Wyatt and his collaborator, Humphry Repton created a new polite focus for the Hereford estate, which had been in existence since the Middle Ages. The old focus for the estate was in a secluded valley 2-300 yards to the north-east and survives today as Old Sufton, represented by a house of medieval origins and a walled garden perched, with a summerhouse-cum-dovecote, on an adjacent hill.</p> <p>In the Commonwealth period (1649-60) a group of scholars, among them John Evelyn (1620-1706), the future diarist and author of <i>Sylva</i> or a Discourse of Forest Trees, were contemplating founding, what became after 1660 the Royal Society. Much influenced by classical culture and new confidence in the future greatness of Britain they began collecting information about all aspects of British science and culture. Evelyn began assembling models for managing the countryside in a productive but aesthetically pleasing manner. His ideal was referred to as an <i>Elysium Britannicum</i> – it was to be an estate of perfect bliss. He corresponded widely with other scholars but the book he planned was only published in incomplete form in 1998 by the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library in Washington DC. Evelyn corresponded widely with local informants; among them was John Beale (1608-93), a Herefordshire clergyman, vicar of Stretton Grandison and the author in 1657 of <i>Herefordshire Orchards</i>, a Pattern for all England, which was very well received by the putative members of the Royal Society. Beale was very familiar with the area around Old Sufton since he married the sister of the owner, Henry Hereford ‘the mystic’, a fellow of St John’s College, Oxford. Beale was a moderate puritan but his ideas were out of place in Royalist Herefordshire and he had taken refuge in the crevices of Backbury Hill during the early years of the Civil War. He later corresponded with Evelyn, describing the setting of Old Sufton, an extensive quadrant of varied land with its apex at Backbury Hill – a ‘landscape of ravishing beauties’ he called it – the Frome Valley. At the foot of the hill stood the mansion (Old Sufton) where ‘a rich pure fountain’ passed to one side and adjoining it was ‘a garden plot upon a rock’, which was ‘perpetually verdant and could be extended to embrace</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>more of the hillside' and was eminently suitable for the planting of 'medicinal simples (herbs) and vineyards etc'. The springs fed the Frome meadows where there are still traces of 17th century water meadows. Evelyn was charmed by what Beale described and felt that the site could be made into 'one of the most august and magnificent gardens in the world, so far exceeding those of Italy and France'. Beale took his ideas even further and designed a model estate of 2000 acres divided into 16 farms, situated close to a navigable river. This, of course, was the Wye which became navigable in 1662. Beale and Evelyn's ideas were forgotten after the Restoration in 1660 but in 1764 Sir James Hereford built a summerhouse high up in his elevated walled garden, which has recently been restored and encompasses views of the 'rich vale of ravishing varieties (beauties)'. I am sure the Commonwealth visionaries of the 1650's would have welcomed a solar array but they would not have seen it as an ornament to their Elysium but perhaps, have suggested, as we might, that it be placed more inconspicuously on the many empty roofs of the warehouses, offices and manufactories on the Rotherwas industrial estate. Yours faithfully, David Whitehead on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust</p>
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E21/0045	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing house and construction of one 2 storey detached house with basement, loft bedrooms, two balconies to rear first floor; detached garage and front entrance gates. 7 Pishiobury Drive Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 0AD DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Our concerns about reduction in green space at the front of made in our response of 14 April 2021, have not been addressed in the amended documents. We therefore continue to have concerns that the reduction in the greenspace will cause some harm to the approach to the historic Llisted mansion and the 'Capability' Brown Registered landscape. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/1293	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a new swimming pool house, associated works to and extension of the existing boundary wall and installation of double gates.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Northaw Place retains much of its historic fabric and setting despite numerous alterations and additions. It is set in a historic landscape which has been added to the HGT List of Parks & Gardens of Local Historic Importance. The openness of this landscape to the north and south of the</p>

				9 Northaw Place Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NQ MISCELLANEOUS	<p>dwelling is key to the setting and therefore significance of the listed building..</p> <p>The proposed pool house on the southern boundary on No.9 would be a harmful intrusion into this openness, especially as the drive from Coopers Lane adjoins the listed garden walls of the mansion and provides a rural approach to the former walled garden. It is also within the Green Belt and would compromise the openness of the Green Belt. This proposal is contrary to WHBC policies on Green Belt, Listed Buildings and Historic Parks and Gardens, and their settings, as well as NPPF Chapters 16 and 13 . We therefore object to this proposal."</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/1328	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Three storey rear extension with additional dormer and rooflight, alteration to opening</p> <p>8 Boyes Crescent London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1Ub</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT SUPPLEMENTARY WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2021</p> <p>Since submission of our comments, on behalf of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens, on this planning application on 2 November 2021, our attention has been brought to the proximity of the mature plane tree in the garden of 7 Boyes Crescent very close to the boundary with 8 Boyes Crescent. This plane tree is of such height and girth that it could well be part of the design by William Goldring, the prominent landscape designer and gardens writer who laid out the landscape in 1900. The size of the tree indicates it could be one of the mature trees Goldring incorporated within the landscape.</p> <p>The information in the planning application is thus incomplete. Not only is there no Heritage Impact Assessment for the Registered landscape but there is no arboricultural assessment of the effect of the proposed works on this significant tree which is protected by TPO.</p> <p>Before this application is considered, we would suggest that expert opinion is sought as to the effect the proposed works at 8 Boyes Crescent would have on this tree, and especially its root zone which extends into this property's current garden. If permission is granted we would suggest a condition is put on the works to ensure there is sufficient tree root zone and canopy protection so that the tree is not damaged.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust The Gardens Trust</p>
Temple Dinsley	Hertfords hire	E21/1378	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single storey</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for all planning applications</p>

				<p>extension to the North-Eastern elevation 1 Dower House Hitchin Road Preston Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 7TZ BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>affecting Registered Parks and Gardens and HGT is authorised to respond to these on their behalf. The Dower House is set within the Grade II* landscape of Temple Dinsley with the south east aspect overlooking the Registered parkland. Any further development of the Dower House site would have a negative impact on the registered Parkland, especially with the addition of glazing on the south-east aspect. In this case we consider that the harm would be less than substantial. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Putteridge Bury	Hertfords hire	E21/1380	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of front porch, single storey extensions to both side elevations, two storey rear extension (ground and basement), increase size of existing dormers on side roofslopes, and erection of a detached triple garage. East Lodge Lilley Bottom Lilley Luton Hertfordshire LU2 8NH</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2021 The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for ALL Registered Parks and Gardens in the UK and HGT is authorised to respond on their behalf for those situated in Hertfordshire. We note that GT has not been consulted and that the NHBC planning webpage is not accepting comments. However, we are concerned that the proposal would cause harm to the Registered landscape as follows: Historically this lodge was deliberately sited on a slight bend and within woodland. Much of the woodland has now gone leaving the lodge as the sole marker of the entrance to the important Registered Putteridge Bury landscape. We consider that the proposed extensions and addition of a detached garage would cause some harm to the reading of this landscape by cluttering the approach to East Lodge, and adversely affecting the views across the parkland. Further, the Lodge has been much extended in the past but is still readable in the historical hierarchy of buildings in the Park, from the Listed mansion downwards. The proposed extra amendments and additions would render this Lodge unrecognizable as a marker of the entrance to a historic landscape of this importance, thus harming the significance of the park contrary to both NHDC Policies and the NPPF Chapter 16. We would therefore like to lodge an objection to this proposal Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/1416	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey side extension on first floor and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.11.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. This part of Woodland Rise has unaltered houses of a relatively late period</p>

				insertion of 1 x roof light into existing roof 52 Woodland Rise Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LF BUILDING ALTERATION	of Garden City construction houses, separated by plenty of green space, with back garden trees visible from the road and is included in the WGC Conservation Area The addition of the first floor extension would reduce this space, and the green setting noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal. It would thus harm the rhythm of the space/building pattern along this road. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Bayfordbury	Hertfords hire	E21/1496	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension with internal alterations to fenestration and openings to rear. 5 Victoria Mews Bayfordbury Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8SP DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Bayfordbury Stables was constructed in 1812 as part of the layout of the significant landscape park which is Registered at Grade II. Those parts of the block which faced the walled gardens were deliberately ornamental in finish. The less prominent facades were more utilitarian as at 5 Victoria Mews. We therefore do not consider that the Registered Park would suffer significant harm from this development. However, the simplicity and integrity of the stable block would be harmed by the addition of a brick extension, contrary to EHDC Policy HA7 as it would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the exterior of the heritage asset and contrary to NPPF (194) as it causes harm to the heritage asset's significance. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
52 Woodland Rise, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/1519	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey side extension on first floor and insertion of 1 x roof light into existing roof 52 Woodland Rise Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LF BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. This part of Woodland Rise has unaltered houses of a relatively late period of Garden City construction houses, separated by plenty of green space, with back garden trees visible from the road and is included in the WGC Conservation Area The addition of the first floor extension would reduce this space, and the green setting noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal. It would thus harm the rhythm of the space/building pattern along this road. Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Port Lympe	Kent	E21/1147	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021

				<p>The erection of a pergola and the temporary siting of a glass marquee to facilitate weddings/functions</p> <p>Howletts & Port Lympne Wild Animal Parks Port Lympne, Aldington Road, Lympne, Hythe, Kent, CT21 4PD</p> <p>MARQUEE</p>	<p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) on the above application. We have again liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust to consider the new documentation. Although some more drawings have been submitted, there no real changes, so our comments remain as previously outlined in our letter of 18th November 2021.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
The Salutation, Sandwich	Kent	E21/1329	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of 3no. buildings containing 10no. apartments and commercial floorspace (Use Class E) with associated landscaping and open space</p> <p>Land South Of Whitefriars Meadow, Sandwich, CT13 9AS</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>This application attempts to address the reasons for refusal of an earlier similar application (08/01170) on this site.</p> <p>It is understood that the site is designated as Open Space in the Local Plan and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance to the Sandwich Conservation Area. The development of the site would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and would be harmful to the setting of the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p>It is noted that no provision for parking is provided for ten apartments and four commercial units, because there is no vehicular access. The applicant suggests that parking would be available in adjacent Guildhall public car park.</p> <p>For these reasons GT/KGT object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Redleaf Penhurst Place	Kent	E21/1391	II I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of outbuilding. Erection of one 3-bed dormer bungalow.</p> <p>Redwood Penhurst Road Penhurst KENT TN11 8HY</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>This application is a resubmission of 21/02370 which was granted 27July 2021. This new application is different from the previous application in that</p>

					<p>additional bedrooms have been created in the roof space and a basement under the whole ground floor area has been added. These latest changes do not affect the setting of the Registered Park and Garden from the previous granted planning application and the GT/KGT do not object to this current application.</p> <p>We would wish however to comment on the effect the creation of a basement may have on the pond which is located approximately 25m north of the site of the proposed new dwelling. Although the pond is not within the curtilage of the property, it is suggested the effect of excavating the basement could cause disruption of the flow into the pond and as a result effect the overall setting the pond provides in this Registered Park and Garden. Your officers will have to satisfy themselves the basement excavation will not have an adverse effect on the pond when considering this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Squerryes Court	Kent	E21/1430	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a timber framed building for personal office/gym. Dunsdale Farm Cottage Brasted Road Westerham Kent TN16 1LJ GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to construct a timber building 8m X 4m by 4m high within an area of protected trees to use as an office and gym approximately 50m from the residence. The erection of a building of this size is out of keeping with the general landscape in this area which is within the Green Belt, and therefore GT/KGT is agreement with the parish council and cannot support this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Syndale Park	Kent	E21/1551	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of elderly persons care home. Syndale Park London Road Ospringe Faversham Kent ME13 ORH</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>I am writing on behalf on Kent Gardens Trust to object to Planning Application 21/504695/FULL for the building of a Care Home at Syndale Park, London Road, Ospringe, Faversham, Kent ME13 ORH</p> <p>The site lies within the Syndale Conservation Area and the application recognises that the development will have a significant effect on the</p>

				MEDICAL	<p>conservation area, involving removal of trees which are referred to as being "fine" specimens, which originate from the development of the Syndale Park, thus creating harm the conservation area. An Arboricultural Method Statement has not been to provided to demonstrate that the siting of the care home has been chosen to mitigate the number of trees to be felled, and how construction of proposal would be carried to ensure protection of the trees to be retained.</p> <p>No Ecological Impact Assessment has been provided to demonstrate the effect the development may have on the biodiversity of the area and how it can be conserved.</p> <p>For these reasons Kent Gardens Trust cannot support this application.</p> <p>Kind regards Mike O'Brien Co Chairman</p>
Marston Hall	Lincolnshire	E21/1368	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of dwelling Dove House, Barkston Road, Marston, Lincolnshire, NG32 2HN RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2021</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 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Dove House is separately asking for 2 applications. One application, S21/2166, concerns the alteration and extension of a barn into a dwelling, behind the existing Dove House and will not have much visual impact, apart from a new vehicular access from the road and the creation of 4 parking places with materials to match Dove House. This application would be acceptable in isolation.</p> <p>What we do have concerns about however, is a separate application S21/2165 to build a completely new dwelling adjacent to Dove House (S21/2165). One of the documents (Drawing 21.067PL01-4) relating to the current application, shows the additional dwelling as part of the architect's drawings. The combination of the two will change the rural setting of the road, right opposite the Grade II parkland and 'avenue' trees of Marston Hall. The 'plot' for that dwelling is the old orchard belonging to Dove House.</p> <p>When considering the above applications, we need to bear in mind the overall plan for this site. The S21/2166 application hopes to create spaces for 4 cars (clients for hairdressing salon), but the S21/2165 application has a double garage and carport planned, meaning a minimum of 2 additional</p>

					cars. Apart from the considerable increase of car movements created by these dwellings, it is the visual impact on a very rural setting which raises our concerns. At the moment, the lane acts as a transition from the village proper to the historic parkland. The lane will, once these applications have materialised, be changed from a low density, rural lane alongside an important historical asset, into a much more densely built environment. We would be grateful if your officers could consider both applications together for their impact upon Marston Hall. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Marston Hall	Lincolnshire	E21/1381	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion/extension of outbuilding to form dwelling (Use Class C3) and hair salon (Use Class E) and formation of new vehicular access. Dove House, Barkston Road, Marston, Lincolnshire, NG32 2HN CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2021 Thank you for coming back to us for clarification on the above applications. Although my colleagues from the Lincolnshire Gardens Trust knew the site, since your recent email they have driven past the application site again. Whilst normally we would be concerned about the loss of an established orchard, in this instance there are only three trees which would need to be felled for the building of another house, so we do not object on those grounds. Currently, the orchard is a green gap between two houses opposite the Grade II registered parkland (RPG) of Marston Hall. Further building on this site, if permitted, would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the registered park and garden as defined by the NPPF but would subtly alter the rural setting of the RPG to something more built up. If your officers approve this application we would suggest that local varieties of orchard trees be planted along the boundary hedge to at least give a nod to the land's historic purpose. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Horton Hall	Northamptonshire	E21/1298	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Ground floor Garage extension to existing Annexe Building. Annexe Horton Lakes 37 The Drive Horton NN7 2AY. BUILDING ALTERATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Historic Parks and Gardens as per the above application. Please forgive the slightly late response. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Members of NGT's Council of Management have carried out a rapid desk-

					<p>based study based on information relating to this planning proposal and made available via the West Northamptonshire/South Northamptonshire Council website along with other relevant digital material in the public domain.</p> <p>Planning documents submitted to West Northamptonshire Council by the applicant do not appear to include a heritage statement. Planning application WNS/2021/1740/FUL lies within the area of a Registered historic parkland and c.50m from Scheduled medieval village remains at their nearest point.</p> <p>Horton Hall Park, principally a mid-C18 landscape by Thomas Wright but with earlier origins, is designated at Grade II on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (List Entry Number 1001316) for the following principal reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic Interest: as a notable, partially relict Rococo landscape, probably the work of Thomas Wright for the 3rd Earl of Halifax, retaining serpentine lakes and some mid-C18 landscape features in addition to estate buildings Listed as nationally important. - Archaeological Interest: the designed landscape overlies, and accommodates, the earthwork remains of the medieval village of Horton and the ridge and furrow cultivation of its open field system. The park is now used principally for pasture. <p>The earthworks and buried remains of the medieval village of Horton and its adjacent field system (including possible C18th militia remains), are additionally designated as nationally significant (Scheduled Monument List Entry Number 1418388), both north and south of the registered parkland's serpentine lake.</p> <p>Horton Hall was demolished in 1936 but First Edition Ordnance Survey mapping published in 1885 (25 inches to 1 mile) shows its location to have been immediately adjacent and north of the west end of the serpentine lake, close to the Grade II Listed Lily Pond Bridge. The Hall stood in the area currently occupied by buildings at both No 37 and No 39 The Drive. It is not known to the GT/NGT whether any archaeological fieldwork was carried out during the construction of these buildings to establish the depth or quality of survival of remains of the former Hall or the courts and gardens immediately surrounding it.</p> <p>Maps and aerial photographic imagery suggest that the proposed development should have minimal impact on the surviving landscape remains of the Registered C18th parkland. Thus the GT/NGT have no</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>objection to the proposed development in principle; however it is recommended that an archaeological watching brief be carried out during groundworks to record any remains of the former Hall and its surrounding courts and gardens which might be revealed by the groundwork.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E20/1976	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Hybrid planning application for proposed employment park seeking: a) Detailed (full) planning permission for erection of two warehouse buildings for B2 (General industrial), B8 (Storage and distribution) and/or Class E (Commercial, business and service E (g) (i)(ii) (iii)) uses, with ancillary offices, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works; and b) outline planning (all matters reserved with the exception of access) for Class E (Commercial, business and service), B2 (General industrial) and B8 (Storage and distribution) uses, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works, to be implemented in phases.</p> <p>Land Comprising Field At 440633 457078 Allerton Park North Yorkshire</p> <p>MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with the amended application, with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>As we noted in our letter of 29th August 2021, the land for this employment park is within the wider setting of Allerton Park and especially the views from the two elevated buildings within the registered park and garden; Allerton Castle at grade I and the Temple of Victory at grade II*.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the massing, scale and landscape scheme that is proposed in this hybrid application will be damaging to the significance of the heritage assets in what has been until recent times a largely rural setting where the reciprocal views can be widely enjoyed. The character of this area will be fundamentally changed. And this application is for only a portion of the proposed employment park and as such gives even greater concerns for the future impact of development on the heritage assets.</p> <p>We first responded to this application on 24th April 2021 and this letter should be read in conjunction with that letter and our letter of 29th August 2021. We have looked at the additional documentation – Environmental Statement Addenda 1, 2, 3,4 - submitted since our last letter and the scheme has not been revised; there is no change to the building heights and ground floor plans – see ES Addendum Part 1 'Built Heritage'. Similarly, also in ES Addendum Part 1, 'Landscape and Visual Impact', ie The Landscape Masterplan is the one that we have already commented upon. So much for the so-called primary viewing/green corridor, not only is it diminished compared with the original discussions, but it has an access road in it – with moving vehicles and road surface, we</p>

					<p>question how that will be sympathetic to the heritage assets and the views. This current iteration of the application continues to disregard the special interest of the settings of the highly designated heritage assets and registered park and garden at Allerton Park. Our concerns have not been addressed.</p> <p>We do not consider that this application meets the requirements of NPPF (July 2021) paragraphs 199, 200, 202 and 206. We urge your authority to address the concerns of your own Principal Conservation Officer, those of Historic England and the Gardens Trust.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register their objection to this application in its present form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Newburgh Priory	North Yorkshire	E21/1165	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land to the NW of Byland Abbey. Land to the S and SE of Brink Hill. Craykeland Wood. Land near Oulston.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.11.2021</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 Newburgh Priory, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Newburgh Priory founded in 1145 by the Augustinian order was granted a licence to enclose a park in 1383. It was acquired by Anthony Bellasis after the Dissolution and the pleasure grounds and park were laid out c.1730-40 for the fourth Viscount Fauconberg. The Registered Park and Garden extends to c. 450ha. A series of estate maps survive (see Reference below) including one dated 1605 and others dated 1722 and 1744. There are also two paintings c. 1695-1700 (Reference, Harris 1979) showing the likely layout at that time. The estate is situated in the Howardian Hills AONB. This consultation is very extensive covering much of the woodland in the historic designed landscape and is in association with a Woodland Management Plan. We were pleased to receive further maps/documents today which are very helpful for our understanding of the proposals. Thank you. We have noted that there are Scheduled Ancient Monuments in compartments 13f (Roman Plantation) and 9a, 9c, 9e (Tumuli in Four Acre Wood) and the many compartments within the Registered Park and</p>

					<p>Garden are now clear to see. The Operations Map makes it clear that many of the compartments are due for thinning work as part of the on-going Woodland Management Plan.</p> <p>In terms of the thinning, we would like to comment on The Stripe (compartments 31a-j) along the Coxwold to Oulston road which we understand were replanted quite a few years ago. Then, we understand, concerns were raised about using the usual planting density of 2250 saplings/ha along it. The Stripe is shown on the 1722 map as an avenue and also on the 1744 map with a sinuous path or ride leading through it to a clearing with a temple. Circular Wood (compartment 16) lies on the east edge of The Stripe and is shown on the 1744 map. Because The Stripe had been a drive or avenue and there is still an earthwork visible it was advised that the planting density should be low, off the earthwork, and more in keeping with an avenue. We note that it is proposed now to thin out to the best at 1600/ha. We are pleased that this is to take place and would like to underline the fact that The Stripe is an old avenue or drive mentioned in the Register description and aim for an avenue effect. Uprooting is not suggested here and we would prefer thinning to be cutting down to stump and if possible, to prevent damage to the earthwork, treating the stump to prevent regrowth if this still an approved method. In terms of thinning in the various compartments, the woodland edge is important in views. Of the compartments due for felling, we would like to mention: Compartment 17b which is part of Crow Wood pleasure grounds to the east of the Hall, with the two historic vistas cut through. Compartment 17b is located in the angle between the two vistas.</p> <p>The Mount is the site of an early 18C hunting lodge (listed grade II) shown in 1744 with woodland and an irregular enclosure with the building within it. Mount House is within Mount Plantation but should be unaffected by the felling in compartments 13e, and 13i. However, we trust that care will be taken with compartment 13f Roman Plantation not to damage the Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p>We understand the threat of ash dieback and that the replanting will be a mix of broadleaves with some pine; Scots pine and Corsican pine. We are pleased that oak does well and the estate are working for the long-term. Although understandably there will continue to be debate about species for replanting, we should be aware of the historic design intention of the Registered Park and Garden and take into account views and vistas and the species mix and planting design to achieve the aesthetic quality that marks</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>out this heritage asset. Setting is also important so the compartments just outside the registered boundary eg 46b, may be important but without a site visit it is difficult to know. Native Scots pine and Corsican pine (introduced 1759) are typically picturesque planting and as you will know other species such as beech have been widely planted in historic designed landscapes. The woodland edge is particularly important where it faces onto the park and will be important in views so we recommend particular care there. The woodland edge should reflect all the varieties planted in the compartments.</p> <p>We have no objection to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Sutton Park	North Yorkshire	E21/1207	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for change of use of land to create a glamping site and the siting of a tree house Sutton Park Main Street Sutton On The Forest York CAMPING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2021</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. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The historic park and garden at Sutton Park are not currently included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens however they are of some significance. Sutton Park is the setting for the Hall (Grade I listed) and its associated stables. The house sits prominently in the landscape and is surrounded by walled gardens, rolling parkland and a shelter belt in the heart of the village.</p> <p>There is a statement of significance for Sutton Park, created by the Yorkshire Gardens Trust, derived from research carried out as part of Hambleton District Historic Designed Landscapes project see reference below. The following is an extract:</p> <p>The designed landscape of Sutton Park was developed by its owners, the Harland family and their successors for over 300 years, with major developments in the early 19th century and the 1960s. Philip Harland is thought to have rebuilt the house, enclosed part of the former village green with the village pond to form a walled garden and probably started to develop the pleasure grounds and parkland between 1750 and 1766. An undated plan by Adam Mickle II for proposed alterations to the grounds</p>

					<p>commissioned by Philip Harland's son-in-law the Reverend Henry Goodricke survives. Whilst the proposals do not appear to have been fully carried out, they give an indication of the owners' interest in contemporary landscape design. The historic landscape including formal and productive walled gardens, an icehouse, pleasure grounds, parkland, woodland copses and woodland shelter belts largely remains. The estate therefore provides an important aesthetic and community asset for the village of Sutton on the Forest and its visitors. The house, Sutton Park (formerly Sutton Hall) is grade I listed, the icehouse, former stables and wall to kitchen garden are listed grade II. The house and gardens lie within the Sutton in the Forest Conservation Area. There are possible connections with the Goodricke family of Ribston Hall. Ribston Hall's 18th century gardens, developed by Henry Goodricke's father, were noted for their collection of rare and unusual trees and as the birthplace of the Ribston Pippin apple. At Sutton Park, the extent of the involvement of the landscape architects Percy Cane and Peter Coates in the 1960s is not clear.</p> <p>The parkland and woodland are an important part of the designed landscape with reciprocal designed views linking the house to its setting. As such the designed landscape contributes to the setting of the Grade I listed building.</p> <p>The proposal is for the introduction of a treehouse and three timber pods or bell tents within the parkland at Sutton Park. The treehouse constructed of timber is proposed to be integrated into the mature trees on the south eastern side of the copse that flanks the apron of parkland in front of the house on the eastern side. Located below the tree canopy, it should be hidden from views from the house and gardens. The three timber camping pods / bell tents are proposed to be sited in the mature woodland along the western margin of the eastern boundary woodland. This will need to be done carefully so as not to impose on the views and on each other. We understand that the camping pods/bell tents will be bespoke and of high quality. The existing caravan site will be removed.</p> <p>We have noted that the applicant has had extensive pre-application advice from Historic England and we support their comments and advice.</p> <p>As the planning proposal is in such a historical area, we recommend that any new planting should enhance the historical planting at Sutton Park and follow historical precedents but also bearing in mind the possible effects that our changing climate may have on the robustness of the planting. New hand-forged estate railing replacing the post and rail timber fence on the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>eastern flank of the house would enhance the landscape and the setting of the house. On the wildflower meadow: the seed should have local provenance. A flowering meadow 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.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no overall objection to this application which has been well-prepared but we would like to mention some concerns:</p> <p>Will there be any provision for preventing the accumulation of infrastructure eg barbeques, fire pits etc which would harm the site?</p> <p>How will artificial lighting be prevented from intruding into this dark historic area? We presume that the car park and paths will need to be lit.</p> <p>How will the construction work be managed? Will a temporary protective surface be laid for vehicles and the construction of the tree house and pods?</p> <p>How will the access be arranged for servicing between lets ie transportation of cleaning materials, bedding, kitchen equipment/food etc.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
Well Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1271	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alterations to existing residential outbuilding to form a residential annex and storage area to be used in connection with Well Hall Well Hall Church Street Well Bedale</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2021</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. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We do not have any comments to make about this application. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E21/1344	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed Agricultural Building Allerton Grange Farm Allerton Park Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0SE</p> <p>AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is</p>

					<p>authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Registered Park, includes a number of designated heritage assets including Allerton Castle (grade I), Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). Both Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are sufficiently elevated to be further harmed by massing of yet more agricultural buildings.</p> <p>As you will know Allerton Park remains on the Historic England (HE) 'Heritage at Risk' register: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/list-entry/26153 and will be further negatively affected by yet more development in its setting.</p> <p>To date this year the following applications for proposed agricultural buildings on the piece of land between the A1M and A168 (Grid Ref: E 441015 N 457492) have been submitted and approved: 20/04649/FUL; 20/04650/FUL; 20/04651/FUL; 20/04652/FUL (granted permission in April 2021). In addition, approval had previously been granted for a further double block of agricultural buildings; making a total of six.</p> <p>In July 21/02572/FUL; 21/02574/FUL; 21/02576/FUL; 21/02575/FUL were submitted and approved for the same area, making a total of 10 agricultural buildings.</p> <p>This planning application with its accompanying application, 21/04639/FUL, (which we will be responding to separately), makes 12 so-called agricultural buildings in total on this piece of land between the A1M and A168.</p> <p>In addition, currently there is an application 21/04832/FUL for Change of use of agricultural building to B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or distribution) use. This is for the most southerly of the line of agricultural buildings approved this year. We have raised this matter with your colleague Christopher Keddle, Enforcement Officer, and we will be following this up with him as we have very major concerns.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have very strong objections to the applications: 21/04639/FUL, 21/04640/FUL and 21/04832/FUL; the continuing development by the applicant on land within the setting of Allerton's highly designated heritage assets and Registered Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>We have the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We understand that when the land was approved for temporary use as a site compound for the road intersection works that the land would be re-
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>instated. Instead, it appears to be being developed, not for agricultural use, but rather a warehousing/distribution depot. We have been told that hardcore/road works waste is being dumped on the area north of the 'Change of Use' building.</p> <p>2. We have already expressed doubt about the applicant needing so many agricultural buildings; we have not seen any justification.</p> <p>3. The buildings could not be more unattractive in appearance.</p> <p>4. Access and parking. We note at Section 8 of the Application Form for 21/04639/FUL (we cannot see an Application Form for 21/04640/FUL) 'Pedestrian and Vehicle Access etc' 'No' to all questions. At Section 9 of the Application Form, the answer 'No' to vehicle parking both existing and adding or removing parking spaces. How will access and egress of the site work for all the buildings approved and the current proposals?</p> <p>5. Hedges. We note Section 10 of the Application Form 'Trees and Hedges' 'No' to all the questions, but we note that there is a hedge bounding the A168 where there has been recent cutting back. We advise that the hedge should be retained and strengthened by further planting and that there should be planting on the boundary with the A1M.</p> <p>6. The application 21/04832/FUL for Change of use of agricultural building to B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or distribution) use gives credence to the continuing concern that this area is to become a warehousing and distribution site. The building in question has not had any agricultural use as far as we are aware.</p> <p>We would like to underline NPPF (July 2021) Paragraph 189. We consider that the proposals will further harm the significance of the designated heritage assets and we are not aware of clear and convincing justification and firmly recommend a refusal.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly object to this application, 21/04640/FUL</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p>
Constable Burton Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1387	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Planning Permission for Extension of Existing Touring Caravan Site and Siting of 45 no. Holiday Lodges, of Which 8 no have Annex Bedrooms, Welcome Building and Pavilion, with</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2021</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 Burton Constable Hall, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites,</p>

				<p>Associated Landscaping, Drainage and Wildlife Pond, and Parking at Constable Burton Hall Caravan Park, Constable Burton, Leyburn, North Yorkshire, DL8 5LJ HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Knyff and Kip engraving of c.1700 shows the earlier 17th Century house with its gardens and designed landscape and it is likely that the current house designed by John Carr of York 1762-8 is on the same site. There was a deer park in the medieval period mentioned by Leland in the early 16th Century and shown on Speed's map of 1610. The parkland in the natural style of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown may have been laid out by a local landscape gardener, perhaps 'Jones' who at that time was working with John Carr at Swinton near Masham, or perhaps by Adam Mickel I from Bedale. (Mickel I, was employed as a foreman or clerk of works, by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown, between April 1757 and August 1779 and also did work on his own account.) To the west of the Hall the park gently rises to the north west with Burton Park nearest the Hall; pasture with mature trees and clumps, and Middle Park beyond now in arable, towards Hardcastle Wood. The land that is the subject of this planning application is to the south of Burton Park immediately outside the Registered boundary and in the wider setting of the fine grade I listed Hall. The northern boundary of the proposal site may reflect an old vista. The parcel of land is currently in arable and is west of the existing caravan park for which permission was granted in the late 1990's. Both are immediately north of the A684; the main road through Wensleydale.</p> <p>The proposed development would provide 48 no. holiday lodges for short term holiday lets. It is also proposed to improve ancillary facilities by replacing the existing reception for the caravan park with a welcome hub building, and provide a pavilion for events and use by visitors. A wildlife lake is proposed which will also provide water storage in connection with a sustainable drainage strategy for the site. Car parking for the extended site is to be provided in the location of the existing hardstanding at the site entrance. Access to the proposed lodges would be via the existing entrance to the caravan site.</p> <p>This is a considered and well documented application with a landscape scheme that strengthens the planted boundaries whilst developing a sympathetic landscaping scheme that should deliver environmental and aesthetic benefits for all who visit the site. Importantly the scheme should limit the impact on views from the Registered park, and the setting of the other designated heritage assets.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that the car parking and road surfaces are to be of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>compacted gravel with low level path downlighters and timers. We query the proposal to use Northumberland Meadow Seed Mix for the Meadow Areas. Would not Pennine Dales MG3 Anthoxanthemum odoratum – Geranium sylvaticum (Sweet Vernal Grass – Wood Cranesbill) be more appropriate? (Rodwell, J S National Vegetation Classification, 1992). See NOTE below. If the planning application is agreed then we advise that the planting round the boundaries is done at a very early stage; before next spring would be ideal. There could also be more planting around the entrance. We trust that there will not be solar panels introduced for this development.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposals will impact on the significance of Constable Burton Hall and Park and we do not have any objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E21/1437	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of agricultural building to B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or distribution) use. Allerton Grange Farm Allerton Park Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 OSE CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>On 6th January 2021 we responded to previous planning applications for four agricultural buildings on land between A1M and A168 immediately north of Junction 47 of the A1M which although they are beyond the Registered boundary, they are within the wider setting of Allerton Park: 20/04649/FUL; 20/04650/FUL; 20/04651/FUL; 20/04652/FUL Proposed Agricultural Building. Allerton Grange Farm, Braimber Lane To Allerton Park Interchange, Allerton Park HG5 OSE.</p> <p>These were granted permission in April 2021. In addition, approval had previously been granted for a further double block of agricultural buildings; making a total of six.</p> <p>The current applications: 6.95. 21/02572/FUL; 6.95. 21/02574/FUL; 6.95. 21/02576/FUL; 6.95. 21/02575/FUL are for a further four agricultural buildings in the same area.</p>

					<p>As you will know Allerton Park remains on the Historic England (HE) 'Heritage at Risk' register: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/list-entry/26153 and it is likely to be negatively affected by further development in its setting.</p> <p>The Registered Park includes a number of designated heritage assets including Allerton Castle (grade I), Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). Both Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are sufficiently elevated to be further harmed by massing of the four proposed agricultural buildings or rather 'sheds'.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust make the following observations of objection in the setting of the Registered and Listed heritage assets of Allerton Park:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is hard to believe that the farmer needs four more agricultural sheds on top of the six approvals and the Highways shed. 2. The buildings could not be more unattractive in appearance with anthracite roof and green walls. 3. There are no landscape proposals, screening etc. 4. There is no indication of access for large agricultural machinery, agricultural turning spaces for tractor & trailer etc. Could two agricultural vehicles pass on this new long access route alongside the buildings? 5. No parking. 6. It is feared that with the existing approvals and these additional four if approved, will be excessive agricultural needs and a change of use for industrial use will arise, needing advertising boards, adverts to the A1M etc. 7. There is no provision for parking / circulation that is needed for industrial / warehouse use. 8. The whole area seems destined to become the long- term mixed use setting ruining the significant heritage assets of the area. 9. The original short-term approval for temporary works should eventually be terminated with the area returned by the highways contractor to agricultural land. <p>We would like to underline NPPF (February 2019) Paragraph 194. We consider that the proposals will further harm the significance of the designated heritage assets and we are not aware of clear and convincing justification and firmly recommend a refusal.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust object to these four</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>applications. Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E20/1558	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of renewable led energy generating station comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancement. Land to South West of Cowley Substation, Nuneham Courtenay, OX44 9PA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2021 Thank you for re-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. The Gardens Trust and Oxfordshire Gardens Trust have submitted two responses regarding the above application, on 25th January 2021 and 20th August 2021. We have no further comments to add and maintain our strong objection to this application for all the reasons outlined in our previous correspondence. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E21/1127	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extensive renovation works to reinstate the derelict fire damaged cottage back into a residential dwelling Fisheries Cottage REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021 Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) on the above application. We have again liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust now that the applicant has provided a Historic Impact Assessment by Nick Cox. However, there are no changes to the proposals, so we maintain our reservations about certain aspects of the proposals for the reasons outlined in our letter of 30th September 2021, although we do not object to the principle of the project. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Friar Park	Oxfordshire	E21/1245	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed erection of a dwelling Friar Park Badgemore RG9 4NR RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2021 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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Given the location of the proposed house, we do not consider that it will</p>

					<p>impinge on the designed garden and its somewhat unusual form is in the tradition of the original concept, so the GT/OGT do not object. However, somewhat surprisingly, the Heritage Statement ignores the Grade II registered park and garden in its analysis. We would suggest that to inform and reassure your officers, a proper assessment with a plan of all the elements of the designed garden as they exist today, be carried out.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Patshull Hall	Shropshire	E21/1474	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a two storey side extension (resubmission) 2 Brewers Lodge, Stanlow, Wolverhampton, Shropshire, WV6 7HZ. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you again for consulting us on the above application, which has been resubmitted following preparation of an Ecology Report relating to the application.</p> <p>As described previously, Brewers Lodge is a modest estate building at the periphery of Patshull Hall Park, which is included at Grade II on the National Heritage List. The Lodge building itself, although not Listed, would be classed as a 'non-designated heritage asset' and any application for its alteration, particularly where this may impact upon the surrounding Registered Park and Garden, should be treated with great care. It occupies a key position at the southern approach to Patshull Hall itself and the nearby Patshull Lake. Any changes to the building will thus impact upon the approach to and hence the setting of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Patshull Hall, as well as affecting its own significance.</p> <p>In our previous submission, we expressed our concern at the impact of the proposed alteration and in particular the creation of what would be in effect a second competing 'gable', which we feel would greatly unbalance the existing main front of Brewers Lodge.</p> <p>We note that Shropshire Council's Historic Environment Officer similarly objected to the form of the previous proposed development, stating '...there is concern with the front projecting gable/gablet which draws your attention away from the existing principal (central) gable on the front elevation....</p> <p>Overall this element should be omitted in order to protect the existing modest character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset...'. The Officer noted also that the proposed development as then submitted, '...is considered to be contrary to paragraph 203 of the NPPF, policies CS6 and CS17 of the Core Strategy, policies MD2 and MD13 of SAMDev and policies SP1 and DP23 of the Submission Local Plan...'. Notwithstanding this clear advice and recommendation, the applicant</p>

					<p>appears not to have amended the details of their proposed development, retaining the proposed front gable and dormer design.</p> <p>We note a reference in the Shropshire Council Development Management Report (for the previous application) to a pre-application comment made in 2012, i.e. roughly ten years ago, that ‘...the use of a front facing gable to emulate the existing frontage is considered to be appropriate...’.</p> <p>Much has changed since that time however, including the NPPF and Shropshire Council’s own SAMDev Plan, as well as the advice of the current Historic Environment Officer regarding the existing application, which we would suggest carries more weight than an in principle pre-application response of nearly ten years previously.</p> <p>We concur with the present Historic Environment Officer’s view, that it is not the development per se that is at issue, but rather the form of the proposed extension when viewed from the main front of the building and its likely negative impact thereon.</p> <p>We repeat our view that if the proposed ‘dormer’ window is held to be absolutely necessary, we would wish this to be moved to the rear of the proposed extension (not the side, as referred to in the Development Management Report) and replaced on the main front by a pair only of Conservation Rooflights made by the Conservation Rooflight Company, i.e. not Velux or other make.</p> <p>We do not agree with the statement made in the Development Management Report that the existing proposal ‘...would respond well to the form and layout of the existing development, conserving the character and appearance of this Non Designated Heritage Asset and the surrounding historic environment’. Rather, we consider that it would be detrimental to the appearance of the building and would thereby harm its significance, as well as the Setting and hence the significance of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>We therefore continue to object to the proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Christopher Gallagher for Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust & The Gardens Trust</p>
Nynehead Court	Somerset	E21/1113	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a Class A1 foodstore with associated parking, landscaping and access works on land north west of the Nynehead</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has been contacted by Victoria George-Taylor of Lidl highlighting comments made by Kate Gapper of RPG Group, querying our suggestion that oak trees should be planted in the replacement hedge. We would like to reiterate our earlier comments that we would urge your</p>

				Road/Taunton Road/Torres Vedras Drive Roundabout, Wellington RETAIL	officers to suggest the applicant plants oak trees within the hedgerow at 10m spacings. At this stage in the scheme changing the landscaping scheme slightly should not present any problem. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Marston House	Somerset	E21/1348	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an agricultural barn and associated access/car parking. Land At 375877 143698 Cheese Hill Marston Bigot Frome MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, AGRICULTURE, PARKING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. We have looked at the sparse online documentation and were surprised that given that the proposed new barn lies adjacent to the edge of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Marston House, there was no mention whatsoever of this in the Design and Access statement. We would have expected a heritage impact statement and a statement of significance which would help us and your officers ascertain whether or not the proposed structure would impact upon the RPG and/or its setting. An alternative site was mentioned but this was not expanded upon in the documents. Without active consideration of the proposals in relation to the RPG we do not think that your officers will be able to satisfactorily make an informed decision on this application and satisfy themselves that the barn does not negatively affect the setting of the RPG either in its current position or in any alternative site that might be proposed. We would urge your officers to request a Heritage Impact Statement to assess the possible impact, and until one has been received and you can satisfy yourselves that there is no negative impact upon the RPG, we would like to submit a holding objection. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021 Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above

				<p>application. The applicant has still not submitted a Heritage Statement as suggested in our response of 10th November. We therefore continue to object to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust responded to the above application in our letter dated 28th October with the response date due on 29th October. We had not been able to visit the site for a number of years prior to our letter. I was pleased to visit Canon Hall yesterday (31st October) and noted the good work that has taken place since our last visit. My colleague Jane Furse has done much historical research on Cannon Hall with detail relevant to this application noted in our letter of 28th October. I noted that the access on the south front of the Hall that overlooks the sloping lawns and ha-ha, and to the eastern end of the terrace, is now resin bound gravel with a sloping resin bound gravel path up to the Garden House, G5, G6, and another path and steps to G7, the Garden House/Display House. The area has flower beds and a pair of large planters on either side of the steps to G7. G5, the western room, has the remains of the two oval windows; on the eastern side return it is blocked in but visible on the exterior elevation, whilst the oval window on the western side is completely blocked in but visible beneath the rendering/paint on the inside (it is now part of the wall of G4 that is shown on the 1st Edition OS map from 1850.) These oval windows are likely to be where John Spencer looked outdoors from his Garden House/summerhouse as noted in our previous letter. G7, the Display House, has a rear door which accesses the kitchen garden behind, enabling the tender plants to be brought in and displayed or for the family to have ready access to the kitchen gardens. We understand that there is no intention to change or alter the fabric of either building or the environment around them, no landscaping, or alterations to paving or entranceways are proposed, and that an archaeological survey has been carried out to record the fabric. We trust that this includes the research highlighted in our letter that underpins the significance of the Garden House and Display House as part of John Spencer's work on his pleasure grounds. Currently the buildings are unoccupied and the proposal is to rent out both</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>buildings as Class E retail and/or exhibition space to an artist or small retail outlet. The use of both buildings will be controlled by your authority's contractual agreement to ensure both buildings are used appropriately, and no alterations are made to the fabric of the buildings.</p> <p>Having now made a site visit we withdraw our objection for the change of use. We suggest that the interpretation could be modified to explain the 18th Century build and use of the Garden House buildings ie the western G5 and G6 are the Spencer summerhouse and G7 the display house. This would add to the story of the development of the Spencer family's pleasure grounds that is already in place at Cannon Hall. We suggest that maybe the buildings be used for garden-related enjoyment or retail activities/exhibitions in the future. This could provide some links with their past significance.</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 02.11.2021</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust responded to the above application in our letter dated 28th October with the response date due on 29th October. We had not been able to visit the site for a number of years prior to our letter. I was pleased to visit Canon Hall yesterday (31st October) and noted the good work that has taken place since our last visit. My colleague Jane Furse has done much historical research on Cannon Hall with detail relevant to this application noted in our letter of 28th October. I noted that the access on the south front of the Hall that overlooks the sloping lawns and ha-ha, and to the eastern end of the terrace, is now resin bound gravel with a sloping resin bound gravel path up to the Garden House, G5, G6, and another path and steps to G7, the Garden House/Display House. The area has flower beds and a pair of large planters on either side of the steps to G7. G5, the western room, has the remains of the two oval windows; on the eastern side return it is blocked in but visible on the exterior elevation, whilst the oval window on the western side is completely blocked in but visible beneath the rendering/paint on the inside (it is now part of the wall of G4 that is shown on the 1st Edition OS map from 1850.) These oval windows are likely to be where John Spencer looked outdoors from his Garden House/summerhouse as noted in our previous letter. G7, the Display House, has a rear door which accesses the kitchen garden behind, enabling the tender plants to be brought in and</p>

					<p>displayed or for the family to have ready access to the kitchen gardens. We understand that there is no intention to change or alter the fabric of either building or the environment around them, no landscaping, or alterations to paving or entranceways are proposed, and that an archaeological survey has been carried out to record the fabric. We trust that this includes the research highlighted in our letter that underpins the significance of the Garden House and Display House as part of John Spencer's work on his pleasure grounds.</p> <p>Currently the buildings are unoccupied and the proposal is to rent out both buildings as Class E retail and/or exhibition space to an artist or small retail outlet. The use of both buildings will be controlled by your authority's contractual agreement to ensure both buildings are used appropriately, and no alterations are made to the fabric of the buildings.</p> <p>Having now made a site visit we withdraw our objection for the change of use. We suggest that the interpretation could be modified to explain the 18th Century build and use of the Garden House buildings ie the western G5 and G6 are the Spencer summerhouse and G7 the display house. This would add to the story of the development of the Spencer family's pleasure grounds that is already in place at Cannon Hall. We suggest that maybe the buildings be used for garden-related enjoyment or retail activities/exhibitions in the future. This could provide some links with their past significance.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Old and New Cemetery, Ipswich	Suffolk	E21/1206	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single-storey side extension 24 Carlton Way Ipswich Suffolk IP4 2TR BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The application site lies immediately adjacent to the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Old and New Cemetery, Ipswich. We have looked at the online documentation accompanying this application and were surprised that there was neither a Design and Access statement, Statement of Significance, Heritage Statement or indeed, most importantly, any historic impact assessment to quantify the physical, visual or aesthetic impact of the proposed development on the historic designed landscape. The NPPF Para 194 requires 'an applicant to describe the significance of</p>

					<p>any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.' There was no mention whatsoever that the application site is situated adjacent to an RPG, especially concerning as it is a site of more than usual importance, being listed at Grade II*.</p> <p>Whilst the extension seems relatively modest, we would suggest that before your officers decide this application, you request that the applicant provides the above information. We feel unable to comment authoritatively unless we have some understanding of visibility, sightlines and what sort of light emittance the new extension will throw onto the RPG. Until then we would like to submit a holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Claremont	Surrey	E21/1432	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Artificial sports pitch with connecting footpath and associated perimeter fence following removal of existing playing field. Claremont Fan Court School Claremont Drive Esher Surrey KT10 9LY SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2021 The Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member of the Gardens Trust, a statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, and works with them to respond to planning consultations. The possibility of an artificial sports pitch in South Field has long formed part of proposals for the School campus which sits within the wider Claremont Registered Park. In principle this has seemed acceptable from the historic parks and gardens point of view due to the "corner" location in South Field which is itself an area of lesser significance within the Register site. The current proposal is a detailed project for consideration. The ground level changes are modest in scale and the surface treatments seem acceptable. The need for fencing is understood and its height, colour and materials will not be unduly obtrusive in long views up and across South Field. In terms of NPPF paragraph 202 this would seem to be less than substantial harm whilst adding to the School's facilities and thus assisting its continued viability as the owner of a major part of the Registered Park. Don Josey On behalf of Surrey Gardens Trust</p>
Wynyard Park	Tees Valley	E21/0524	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for change of use from agricultural land to an equestrian menage. Garden House, The Avenue, Wynyard</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2021 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</p>

				EQUESTRIAN	<p>Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We welcome the submission of the detailed Heritage Statement but would disagree with the conclusion that this proposal would have a 'neutral' impact on the Registered Park and Garden (RPG). In the Wynyard Hall & Estate Conservation Plan - Simpson and Brown with Fiona Green October 2012, this area, identified as Conservation Area 5, was identified as having 'considerable significance'. The introduction of a menage with the associated built elements of fencing, timber retaining wall, surfacing etc. in an otherwise open area of former parkland will inevitably have some detrimental impact. Given the recent arable use of the area, we would advise that such impact will be at least 'minimal'.</p> <p>As we stated in our letter of 13 July 2021 the construction of a menage might appear to be a relatively minor change within the RPG but should be considered in the context of the accumulative impact of the many small changes and developments which have taken place in this area of Wynyard Park. Should Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council see fit to grant this application for planning permission we would advise that conditions should be set to restrict any further expansion of development in this area to prevent further erosion of the 'considerable significance' of this area of the RPG. We would also advise that screen planting, comprising a tree and shrub mix of native species, should be a further condition to help mitigate the visual impact of the menage in the landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager cc Northumbria Gardens Trust</p>
Charlecote Park	Warwicks hire	E21/1408	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of 119,682sqm of horticultural polytunnels for protected cropping of salad and Chinese vegetables; installation of an attenuation basin for the collection of surface water run-off and associated irrigation purposes; and all associated landscaping works</p> <p>Old Pastures Farm , Stratford</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have studied the application documents and entirely concur with the detailed response by Erika Diaz-Peterson of Historic England. Even though the area of polytunnels proposed is smaller than the 243,181 sq metres (application 20/01007/FUL) which we objected to on 11th August 2020, the current proposals of 12 hectares of polytunnels remain in the area closest to the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Charlecote, and as</p>

				Road, Hampton Lucy, CV35 8BQ AGRICULTURE	<p>such still compromise a key part of the views which contribute to the setting and significance of this important heritage asset. We have set out our objections to the polytunnels in great detail in previous correspondence and those comments are still applicable for the current application.</p> <p>We will not repeat all the comments made by HE for brevity's sake. The proposed mitigation screening will take many years to mature and will never completely hide the sea of prominent polytunnels, as well as altering the long-distance views enjoyed from within the RPG and Charlecote itself. We strongly object to the new proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Thornes Park	West Yorkshire	E21/1211	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning permission for change of use from a F1 (Non-residential institution) to a flexible Class E (offices/ caf��), F2 (local community use) and Sui Generis Use (Theatre) Wakefield College Thornes Park Centre , Horbury Road, Wakefield CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2021</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 Thornes Park, a public park which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>As you will know Thornes Park consists of three historically distinct areas of landscaping, the earliest dating from the later 18th century. With Clarence Park and Holmfield Park, it forms a large parkland to the south west of the centre of Wakefield, and the features include the earthwork remains of a former motte and bailey castle, a rose garden within the old kitchen garden of Thornes House (house now lost), gate lodges and two drinking fountains. It is a good example of an urban municipal park of the late 19th and early 20th centuries where the layout survives almost intact. It has added interest in a late 18th century landscape possibly designed by John Carr of York.</p> <p>This planning application is for the former Wakefield College Campus in the centre of Thornes Park now known as the Penny Appeal Campus. This application seeks full planning permission for change of use from a F1 (Non-residential institution) to a flexible Class E (offices/ cafe), F2 (local community use) and Sui Generis Use (Theatre). Some work is retrospective. We understand from the Planning Statement that Penny Appeal requests</p>

					<p>full planning permission for the reuse of a small number of the many buildings it now owns on the site for offices, both for its own call centre and for other tenants and café/restaurants. We note from the Planning Statement at 4.6 that the existing refectory is intended to be brought back into use and the existing Theatre is also opened for community events/productions. It appears that there is no request for any new buildings, any external changes, any additional car parking or any substantive changes to the park in which the college sits prominently in raised ground towards the centre.</p> <p>In principle the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust supports the re-use of the unoccupied college buildings and their infrastructure, which lie at the heart of this significant historic park for Wakefield.</p> <p>However, we do have concerns that this 'change of use' full planning application for the whole campus area could potentially lead to further more radical changes to the core of the heritage asset that could cause harm. The current documentation does not include a Heritage Statement, Arboricultural or Biodiversity Reports as we would expect for a Full Planning Permission for development within a registered park. We therefore strongly suggest that this application should be considered for change of use with conditions in place to ensure that any future development is subject to planning scrutiny.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
Utley Cemetery	West Yorkshire	E21/1345	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of six dwellings Former Mortuary Skipton Road Keighley West Yorkshire RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Historic England Register – Utley Cemetery, HE ref 1404586, registered Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Utley Cemetery was opened in 1857, having been constructed under the aegis of the Burial Board. The designer of the cemetery is unknown. Its listing notes its enjoyment of the landscape setting of the site on its north facing slope over-looking the Aire valley. The cemetery has been provided with a substantial number of specimen trees through which meandering walks (now largely car drives) wend their circuitous loops. A substantial proportion of the original trees survive providing impressive settings for</p>

					<p>many of the elaborate memorials.</p> <p>We comment as follows:</p> <p>We note that the applicant has not submitted a Heritage Statement, without which the application appears to not comply with NPPF para 194 (July 2021). Nevertheless, we note that the locations of the proposed dwellings within their site have been revised since the Outline Approval such that the dwellings are now proposed to be located some 6m or 7m further away from the Cemetery wall – to the benefit of the registered site. The application notes that the western boundary wall of the Cemetery is to “remain as exists”. However, we note that the swept curve of the new site access would appear to require local reconstruction of the junction of the western wall with the Skipton Road wall. Any such reconstruction should be carried out in matching materials and to a matching walling style/technique as existing.</p> <p>We note that the applicant proposes to retain and refurbish the existing pedestrian route from Skipton Road into the south west corner of the Cemetery. It is important that this access route is left with a workable interface with the new site considering such issues as levels and gradients. In our opinion, the adjacency of mature trees in the Cemetery calls for some carefully considered planting to respond within the development – and we would ask that some “public” planting of trees within the site (as opposed to private gardens) to an approved planting scheme should be a condition of any approval.</p> <p>We note that this application shows six dwellings, whilst the previous outline approval was for five. Therefore, we would expect that the access road will need to be “adopted” and publicly accessible. We make this comment as the detailed landscape design of the external spaces may need to accommodate such standards.</p> <p>This cemetery provides last resting places for many of Keighley’s great and good including the Butterfields of Cliffe Castle. As a gesture of respect to this important site, its neighbouring Low Utley Conservation Area and to Keighley’s illustrious history we request that the proposed new dwellings might be provided with a little more architectural embellishment – beyond the minimal functionality shown on the current submission. Could the window and door openings be given ashlar surrounds, and perhaps ashlar string coursing might divide the floors?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E21/1346	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of two dwellings and associated outbuildings; construction of residential care home for the elderly and associated external works 6 And 6A Park Avenue Roundhay Leeds DEMOLITION, MEDICAL/HOSPITAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Roundhay Park, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Park Avenue forms a major length of the southern boundary of Roundhay Park with No 6 and 6A facing north west across Park Avenue to the southerly boundary of Roundhay Park which is known as Military Field. The Park was purchased by Leeds City Council c.1871. Tree lined Princes Avenue stretches north from the southern corner of Roundhay Park. This part of north east Leeds forms the Roundhay Conservation Area and in addition to the c. 200 ha Registered Park, it is known for tree-lined roads with remaining villas constructed in the 19th Century and early 20th Century set in mature landscaped gardens.</p> <p>This proposal is for two adjacent plots, Nos 6 and 6A also adjacent to No 8, another care home and the subject of a planning application for its substantial extension, 20/07175/FU.</p> <p>On the 8th January 2021 we responded to the previous application for this site 20/08208/FU, which was refused and where we gave our concerns regarding the development. These were centred on the car parking, trees and boundaries.</p> <p>We fully support the Landscape Team Consultation's detailed comments for this application in order to preserve as far as possible the particular characteristics of the area.</p> <p>The trees along the northern boundary of the site alongside Park Avenue are important both for reducing the impact on Roundhay Park and for their positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. These need to be cared for as part of the grounds maintenance plan, with any replanting as specimens fail, to ensure that the tree canopy is maintained.</p> <p>Due to these trees along the northern boundary the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposals would impact on the significance of Roundhay Park.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E21/1421	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Application for west garden works and revised bin store design Ledston Hall Hall Lane Ledston LANDSCAPE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Ledston Hall is registered grade II* with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The Park has 17C origins and the walled gardens and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with later additions/changes. The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are pleased to support the proposed mending of the western wall of the west garden in two places. The decision to replace the C19th pond with a stone circle is a pity but we hope it is to the outer diameter as shown on the C20th photo p.12 of the Design, Access and Heritage Statement, and not only the inner ring which survives to this day. This would fit better with the scale of this grand garden. Our main concern is the proposal to break through the northern wall of the western garden where a very old glasshouse stood until the 1950s (* see note below). There are likely to be voids here both on the north and south sides of this double skinned wall due to the provision of underfloor heating by hot air ducts and possible early fireplaces set below ground level on the northern side. Hot air ducts were used for greenhouse heating throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries before hot water heating became practicable. This area is a very important part of the garden, not only the sunniest part, but directly in view when residents and visitors enter from its south east corner, the only access point from the house. Vehicle access is needed whatever the weather and is therefore likely to require hard surfacing for regular use and yet such a track and double gates would detract considerably from this sheltered and sunny part of the garden.

					<p>Whilst we understand the ease for future garden maintenance of breaking through into the west garden, creating it over the early greenhouse remains, severely compromises the most significant part of Ledston's kitchen garden history. This could be avoided if the low wall in the south western corner of the bothy garden (see Heritage and Access Statement photo on p.15), was replaced with a vehicle gate which then led into the main western garden further west, ideally beyond the old back shed's position.</p> <p>Whether Leeds City Council planners recommend going ahead as planned or not, we would strongly urge a preliminary archaeological investigation and recording of the old glasshouse area, including any surviving footings/hot air ducts/fireplaces and the addition of any such findings to the Wheeler Trust's archaeological report.</p> <p>With regard to the bin stores, we are pleased to note that the building will be separate to the historic wall. The new roof rises to c.3.75m. yet the beech hedge screen is shown at approximately 2m. leaving the entire new roof in view from the entrance drive. We note that there are no other new buildings proposed within the setting of the Grade I listed house and its approach and we'd be happy to support a hedged enclosure which would pre-empt the need for such an intrusive structure.</p> <p>Due to the absence of contours, we assume disabled access to the bin area is not a problem but the master plan shows a long set of steps down to the resident's stores tucked carefully into the west side of the bothy garden wall. Is disabled access not required here as well?</p> <p>NOTE * In our considered opinion the old glasshouse is most likely to have been constructed during the eighteenth century due to its form and unusual staggered floor plan. The "back shed" is slightly to the west of the glasshouse structure which suggests it was added to old outdoor fireplaces for the structure rather than being built at the same time. By 1845 - see the first edition 6" per mile map in the Design, Access and Heritage Statement p. 11 - the glass tax was only just or about to come off that year, while the brick tax lasted until 1850. These taxes had strangled glasshouse building for decades. Only the very rich eg. Duke of Shrewsbury at Alton Towers continued to build glasshouses into the early C19th and thereby demonstrate their wealth. Many others referenced in county archives or on the ground were not only much grander in plan than Ledston's, but built of stone and glass instead of brick as a result.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
--	--	--	--	--	--