



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES DECEMBER 2021

The GT conservation team received 205 new cases and re-consultations for in December. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 69 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Hamstead Marshall Park	Berkshire	E21/1468	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a three-quarter span greenhouse Craven House, Hamstead Marshall, Newbury, RG20 OJG GARDEN BUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.12.2021 Thank you for consulting Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT). The Berkshire Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. One of the key activities of the BGT is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on this planning application. The site lies within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Hampstead Marshall and within the setting of the Grade I listed walls around Craven House, the 5no. Grade I listed gateposts in the land to the east and Grade II* listed Church of St Mary to the north-east. The Park, the wall, the gateposts and the church also all form an important historic group to which the walls, which separate Craven House from the main surviving park, make a significant contribution. The first picture below shows this relationship quite clearly. The second shows in more detail the prominence of the walls at the end of the grounds to Craven House. The citations from Historic England clearly describes the significance of this part of the Park

					<p>and the listed buildings.</p> <p>We note that the proposed greenhouse would be roughly 400mm higher than the top of the walls, close to the eastern end of the grounds of Craven House. We also note that the Heritage Assessment is wholly inadequate with no reference to the range of historic assets, other than the walls, and no attempt to assess the impact of the development on these assets. Although there are modern buildings north of the site, the view of the greenhouse above the wall would detract from the views of the listed walls, piers, church and park grounds in this location. This part of the park is one of the most significant and interesting and great care needs to be taken to avoid further damage to the setting of these extant historic assets and the relationship between them.</p> <p>We therefore object to the current proposals on the grounds that the development would be contrary to NPPF 2021, Local Plan policy CS19 and the Heritage and the Historic Environment Objectives and Aims in the West Berkshire Cultural Heritage Strategy 2020-2030. The proposal would harm the Grade I, Grade II* and Grade II heritage assets. While it may not give rise to 'substantial harm', we believe it should be refused as it would lead to 'less than substantial harm' given the proximity of the greenhouse to these assets and the importance of the inter-relationship between the individual elements of this important historic group and the views between them. Nor does the proposal provide any public benefit as required by NPPF para 202.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion. Berkshire Gardens Trust wish to strongly object to the current proposals as contrary to national and local policy.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham BGT Chair On behalf of the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Ascot Park	Berkshire	E21/1534	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Re-use of the mobile home to be used as a rural worker's dwelling for a temporary period of 3 years The Spinney Forest Road Ascot Berkshire SL5 8QU</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021</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. Ascot Place is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden containing a number of listed buildings and structures. The Registered Park therefore forms the setting to these heritage assets as well as being of historic importance in its own right. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the</p>

					<p>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]</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. As Ascot Place is on Historic England's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, it is an important part of the history of West Berkshire's parks and the richness of its history.</p> <p>The Spinney falls within the Green Belt and is an area in equestrian use with its eastern boundary edge just within the southern tip of Grade II* listed, Ascot Place. This southern tip of the Park consists of the truncated avenue, former carriage drive to Ascot Place house, surviving as a gated, grassed track named Coach Road.</p> <p>We have no objections to the application as the proposed siting of the mobile home does not have a detrimental impact on the significance of the Park as a whole or the adjacent former carriage drive. As this application is for a temporary arrangement for 3 years any future applications should seek to enhance the Green Belt setting of this avenue of trees.</p> <p>Comments from Helen Parvin, Planning Advisor 10 December 2021 Kind regards Bettina Kirkham Chair, Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Grendon Hall	Buckinghamshire	E21/0903	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for access and scale for the construction of a new Category C prison (up to 67,000 sqm GEA) within a secure perimeter fence together with access, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works on land adjacent to HMP Grendon and HMP Springhill, Grendon Underwood, Edgcott, Aylesbury HP18 OTL MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021</p> <p>Further to our letter of 10th September, Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and the Gardens Trust (GT) in the light of a recent site visit, wish to amplify our comments and confirm our objection.</p> <p>The GT is the statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting all grades of historic landscapes listed by Historic England (HE) on the Register of Parks and Gardens. Although the grounds at Grendon Hall are not yet a Registered Park and Garden (RPG) it is, nonetheless, a locally (and possibly regionally) significant designed landscape and a strong candidate for the current Local Listing upgrade by Buckinghamshire Council. We urge you to consider the application in the light of this significance.</p> <p>This application damages the setting of the garden, and the fabric and character of the parkland, of Grendon Hall which is Listed Grade II. Recent research by BGT has identified the key elements of that designed landscape and that they survive largely intact despite mid-late C20</p>

					<p>localised developments related to the prison and staff accommodation. A recent site visit to the gardens made by a member of the Bucks Gardens Trust has confirmed the high level of survival of the Hall, and the gardens and park layout together with views over the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The North Park</p> <p>The North Park lies west of the Hall and gardens, and north of the main historic drive from the lodge to the Hall. It is of high significance to the ornamental designed landscape for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) As parkland within the 1880s ensemble when both Hall and grounds were created. It formed part of a sweeping whole, along with the South Park south of the main drive. b) As the immediate setting for the most important element of the designed landscape: the garden to the west and south of the Hall. c) As the setting for key extensive views from the Hall west and south-west to distant Otmoor and Graven Hill near Bicester. d) As the setting for key views from the circuit path around the garden perimeter, particularly from the west end of the main garden terrace, a viewpoint which was formerly marked by a feature which probably included a seat to enjoy these views (OS, 1900). e) As the immediate northern setting for the Listed Grade II gateway and main drive, facilitating bucolic views of the Hall in the main approach. f) As the frame for distant views of the elevated Hall and gardens from the public road, particularly north of the Lodge leading into Edgcott. <p>Key views are mapped below on the 6" OS 1900 below, and the site of the viewpoint at the west end of the terrace is ringed on the 25" OS 1900 below. This area survives intact except for the loss of trees, which could easily be replanted in the historic pattern, and the obscuring of some views by outgrown or introduced hedgerows.</p> <p>As a result of the recent site visit it is clear that the proposals for the North Park are highly damaging to key elements of the design. These proposals will destroy the late C19 historic fabric and character of the North Park by the introduction of alien features, particularly the new gateway, extensive road and sports pitches, and re-landscaping of the areas between, including a new pond. It will greatly damage the immediate setting of and views from the core of the site (the Hall and gardens) which is of the highest significance to the design, and from the main drive and Listed gateway, which together form a feature which is also highly significant to the design. It will also damage designed views of the Hall and its gardens</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>from the public road.</p> <p>South Park The South Park is not so immediately visually connected with the Hall and gardens. It is the park destination for walks from the Hall, particularly the spectacular elevated views from the high point on Spring Hill (and possibly also from Mill Hill to the south) over the Vale of Aylesbury, including Waddesdon Hill, Brill Hill and the Chilterns beyond. These contrast with the views of Otmoor from the North Park.</p> <p>It is also the southern setting for the main drive and Listed Grade II gateway. The south park was not physically divided from the north by a fence line, and the drive deliberately was not fenced in order to promote the parkland character for visitors as a seamless whole. It is the frame for glimpsed views of the Hall from the public road between Grendon and Edgcott villages south of the Listed gateway. Today this is obscured by the park development of houses and later vegetation.</p> <p>The South Park will not be physically affected. It will, however, sustain damage in its setting to the north from the major new development, which will be highly intrusive in the panoramic views particularly from an ornamental park gateway, and the important panoramic park viewpoint on the high point of Spring Hill.</p> <p>The North Setting The setting to the north and north-east, to the rear of the Hall and its service structures, and adjacent to the north side of the walled garden which was formerly part of the east pleasure grounds, will be damaged. While the setting and views from these features are of lesser significance than those relating to the North Park and environs of the Hall and adjacent gardens, and the South Park viewpoints, they will be damaged to a greater degree by the dense modern development in the adjacent setting which has to some degree been compromised already.</p> <p>In conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gardens Trust reiterates that these proposals will cause significant, irreversible and highly harmful damage to the fabric and character of Grendon Hall designed landscape and to the northerly setting. The setting of the Grade II listed Hall and gate piers and metal fencing at the entrance to the prison site will also be damaged. • The site of the new site entrance and road, football pitch and associated modern landscaping is in a key part of the historic park which comprises the immediate setting for Grendon Hall and would result in irreversible and
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>highly damaging harm to the historic fabric and character. The Gardens Trust therefore strongly objects to this application and urges the Planning Authority to reject this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Harleyford Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/1424	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Householder application for construction of outdoor swimming pool and pergola covered kitchen area Home Farm House Harleyford Marlow Buckinghamshire SL7 2DX MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have not been able to make a site visit, so our response is based on the documentation available online, plus Google Maps. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>Harleyford (Grade I) was designed as a villa set in naturalistic grounds unencumbered by other structures or formal landscaping. The striking villa, of exceptional architectural quality, innovation and subsequent influence, was offset in its isolated position by a complex naturalistic setting of informal lawns and scattered trees in the style of Lancelot Brown, if not actually by him. This is the basis of the national significance of the designed landscape (registered park and garden (RPG) at Grade II). The main feature was the meandering Thames, forming an Arcadian riverine setting echoing the Italian rivers such as the Arno and Tiber and emulating the watery settings so admired in the C17 works of Claude and Poussin. This is the most significant landscape phase and until recently it survived largely unaltered as a set piece within the wider English landscape park (see HE register description). The building was the focus of the landscape and was not designed to be seen in a formal setting or with formal relationships to other features. It prefigured and perhaps influenced the setting of other similarly fine mansions which were set in picturesque informal lawns with scattered trees, such as Claremont in Surrey and Bletchinglydon in Oxfordshire, where service and garden buildings were placed at a distance and screened. As far as is known, there were no axial buildings relating to the house at Harleyford in the immediate environs, and the views from the villa were of designed Arcadian landscaping not buildings.</p> <p>The application site, Harleyford Home Farm, sits northwest of the main villa and the golf club and is surrounded to the north by the golf course.</p>

					<p>We understand the buildings on site are replacements for the Victorian farm buildings that were demolished with planning consent in 2002. We note that the site is surrounded by a high hedge. The proposed creation of an outdoor swimming pool and pergola covered outdoor kitchen area sit on the western side of the site.</p> <p>The Planning Statement states that it incorporates a Heritage Appraisal and Impact Statement. In both of these categories the information and analysis is poor, particularly as the Planning Statement makes no mention of the Registered Park and Garden. Neither the heritage, nor the effect of the proposals on it, are adequately appraised. For this reason we cannot assess whether the proposed works will be visible beyond the site boundaries within the wider RPG. The considerable extent of alteration and new building on the application site may mean that the RPG's historic character within the application site is much eroded.</p> <p>We therefore object until it is adequately demonstrated via rigorous analysis that there is no damage to the views or character of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1465	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to existing milking parlour and addition of solar panels on cattle shed Little Yeat Farm Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire HP18 0QH AGRICULTURE, SOLAR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2021</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 please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT/BGT note that the proposal is for alterations to the Milking Parlour and the addition of solar panels on the cattle shed at Little Yeat Farm in Woodham. Consent was granted for conversion of the cattle shed into 3 residential properties in 2019 although the Gardens Trust was not consulted about that particular application.</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 Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) at Wotton Underwood, and that the drive and a little land either side therefore falls within the Grade I RPG. It is also factually incorrect in the section 'Application Site and Surrounds' where it states (2.3) that 'Due to the intervening distance and topography, no setting of</p>

					<p>any historic asset is affected by the proposal.' The alteration to 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 landscaped covered by the Grade I status.</p> <p>Whilst we encourage the introduction of sustainable technologies as part of any application, in this instance, we consider that the introduction of solar panels across the entirety of the two south facing roof pitches will result in excessive reflection which will be visible from the RPG. We acknowledge that planning permission has already been granted for the introduction of numerous rooflights across the same roof pitches but consider that the array of both will be damaging to the RPG.</p> <p>We also note that there is no Landscape Character Assessment or Masterplan. Given that the application site is adjacent to an RPG of the highest rating and is currently subject to a number of applications, we urge the planning authority to require these assessments to be provided to inform decision making.</p> <p>In conclusion, we object strongly to the proposal to introduce a large array of solar panels across the two roofs and recommend that if solar panels are required, that they might be positioned on the ground to the north-east of the buildings and that the planning authority ensure that they are not visible from the RPB. We would like to reiterate that 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>
Huntercombe Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/1466	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 3 hoarding advertisements and 18 flat panel signs - all non illuminated Land at Huntercombe Park, Huntercombe Lane South, Burnham, Buckinghamshire ADVERTISING/SIGNAGE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2021 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 already responded to development proposals at Huntercombe three times : 20th May 2015, July 29th 2020 and 22nd September 2021, and again liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust before replying a fourth time today. The hoardings are adjacent to the main entrance to the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Huntercombe which is therefore an especially</p>

					<p>visually sensitive area, a focal point affecting the setting of the RPG. The dark colour of the proposed hoardings and the graphics are an improvement on the previous scheme, but the flags are in our opinion unacceptable.</p> <p>The GT/BGT would urge your officers to impose a deadline for the removal of all sales-related structures (hoardings, flags, sales buildings etc), perhaps when the sales cabin is removed.</p> <p>In conclusion, as long as there are no flags and a deadline for the removal of the sales material is imposed, the GT/BGT consider the proposals acceptable.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Chenies Place (Woodside)	Buckinghamshire	E21/1518	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Decking with timber privacy screen, black metal staircase leading to raised walkway including satellite deck, leading to a discrete dining platform supported by timber/steel posts, approx height is 8 metres from the ground level at the highest point Woodside House, Village Road, Chenies, Buckinghamshire, WD3 6EU BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021</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 who are familiar with the site and whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The 4 ha, Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Chenies Place (Woodside) is in the top 40% of the 1699 sites on the national register and therefore one of our most significant designed landscapes. Its importance arises from being the first in the internationally significant design partnership between architect Sir Edwin Lutyens and garden designer Gertrude Jekyll in 1896. The garden is relatively small, fragile and very easily damaged by insensitive management or change.</p> <p>For a garden of this importance, it is surprising that the supporting documents for the proposal are so inadequate and provide no adequate Historic Impact Assessment or demonstration of how the proposal will affect the fabric, character and key views. From a prior knowledge of the site and scrutiny of the available documentation, it is clear that the proposal is entirely out of character with the Lutyens/Jekyll garden and will damage the historic character and potentially the fabric. The key garden feature is the set piece axial route through the garden alongside the west side of the house, including three listed structures (sundial, pergola and bridge) which are crucial elements of the ensemble. This is identified in the Register description as, 'The principal formal feature of the garden,</p>

					<p>Lutyens' axial path from the house north down to and across the Chess mill race, unites house, garden, mill race and the strip of land on the north bank.' The proposed structure is close by this feature and lies within the setting of the listed garden structures/house as well as being within the RPG. It introduces a structure competing in scale with, and at 8m tall, considerably higher than, the garden features to which we object on principle. This is compounded by the modern design materials and superstructure. The materials used by Lutyens are incompatible with those proposed.</p> <p>Lawrence Weaver likened the design at Chenies Place to the subsequent great work by the pair at Hestercombe, Somerset, especially the pergola, noting about Lutyens' design the 'large grasp of the essential qualities of the formal garden at an early period of Mr Lutyens' career' which was expressed at Woodside House. Of Miss Jekyll's influence on Lutyens, Weaver noted that 'Her great gift for gardening served as a stimulus to his appreciation, and led him to give the large attention to garden design which has developed so notably, from Woodside, Chenies to Hestercombe.'</p> <p>The proposed structure is unacceptably damaging to the ensemble at Chenies (Woodside) which we believe survives intact, if in divided ownership. Whilst in theory relatively ephemeral, such a structure is a major intervention which, if permitted, would set a precedent and could become the first step towards more permanent change, which such a fragile and important garden cannot sustain. We therefore object and urge the council to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Halton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1565	-	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolish existing remains of industrial building. Erection of replacement industrial building and associated car parking. Unit 5 Harebridge Industrial Estate Harebridge Lane Aston Clinton Buckinghamshire HP22 5PF DEMOLITION, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2021</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 who are familiar with the site and whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>This application site sits within the Grade II Halton House Registered Park and Garden (RPG). It lies adjacent to the south of the locally significant Green Park, formerly Aston Clinton Park, another Rothschild estate, which</p>

					<p>is contiguous with Halton. The report on Green Park by the Bucks Gardens Trust (attached) shows that the Green Park historic boundary was only separated from Halton at this point by the canal, and that the ornamental drive of considerable quality connected the two mansions.</p> <p>The site is light industrial in use and character but was intended to be part of ornamental woodland framing a pleasure ground drive between the two estates, part of which now forms a section of Harebridge Lane, which itself originated as part of an ornamental drive within the Halton RPG. This section of the ornamental drive forms the north section of the present lane running south-east from Harelane canal bridge to just beyond the north development site before branching south to Halton mansion alongside the present south development site. The additional section of the present lane linking the north development site to the Upper Icknield Way is a later addition to provide access to the industrial area at present on the site. This drive originated to the north in Green Park running parallel to and overlooking the north side of the canal, which still exists, crossing the canal over Harelane Bridge adjacent to the north development site. By the late C19 the drive in Green Park was ornamented with statues, now gone. From here the drive ran south into the Halton RPG along a section of what is now Harebridge Lane (also within the RPG) to just south of the north development site. Here it branched south towards the new Halton mansion along the boundary with the southern half of the proposed development site (also RPG). This route predates the present Halton mansion built in the 1880s, before which it linked to the former Halton House near the church to the south-west which was demolished with the construction of the current mansion.</p> <p>This strong ornamental link between the two houses and their extensive parks was devoid of intrusion from other buildings. It constituted an Arcadian route between the two mansions for family and visitors on which the wider world did not intrude. The surviving designed landscape of Green Park, including this drive, was of similarly high quality to Halton, and, as much survives, it remains of great local significance. The reason that Green Park is not on the Register is that the mansion has gone and parts of the perimeter of the north park have been lost to development. Much of the C19 landscape layout and structures otherwise survive, particularly in this south half of the park and pleasure ground which though degraded contained many important landscape features, is complete and capable of restoration. The surviving elements are recognizably part of a fine country</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>house estate as described in the BGT report.</p> <p>Ideally, we would prefer the return of the ornamental woodland character of this site, but realise that this is unrealistic. The elevated site is the backdrop for key views beyond the canal from the Green Park drive below to the north as it approaches the canal bridge, and from the canal bridge (also in the RPG). The site is very important in views as the linking drive continues through the RPG running south from the bridge, as it lies adjacent to the drive, before it forks into the present woodland in a yew-lined section.</p> <p>We do not object in principle as the proposed new structure sits within this complex of similar structures, and whilst it might project further into views from the Grade II RPG, it will be seen as part of the group of industrial buildings. However this is dependent on the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To minimise the visual impact on the RPG the windows on the east and south elevations (facing the woodland) should be confined to the ground floor and if possible reduced in number. 2. We object to any rooflights. 3. Ensure that the structure is no higher than existing buildings, and preferably lower. An alternative roof design might allow for the same footprint whilst reducing the height. <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cliveden	Buckinghamshire	E21/1601	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building consent for new glazed roof structure over conservatory, comprising use of timber and aluminium framed glazing, hip and ridge bars</p> <p>Cliveden Estate Conservatory, Cliveden Road, Taplow, Buckinghamshire, SL6 0JF, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have received justification for this application for the conservatory roof replacement at Cliveden from Ruth Mitchell, NT Senior Building Surveyor, which can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>The application for listed building consent develops the 2020 proposals for which consent has been obtained, and represents minor changes to materiality and design development, but the principles of the original scheme remain unchanged. There is no document within the current application which justifies the principles involved as this was dealt with in</p>

					<p>the original application. The current glazed roof, which is a 1980s replacement of the original roof, has reached the end of its life and is structurally unsafe, and has an adverse effect on the significance of the listed building itself and setting. This is seen as an opportunity to replace the existing roof and enhance the architectural/artistic significance of the building.</p> <p>The proposals which gained approval in 2020 were to replace the existing roof with a new timber framed, clear glazed ridge and furrow roof. The new proposals show a new timber/aluminium framed, clear glazed ridge and furrow roof, with glazing bars of identical sizes. The outward appearance of the roof, and height of the ridge remains unchanged. As the listed building process does not allow for a non-material amendment to be lodged there was a requirement for a full application.</p> <p>The amendments in the current application were developed in consultation with Paul Rhymes of Bucks Council, and reflected his comments.</p> <p>On this basis TGT offers no objection to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Missenden Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E21/1660	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of condition 2 (limiting marquee to March/September inclusive) of application PL/19/3764/FA (Continued seasonal erection of marquee for five years.) Missenden Abbey, High Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0BD. MARQUEE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2021</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>Missenden Abbey is a Grade II listed late C18/early C19 park, woodland, lake and pleasure grounds, laid out around a country house on the site of a medieval Augustinian Abbey founded in 1133. The principal building on the site is Missenden Abbey (Grade I), which sits in the north-west corner of the site and incorporated parts of the medieval abbey buildings which were subsequently altered until the interior was destroyed by fire in 1985, and only the external walls were saved. It was rebuilt 1985-88 so that externally it appears little altered. The gardens lie close the house, to the west, south and east and the house is set on level lawn.</p> <p>This application relates to an existing planning permission PL/19/3764/FA which itself sought to extend a previous planning permission for a</p>

					<p>temporary marquee to the side of Missenden Abbey for use as part of the weddings business at the site. The condition only permits the use of the marquee during the period from March to September and the permission was for five years only. This application seeks to remove the condition to allow for year-round use of the marquee but retains the existing 5 year period.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust does not appear to have been consulted on any of the previous applications for temporary consent for this marquee. However, we recognise that the weddings business provides an important income to the Abbey which has been all the more important during the recent pandemic. We acknowledge that the marquee is fundamentally a temporary structure, but in removing the conditions on the current planning permission, will contribute to making the marquee a permanent feature in the RPG even if it is not a permanent structure.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust would support the planning authority in removing the condition for the remainder of the existing planning consent but, at the end of that period, any future consents should revert to be conditioned so that the marquee does not continue as a permanent feature. The Planning Authority should assure itself that this is the best approach to supporting the business at the Abbey and the use of the marquee should be restricted to weddings and specific events only.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1663	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Display of V-totem sign at site entrance. Lodge Yard Business Centre Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2021</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>This most recent of the various planning applications relating to Little Yeat/Wotton Underwood, is for a totem sign at the entrance to Lodge Yard Business Centre adjacent to Little Yeat Farm in Woodham. The application site sits at the top of 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). Therefore the proposed totem sign will be within the RPG.</p>

					<p>As with all of the other recent planning applications relating to this site, we note that there is no reference to the heritage status of the site and, in this particular case, there is no Design and Access Statement. The erection of any new signs or 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 undoubtedly within the significant designed landscape covered by the Grade I status. Nonetheless, we recognise that the land to the north is part of the Business Centre which will therefore require signage. With this in mind, we would consider that the sign should only be permitted if it is positioned facing north and set against the existing tree line so that it is definitely not visible from the stretch of the North Drive to the south of the proposed position. The accompanying lighting should be no more than the absolute minimum required to illuminate this sign for the benefit of visitors. This should be the limit of signage permitted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Amber Valley Borough Local Plan	Derbyshire	E21/0623	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to alternative spatial strategy options for the scale and distribution of housing and economic growth, as part of the preparation of the new Amber Valley Borough Local Plan. Looking through the documentation we accessed from your link we were unable to see anything which mentions Kedleston or other heritage sites other than the Derwent Valley WHS and the 'heritage' of the various villages and smaller settlements throughout the Borough. If we have inadvertently missed something, perhaps you could point us to the appropriate paragraph(s)? Given Amber Valley's responsibility for safeguarding the exceptional significance of the Grade I listed registered park and garden at Kedleston, we would like to see something in the local plan which reassures us that its setting and significance will be protected. The GT looks forward to hearing how you will incorporate this into the Local Plan.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Thornbridge Hall	Derbyshire	E21/1567	II	PLANNING APPLICATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.12.2021

	e			<p>Erection of building, construction of driveway and car park. ENFORCEMENT NOTICE SERVED Thornbridge Hall, Baslow Road, Ashford In The Water, DE45 1NZ RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>The Gardens Trust (GT), a statutory consultee with regard to development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens, have been notified by the Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) about the unauthorised developments which have taken place at Thornbridge Hall within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) and the Thornbridge Conservation Area. We appreciate being given a little more time to respond to the appeal as we were not notified about this until December 1st 2021.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and a colleague from the Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust has twice visited the site and taken photographs which we have been able to use when responding to this breach of the planning regulations. We have also watched a video made by the Derby Telegraph which has been helpful in getting a feel for the site. https://www.derbytelegraph.co.uk/news/local-news/gallery/caf-owners-thornbridge-hall-been-5647358.</p> <p>The PDNPA have issued an enforcement notice which lists the various alleged breaches of planning control. These are considered below.</p> <p>Thornbridge Hall is a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG), one of only four within the PDNPA, and it also lies within the Thornbridge Conservation Area. The western part of the gardens (within the parish of Ashford in the Water) were previously listed at Grade II, as were numerous garden features that lie within Great Longstone parish. Historic England's register entry for Thornbridge RPG states that 'The Hall stands on a high plateau in the north-west corner of the park, looking over its grounds which fall away to the south and east.' It continues : 'the main area of gardens ... lie on the south and east fronts. The main terrace runs along the foot of the east front and from it are far-reaching views to the south and east out over the countryside' and 'More steps link the southern end of the top terrace with the level lawn which lies below the south front of the Hall, while a further flight leads off the centre of this lawn, down to the croquet lawn. The terrace wall which separates garden from park offers a firm baseline for extensive views south over the park to the farmland.' This is confirmed by the useful map which accompanies the Adopted Appraisal for the Thornbridge Conservation area (TCA map), which marks important views. Comparison of this map with the enforcement notice (EN) plans make it clear that the substantial new roadway (Driveway A on EN plans), constructed without consent, runs for its entirety through land marked on the TCA map as 'Important Open Space'. This new</p>
--	---	--	--	---	---

					<p>two-lane road, complete with central white line and flanked by a bund of excavated soil, is considerably longer than the main drive. It cuts directly across several important designed views shown on the TCA map and crosses a public right of way. These views are SE and E from the main gardens around the Hall, N, S and E from the public right of way, and across the RPG from NW-SE almost the whole way along its route. The new approach road is extremely visible within the RPG and in our opinion, it is an alien intrusion within the landscape, and fundamentally detracts from the significance and experience of the designed landscape.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the proximity of both the new approach road and the new access road (Driveway B on EN plans) to various mature parkland trees. The tarmac surface on parts of the access road comes within a few cm of the base of several tree trunks, almost inevitably causing root damage through soil compaction. The owners state that an arboricultural statement will be provided to demonstrate that the 'development is acceptable in terms of its relationship to trees', but we have not seen this document and would recommend that an independent assessment is undertaken to ensure that their root zones have not been harmed by excavation for the roadway/bunds.</p> <p>A further breach involves the construction without consent of a sizeable car park with hard surfacing, surrounded by massive bunds on two sides. These bunds, and those that flank the approach road, reach a height of about 3m at the SE corner of the car park.</p> <p>Finally, the new café building with its extensive outdoor seating area, has been built without consent in what was formerly part of the working garden/orchard. It lies in close proximity to what the Register entry describes as a fountain bowl and four urns linked by a stone quatrefoil (listed grade II) set within mature fruit trees and form the foreground for a classical temple (listed grade II), brought here from Clumber. Four C19 Herms (also listed grade II) representing the Four Seasons are sited nearby. The mature fruit trees described in the register entry, though visible in recent aerial/satellite images, have now disappeared. It is unclear whether consent was granted for their removal. The settings of these listed structures have suffered substantial harm through the unauthorised development and have been further diminished by the presence of a quantity of jarring paraphernalia, some colourful, associated with the café: chairs, tables, barrels, decking etc, all within not more than 50m from the temple/fountain/urns, which substantially detract from their settings and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the previously pristine landscape.</p> <p>We consider these breaches to come in at the very highest end of Less Than Substantial Harm, consistent with s66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990). There is no Heritage Statement (HS) or Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), both of which are crucial to assessing the degree of harm which the unauthorised development has had upon the RPG and heritage assets. We would have expected key views (as per the TCA map) to be shown and photographed. The work undertaken has in our opinion, led to a notable level of harm to the significance and setting of the numerous heritage assets, in particular the setting of the RPG. This work is in direct contravention to NPPF para 189, having harmed the setting of numerous heritage assets for future generations. The work does not comply with Para 194 (the applicant has totally failed to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting). This, combined with the lack of a HS & VIA means that the PDNPA cannot adequately assess the significance of the development upon the setting (Para 195) and the unauthorised alterations do not make a positive contribution to the landscape (Para 197c). The justification provided by the applicant for the unauthorised works is insufficient in our opinion to comply with Para 200a, and as these works verge on substantial harm, we consider that Para 201d in particular, applies. The works are also in contravention of Para 176 as they neither conserve or enhance the landscape or cultural heritage of the Peak District National Park, and their scale and extent is neither limited or sensitively located or designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. They do not comply with Para 177 as the cumulative effect of the work undertaken is extensive and major. The PDNPA also mention breaches of Core and Development Management Strategy policies which we will not repeat for brevity. The owners of Thornbridge Hall previously applied for and were granted permission to build two tennis courts and a pavilion in 2005, on the site of the café; the current use of the site then was listed as 'garden'. The permission was renewed in 2010 and we assume never implemented. In the 2005 documentation there is a note from the landscape officer at the PDNPA suggesting that the applicant had agreed to produce a comprehensive plan for management and conservation of the site especially the gardens and wider parkland. Checking with the PDNPA the Cultural Heritage Team Manager, Anna Badcock, has confirmed that the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>PDNPA does not have a Conservation Management Plan or a Parkland Plan on their records, so it would seem these vital documents were never commissioned or implemented.</p> <p>The excavations would appear to have been undertaken without an archaeological watching brief. Should the Inspector feel that the bunds/roadway/car park etc are inappropriate, we would suggest that all materials are carefully sifted when they are removed to ensure that if there is any surviving evidence it is preserved as far as is possible under the circumstances.</p> <p>We appreciate that the owners need to find ways of making Thornbridge Hall pay for its upkeep, but the construction of a road and car park (both with bunds) plus a café with hardstanding etc, without permission, is not the way forward. The Derby Telegraph video states that the owners said that they were unable to apply for planning consent during the lockdowns as PDNPA officers were unavailable. In our experience, during the previous two years, all local authorities very quickly organised new working arrangements, and during lockdowns and subsequently we have been busier than ever, with planning officers mostly working from home extremely efficiently.</p> <p>Thornbridge Hall is an RHS partner garden. We would therefore have expected any changes to have been made entirely 'by the book' in order to uphold the expected high standards that such an association implies.</p> <p>The unauthorised work undertaken by the owners constitutes probably the most egregious breach of planning that the Gardens Trust has been made aware of in the last 8 years. Had these works been the subject of a planning application we would have robustly argued against their implementation.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust object in the strongest possible terms to these significant, detrimental interventions.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Boveridge House School	Dorset	E21/1506	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erect 3 separate buildings for educational and administration use</p> <p>Aurora Boveridge College Church Avenue Cranborne Wimborne</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021</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, so our comments are based on a desk based survey.</p>

				BH21 5RT EDUCATION	<p>We have looked at the sparse online documentation and are surprised that given that the application site lies in within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Boveridge House School, there is no Heritage Impact Assessment or even a mention of the RPG. At the very least the NPPF requires a statement of significance so your officers can understand whether the application is likely to affect the setting of the heritage assets. Boveridge House School's landscape is an unusual combination of Gertrude Jekyll planting within a Thomas Mawson design, set within C19 pleasure grounds and parkland.</p> <p>The proposed buildings are utilitarian in nature and apart from the Administration building, appear to be mostly screened from the mansion house by trees. The staffroom lies to the south of what we assume (from the HE register description) to be the early C19 stable block. Further clarification would have been helpful. The Administration building lies immediately to the north of the main house, and again we would have liked to have seen how this looks against the listed main building. Finally, the classroom appears to be out on its own near to what Google Earth shows to be a parking area. This area looks heavily treed and your officers will have to satisfy themselves that the applicant's assertion that no trees or their root zones will be compromised is correct. We would be concerned should this application be the first of others increasing ad hoc building around the school campus. We would suggest that the school consider producing a masterplan so that if additional accommodation becomes necessary in the future, this is done in a planned manner, in areas of the least heritage sensitivity.</p> <p>Whilst we do not in this instance offer more than the comments above, we would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Parnham House	Dorset	E21/1597	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erect 4.No. River Lodges and realignment of the existing access track. Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster DT8 3LZ GARDEN BUILDING	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.12.2021</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 Dorset Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our joint comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p>

					<p>There is a very clear and thorough Heritage Statement and landscape assessment, which makes a convincing case for the siting of the proposed new river lodges. We are glad to note that the proposed structures are lower than the wall behind. What we would have liked to have seen is an overall management plan for the registered park and garden (RPG) which is Grade II*. Whilst the lodges are somewhat detached from the main house, we would have found it helpful to understand how the rest of the RPG is to be managed. We would not necessarily expect any approval to be tied to a management plan but we would be reassured if the applicant either has such a document or that there was an intent to create one.</p> <p>We are also somewhat concerned about the design of the structures. Their arrangement has more of the look of an urban mews development than lodges in a Grade II* registered parkland. We are not against contemporary designs, but do feel that any such structures need to fit within the context of their surroundings and be complimentary to the house and its immediate surrounds. We ask that the planning authority carefully considers this aspect of the submission.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Buxted Park	East Sussex	E21/1607	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION C2 RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME. LAND EAST OF COOPERS GREEN ROAD, RINGLES CROSS, UCKFIELD MEDICAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.12.2021</p> <p>On 8th October 2020 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) commented on an earlier application (WD/2019/2466/MAJ). While the Planning Officer referred to these comments in his report, the letter has not been retained on the website and other interested parties will not be able to see it, so the earlier letter is shown below.</p> <p>The present application entails a lower structure with a smaller footprint located a little further back from Views Wood. These changes are welcome. SGT does not object to the present planning application, but neither does it welcome the loss of this block of pasture land so close to the Registered area.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.</p>
St Mary's, Painswick	Gloucestershire	E21/1498	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two single storey extensions Stocks Cottage, St Marys Street,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.12.2021</p> <p>Dear Ms. Brown, The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has referred</p>

				Painswick, Stroud. BUILDING ALTERATION	this proposal to the Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) for comment. Having seen and commented on the earlier scheme, GGLT considers that this final submission would not have any adverse impact on the adjacent churchyard and conservation area. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Snowhill Manor	Gloucestershire	E21/1515	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Upgrade existing path surface within Inner Court Garden from loose gravel to york stone flag surface. Snowhill Manor, Snowhill, Snowhill FOOTPATH	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.12.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered gardens, parks and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. This proposal to surface this heavily used path in York stone is logical, and does not create any aesthetic problem in this setting. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Miserden Park	Gloucestershire	E21/1522	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of gas tank Miserden Park, Miserden, Stroud, Gloucestershire ENERGY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.12.2021 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes has notified The Gloucestershire Landscape and Gardens Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. The response from the Parish Council is noted; as is the fact that in this seemingly minor proposal, the object of the application- namely a gas tank, is not illustrated. Its colour could be anything you like, there is no screen planting etc ,etc. It would be churlish to object (seeing that it may already be there), but I would suggest that SDC have a careful look to see if conditions might be added if its visual impact could or needs to be minimised. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Terrace and Buccleuch Gardens Richmond Terrace Walk	Greater London	E21/1532	II II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 1 no. building comprising 28 one and two bedroom affordable retirement apartments and communal facilities. Associated	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2021 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 London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.

				<p>external works and landscaping. Howson Terrace Richmond Hill Richmond DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>The application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Terrace Gardens & Buccleuch Gardens and immediately north of the Grade II* registered Richmond Terrace Walk RPG. The gardens register entry states that the ‘gardens frame the important historic view from Richmond Hill (Richmond Terrace Walk II*) which was protected by Act of Parliament (1902). Views within the gardens and across the grounds with outward views to the River Thames and Surrey from the top of the gardens; group value as one of the interlocking landscapes along the River Thames between Kew and Hampton Court.’ It is clear therefore, that any development on such a sensitive site must be extremely carefully thought out. Pegasus’s documentation of both the Heritage statements and the 7x Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment documents sets out the process clearly.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT appreciate the care that the applicant has taken listening to feedback from the 3 pre-app meetings, reducing the quantity of units from an original 41 units to the current 30, as well as reducing the height and massing, and integrating the new proposed buildings more with the landscape by including green roofs and vertical gardens. Whilst the new building does lie within the Grade II RPG of Terrace Gardens & Buccleuch Garden, the replacement building is an improvement on the largely empty existing buildings they seek to replace.</p> <p>Its impact upon the Grade II* Richmond Terrace Walk is certainly less than substantial harm but we still have some concerns regarding the imposition of the new building as viewed from Petersham Road. The applicant’s own heritage statement acknowledges the negative impact on the protected views of the sweep of the Thames from Terrace Gardens and Richmond Hill. This impact would be even more noticeable in Winter when surrounding trees are bare. The trees offering some protection to the views from the river and elevated viewpoints are not within the site and as such are vulnerable to future redevelopment or even disease. For this reason we feel their offsetting of detrimental impact is limited.</p> <p>Since pre-application discussions, green roofs and vertical walls have been added. And again, their ability to ameliorate against intrusion on important views is limited. We were unable to find the detailed plans for these elements which will need to be conditioned. Vertical walls still have a high incidence of failure and green roofs are not always attractive – the most ecologically useful often being those left to be colonised by weeds. It is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>unlikely such a roof would have the desired effect of softening views of the building from important viewpoints.</p> <p>The choice of brick and colours could also do more to fit with the surrounding vernacular – even if the architecture is incongruous.</p> <p>We feel that although the application will cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the various heritage assets, on balance, we consider there is still more which could be done to minimise the detrimental impact on the protected views from the Terrace and Petersham Road toward the river Thames.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Panshanger	Hertfords hire	E21/1530	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline permission for the erection of 215 x dwellings (Class C3), associated infrastructure, landscaping, provision of allotments and 12 x Gypsy & Traveller Pitches with all matters reserved except access</p> <p>Land North East of Welwyn Garden City Panshanger Welwyn Garden City AL7 2QJ</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments on the Hens Lane access to the site nor to the Hens Lane/ B1000 junction.</p> <p>We do have concerns about the junctions on Panshanger Lane; with the B1000 at Poplars Green where visibility is restricted, at the A414 which is already a dangerous junction, and along Panshanger Lane itself. The access for the proposed large car park (173 spaces) and visitor facilities for Panshanger Park , along the former haul road off Panshanger Lane, is currently closed. When this is opened, possibly in 2022, there will be considerably more traffic along Panshanger Lane than was noted by the Road Safety Audit. Given the proximity of the exit from the former aerodrome to the Park entrance, combined with crossing points for pedestrian and bridle paths, more thought needs to be given to safety issues.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E21/1536	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Insertion of dormer and glass balcony to the rear. Replacing first floor window on side elevation with Juliette balcony.</p> <p>AT: 46 Newton Drive Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 9HE</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that the proposed first floor window in the rear elevation contains considerably more glass than the smaller windows it replaces. However, the tree cover inside the Registered park of Pishiobury should prevent any glare from this window having an adverse impact on the park itself.</p> <p>We therefore have no objections.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

Moor Park	Hertfords hire	E21/1559	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Part-retrospective: Single storey rear infill extension and two storey rear extension; creation of basement level; alterations to roof including increase in eaves height and insertion of rooflights; internal alterations and alterations to fenestration; and repositioning of garden room</p> <p>Redwood House 12 Temple Gardens Moor Park</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comment to make on the proposed changes to the plans approved under 17/2403/FUL.</p> <p>We are, however, dismayed that the purported Heritage Statement does not mention that the property lies with the Grade II*Registered Park & Garden of Moor Park not that it is part of the setting of the Grade I Listed mansion and therefore contributes towards the significance of both. Consequently it does not address the impact of these proposals on the significance of these heritage assets.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Putteridge Bury	Hertfords hire	E21/1573	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front entrance porch and rear dormer window including Juliet balcony to facilitate loft conversation. Erection of detached garage/garden room/office outbuilding.</p> <p>103 Mangrove Lodge Putteridge Park Luton Hertfordshire LU2 8LB</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION, GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2021</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, and authorised by them to comment on their behalf.</p> <p>Mangrove Lodge lies within the Registered Park of Putteridge Bury . Over the years it has had extensive alterations and additions which have already harmed its significance as an important entrance to the parkland. The proposed extension together with the proposed garage/garden room increases the footprint of this property disproportionately and would have an adverse effect on the historic parkland and its significance. This cumulative harm to a designated heritage asset is contrary to the NPPF Section 16 .</p> <p>Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Temple Dinsley	Hertfords hire	E21/1574	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of detached car port</p> <p>4 Dower House Hitchin Road Preston Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 7TZ</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2021</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Historic Parks and Gardens and is authorised by them to comment on their behalf. The Dower House falls with the registered landscape of Temple Dinsley and is the focus for a number of views across the parkland. This site has already been granted permission for extensive alterations and development.</p> <p>We consider that, although the design of the proposed car port is sympathetic to the nearby former barn, the siting of the car port would be an intrusion into the landscape, harming views of, and thus the setting of the Listed Dower House and reducing the significance of the Dower House</p>

					and Registered Park contrary to NPPF Section 16 where heritage should be conserved and enhanced not diminished and harmed. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Kings Langley	Hertfords hire	E21/1583	-	Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation on the Submission (Regulation 16) version of the Neighbourhood Plan	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2021 The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens and its member Hertfordshire Gardens Trust responds to planning issues on its behalf in Hertfordshire. We are very disappointed that the designed landscape heritage of Kings Langley has not be addressed at all. The designed landscapes around the Dickinson Mills; Abbots Hill, Shendish Manor and Nash Mills, all occupied by members of the family, had views between them, largely lost to later inappropriate development and were significant Victorian gardens in their own right. Shendish Manor was laid out by Edward Kemp who included it in his famous book on garden design. He worked with Joseph Paxton, notably on Birkenhead Park, and was influential in the design of Central Park New York. Much of his design can still be seen, although again inappropriate development has harmed it. Nash Mills garden has now been built over but the Memorial Garden for Dickinsons' employees killed in the world wars is significant, not just for the memorial but for its setting. These landscape were part of a deliberate early industrial landscape along the canal on par with the industrial landscape around Soho Works in Birmingham and elsewhere. We would suggest that policies for heritage be more robust and comprehensive including these two undesignated but locally very significant historic gardens, their setting and the remaining designed views, to conserve and enhance them in line with the NPPF Chapter 13. Heritage assets, especially parks and gardens, are fragile and irreplaceable and should have protection in Neighbourhood Plans. Both sites are included on the Local List of Historic Parks and Gardens, prepared by HGT under the guidance of Historic England and submitted to Dacorum BC. Heritage Policies Designated and undesignated heritage assets; buildings, parks and gardens and archaeology, form the basis of the character of Kings Langley. They should be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance, for the enjoyment and use of current and future generations. Planning proposals which harm these assets should justify the harm to be caused. Appropriate re-use of heritage assets will be encouraged.

					Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Putteridge Bury	Hertfords hire	E21/1642	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey side extension Shooter's Lodge, Putteridge Bury, Luton, LU2 8LD	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2021 The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for planning issues affecting historic parks and gardens included on the Historic England Register. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of GT and is authorised by them to respond on their behalf. Shooters Lodge is set within the RPG of Putteridge Bury and part of the original home farm complex. We are disappointed that there is no heritage impact statement as required by NPPF, on the effect this extension would have on the heritage asset of the park. The proposed east elevation does not affect views across the park but the west (front) elevation is in view of the parkland . Glare and reflections from the glass can cause harm to the significance of the parkland and also reduces the rural character of the area as it is not sympathetic to the style of Shooters Lodge and the neighbouring properties. The south front may also cause harm to the landscape for the same reasons but this would be reduced by the hedge surrounding the garden and the trees to the south. Although we have no objection to a small extension per se, we consider that the glass elevation to the west is inappropriate and will cause harm to the heritage asset. An elevation in materials more in keeping with the character of the area would remove our objection. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Markyate Cell	Hertfords hire	E21/1643	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of Use of existing grassland to provide 3 x additional hard landscaped car parking spaces for the exclusive use of future residents of The Factory. Removal of a section of existing grassland to achieve 3 x additional permeable block paving car parking spaces in front of the Church.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2121 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The proposed parking spaces on the existing grassland by the church will cause some harm to the setting of the Listed Church and the Registered landscape of Markyate Cell. However, we do not consider this would cause substantial harm and it could be mitigated by planting shrubs. We would not recommend trees be planted which could block the view of the church from the A5. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hemel Water Gardens	Hertfords hire	E21/1658	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of existing temporary base station for a further 18	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2021 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. There is no Heritage Impact Statement for these proposals nor any

				<p>months comprising a 24m high lightweight lattice mast, associated antennas, dish and equipment cabinets, within a fenced compound and ancillary works. Adj The Water Gardens Waterhouse Street Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire. COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>mention of the adjacent landscape of the Water Gardens which is Registered at Grade II and recently restored to Geoffrey Jellicoe's original design. This garden is significant in Jellicoe's oeuvre and in the New Town aesthetic developed during the 1950s. The mast is currently sited within one of Jellicoe's 3 Key Views, that from Bridge Street across the river towards Cotterells and Heath Lane. Jellicoe's intention, as noted by him, was to marry the older landscape to the west of the river with his new water landscape to provide a wider green environment. The mast is clearly visible even when trees have summer foliage (and more visible in winter), harming Jellicoe's design. The original application, as is this one was for a temporary installation. It is three years since it was installed and, given the harm it causes to the setting, and therefore significance of the Registered landscape, we would not wish to see the the permission renewed. We therefore object to the proposal. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Briggens	Hertfords hire	E21/1691	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application for development including demolition of existing structures, refurbishment and change of use of existing Grade II Listed Brickhouse Farm Barn and structures and erection of a residential led mixed use development comprising: up to 1,500 residential market and affordable homes; a mixed use local village centre; retail, business, commercial and community uses; primary school, early years and nursery facilities; leisure and sports facilities including a football hub; provision for 8 no. pitches for Gypsies & Travellers; open spaces, ecological areas, woodlands and public realm; pedestrian, cycle</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2021 The Gardens Trust and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust objected to the proposals for Gilston Village 7 on 17 February 2021. We stated the serious concerns we had over the proposal on heritage grounds, detailing the many designated and undesignated heritage assets which would be directly harmed as well as those where their setting would be harmed, and thus their significance reduced, contrary to the NPPF and EHDC Policies HA1, HA2, HA3, HA7 and HA8. These concerns have not been addressed in the amended documents and we therefore OBJECT to the proposals. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>

				and vehicular accesses and network within the site; associated drainage, utilities, energy and waste facilities and infrastructure; works to and realignment of the existing highway; other supporting works, facilities and infrastructure; together with associated temporary enabling works or structures. With all matters reserved apart from detailed works to the A414 Church Lane junction (phased development). Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Gilston Village 7 Land Off Church Lane A414 Hunsdon And Eastwick Hertfordshire MAJOR HYBRID	
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/1740	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Rear garden area A1 T1 - Lawson Cypress - Fell. Reason - infected stem on SE side with Phytophthora fungus. 54 Beningfield Drive London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1UX TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.12.2021 The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for historic Parks and Gardens on the HE Register, and HGT is authorised to comment on their behalf. Napsbury Park was laid out by William Goldring in the style of a country estate for the Middlesex County Asylum in 1905. The gardens round the wards were designed to provide a restful and attractive setting for those with mental health problems. As such this tree, part of the original layout, is of historic significance and part of a Registered heritage asset. The felling of this tree, due to a problem with one part of it, may not be necessary if pruning would resolve the issue. We would suggest that the tree is assessed by council officers before a decision is made. If the tree has to be felled then a condition of a replacement to be planted should accompany the permission. Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Swainston	Isle of Wight	E21/1668	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Agricultural prior notification for a barn. Ashengrove Farm	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2021 The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust (IWGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works to protect and conserve historic parks and

				Calbourne Road Newport Isle Of Wight AGRICULTURE	<p>gardens.</p> <p>While the application falls outside the Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Swainston, the registered area surrounds the application site on three sides and is in close proximity.</p> <p>The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust has long been concerned about the degradation of the landscape within the area defined by the red outline on the planning application which historically lay within Swainston Park but is now used for light industry/storage uses. We feel that additional unsympathetic buildings and uses would lead to further degradation of this important landscape. Whilst the proposed building is shown to be no more than 5m in height it joins existing unsightly buildings and storage areas which will collectively further detract from the value and character of the RPG. Furthermore, the application does not give any acknowledgment about the value of its RPG setting and does not include any mitigation measures as to how the setting and character of the RPG can be protected. Has the applicant considered and exhausted other options for farm storage that could perhaps be accommodated in less-sensitive locations within the main farmstead area to the south of the Calbourne-Carisbrooke Road? Should permission be granted, we respectfully request that proposals are submitted as part of a planning condition which set out measures to mitigate the impact of existing site use and the proposed new barn on the setting and character of the grade II listed RPG.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Isle of Wight Gardens Trust</p>
Goodnestone Park	Kent	E21/1548	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a orangery marquee for use as a wedding venue Goodnestone Park , The Street, Goodnestone, CT3 1PL MARQUEE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021</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>We have looked at the online documentation and the applicants clearly use this location for temporary marquees at present, erecting and dismantling as and when needed. The proposed replacement is described as 'semi-permanent' (March-October) and is somewhat more elaborate than a temporary marquee. The Heritage Statement is rather lacking in details, so whilst the proposals are probably an improvement visually, we do have some concerns that 'temporary' may eventually become 'permanent'. We would therefore request that your officers might consider a reduction in</p>

					<p>the period when the marquee can be erected and that the temporary planning consent, if granted, be for a set period of say five years?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Scarisbrick Hall	Lancashire	E21/1457	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline - Construction of a new dwelling and associated external works following demolition of existing agricultural storage building (including details of layout and access). Land To The Rear Of 3 And 7, Clyffes Farm Close, Scarisbrick RESIDENTIAL, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation letter inviting The Gardens Trust (GT) to comment on the above application. As previously notified to you, GT as the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to the County Trusts. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case.</p> <p>The LGT recognises the importance of the heritage assets notably the Grade I listed Scarisbrick Hall, and Scarisbrick Park in being a Registered Park and Garden Grade II, and numerous Grade II listed estate buildings and garden features. This application lies within the Registered Park and Garden (RPG), although the application's Heritage Impact Assessment makes no mention of Historic England's listing of the RPG. The application site red line in this HIA does not agree with that in the submitted Location Plan, which includes the access driveway between numbers 5 and 6 Clyffes Farm Close.</p> <p>Historic England identifies Scarisbrick Park Conservation Area, and Scarisbrick Park RPG in their At Risk Register, due to its subdivision into multiple ownerships, and its declining condition, drawing attention in particular to the decline of the plantations. Culshaws Plantation abuts the application site and is one which has suffered neglect in recent decades. The LGT's concerns regarding this outline application are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are no details of the dwelling actually proposed • replacing a single storey storage building with a two storey dwelling represents a significant further erosion of the RPG • No works are indicated to the access drive between 5 and 6 Clyffes Farm Close, which unavoidably may require widening or reconstruction, adversely affecting the trees within the adjacent Culshaws Plantation. The blue line on the location plan indicates that the applicant appears to own much of Culshaws Plantation (if not larger areas of this part of Scarisbrick Park), and the opportunity to secure improved management of this plantation and parkland should be pursued before any application is

					<p>decided. This application should not be approved without securing certainty that the long term health of Culshaws Plantation and the parts of Scarisbrick Park can be secured, We object to this application as currently proposed. Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Belton House	Lincolnshire	E21/0096	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Submission for approval of reserved matters (aorm) relating to landscaping only, pursuant to outline permission S15/3189 Land To The North Of Longcliff And South Belton Lane MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021 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. Whilst we did not submit any substantive comments earlier, with even more housing, the pared down landscaping becomes more of an issue. Having read the response by the National Trust with regard to landscaping, we agree with their assessment suggesting the necessity that 'robust planting along the full length of the north/northeast boundary of the site is secured in order to mitigate the impact on views from Belmont Tower and other locations within Belton Park.' Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Belton House	Lincolnshire	E21/1020	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Submission for approval of reserved matters (aorm) relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 480 residential units pursuant to outline permission S15/3189 The reserved matters submitted relate to the construction and layout of 480 homes. Subsequent reserved matters applications will be submitted for the school, local centre and external landscape areas. The original outline application was accompanied by a voluntary ES. However, it</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2021 As per E21/0096</p>

				<p>should be noted that the SoS deemed that the development of 550 units (the original scheme as submitted) would not have a significant environmental impact and screened the proposed development negatively and confirmed that no ES was required.</p> <p>Land To The North Of Longcliffe Road And South Of Belton Lane, Grantham, Lincolnshire</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	
Marston Hall	Lincolnshire	E21/1381	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion/extension of outbuilding to form dwelling (Use Class C3) and hair salon (Use Class E) and formation of new vehicular access.</p> <p>Dove House, Barkston Road, Marston, Lincolnshire, NG32 2HN</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2021</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for coming back to me for further clarification to our previous letter of 1st December.</p> <p>As you are of course aware, any park or garden which has been listed by Historic England is of national importance. The Gardens Trust's remit is to respond to planning applications in such a way that the impact of proposals</p>

					<p>preserves their historic setting and significance, as far as possible, for future generations. We do not therefore consider heritage assets in isolation, we look at them in conjunction with the surrounding landscape, the NPPF and local plans etc when we respond. We also take into consideration HE's Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. We bear in mind statements from this document like : (p.2) 'Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage'; (p.2) 'A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.' And also p2 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.'. There is also (p5) 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary. It can include: land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it'.</p> <p>In our opinion, turning the area directly adjacent to the Grade II RPG of Marston Hall (in this case only separated by a rural lane) into a more built-up area, the application alters and harms the setting of this heritage asset.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.12.2021 The Gardens Trust (GT) has been sent the attached letter by Mr Thorold of Marston Hall asking us to reconsider our objection. As a Trust we do wish to support garden owners and have no wish to make local enemies. However, all the applications we are asked to look at concern properties where gardens, parkland/property are listed, or of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>importance. This is to make sure they are not damaged by development. The lane adjacent to the property has not yet had continuous development, as is the case further away, meaning the rural aspect has been preserved. Once this property gets built, that rural aspect will be gone for ever and a bit along the line, another application will follow. We appreciate the considerable financial burden owners of registered parks and gardens have to bear, but our remit is to do what we can to enable such sites to be enjoyed by future generations and therefore re-iterate our previous comments.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Lincolnshire Gardens have merely given our opinion, and as such cannot be said to be ‘blocking’ development. Whether or not your officers decide to allow this application or not our comments are merely one of the many factors you will need to consider when coming to your decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Statement of Community Involvement	Norfolk	E21/1490	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to Breckland District Council’s Statement of Community Involvement submission consultation. We welcome the broad thrust of the statement and support the consultation process with key stakeholders and community groups. However, we note that neither The Gardens Trust nor the Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is named among the key stakeholders at Appendix 1. We appreciate that the list is not intended to be comprehensive but it does include many arguably more minor organisations. Given the role of GT as a statutory consultee, we ask that both the GT and the NGT be added to the list. NGT which works closely with the GT and takes a broader interest in parks and gardens that, while not listed by Historic England (HE) on the Register of Parks and Gardens, are important heritage assets and often recognised as such on Local Lists.</p> <p>For reference, I attach a short note setting out the basis for statutory consultation with The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>sincerely, Susan Grice Norfolk Gardens Trust Planning & Conservation team</p>
West	Northamp	E19/1653	n/a	LOCAL PLAN Strategic Land	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.12.2021

Northamptonshire Strategic Plan	Northamptonshire		Availability Assessment (SLAA) draft methodology consultation	<p>West Northamptonshire Spatial Plan: Joint Gardens Trust and Northamptonshire Gardens Trust response</p> <p>The Gardens Trust in partnership with Northamptonshire Gardens Trust welcomes the opportunity to comment on the West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan, Spatial Options Consultation 2021. We have the following observations and comments to make.</p> <p>Corporate Plan, Priority 1, Green and Clean - Environment and Well-being, Strategic Objectives</p> <p>Safeguarding the future of our historic parklands has an important role to play in the delivery of almost all of these strategic green objects, and as such their preservation, pro-active conservation and sensitive enhancement where possible should be embraced.</p> <p>Objective 1: Climate Change</p> <p>To support the transition of West Northamptonshire to a net zero carbon area, and deliver effective adaptation to and mitigation for the impacts of climate change by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing radical reductions in carbon emissions - maintaining historic parklands plays an important part in reducing our carbon footprint; well managed tree cover, shrubs and grassland effectively keeps carbon locked into the earth, as well as absorbing atmospheric pollution. • Ensuring strategic development allocations are located and designed so as to be resilient to future climate change and the risk of flooding - historic parklands assist in building resilience to climate change as they play an important part in stabilising land, preventing soil erosion and absorbing surface water. <p>Objective 2: Green Infrastructure and Natural Capital</p> <p>To conserve natural habitats and species, provide net gains in biodiversity and enhance West Northamptonshire’s network of natural capital and green infrastructure by improving existing areas and designing green and blue infrastructure into development - well managed historic parklands already provide a rich and varied environment for the natural flora and fauna which contribute to a flourishing level of biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective 3: Landscape</p> <p>To protect and enhance West Northamptonshire’s distinctive landscape character especially those valued landscapes which have been designated as special landscape areas - the county’s valuable resource of 300+ historic parklands play a significant role in it’s landscape character and should be protected and enhanced as such.</p>
---------------------------------	------------------	--	---	---

					<p>Objective 4: Heritage</p> <p>To conserve and where possible enhance West Northamptonshire’s heritage assets and their settings, recognising their contribution to local distinctiveness, a sense of place, quality of life and economic success - the conservation and enhancement of historic parklands as key heritage assets would be welcomed and should not be compromised by insensitive development.</p> <p>SPATIAL STRATEGY OPTIONS</p> <p>Spatial Option 1a - Northampton North – North of Buckton Fields - Residential (2,000 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>The proposal lies immediately west of the nationally significant Boughton Hall Park (Registered Grade II), on the other side of the A508.</p> <p>Consideration of this Option should include careful assessment of planned sight lines looking west from the parkland, in particular any intended views from the Hawking Tower at the western entrance into the park. Views out from the park should also take into consideration the role which the prehistoric round barrow (a Scheduled Monument) may have played in relation to the designed landscape and it’s remarkable collection of eye-catchers. It is notable that within the pleasure gardens to the west of the site of the earlier Hall paths and walks focus upon a semi-circular bastion-like feature or demi-lune which interrupts the otherwise straight course of the western parkland boundary. This potential viewing point out westwards from the park is situated so as to focus directly on the mound of the barrow.</p> <p>Spatial Option 1b - Northampton North – East of Boughton - Residential (1,500 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>The proposal lies south-east of the nationally significant Boughton Hall Park (Registered Grade II) and Boughton village, on both sides of the Boughton to Moulton Road. Consideration of this option would need to include careful assessment of planned sight lines looking east from Boughton Park. Boughton Hall Park is remarkable for it’s collection of gothic follies and eye-catchers; some of these were located within the park (eg. The Hawking Tower, Listed Grade II), others at the fringes of the park (eg. New Park Barn, now called Fox Covert Farm, Listed Grade II), and more were sited within fields beyond the park (eg. Bunkers Hill Farm and The Spectacle, both Listed Grade II). Such structures were probably intended to be viewed from within the parkland, providing eye-catchers to focus views outwards into the countryside, and/or sometimes used as features of interest on</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>recreational journeys beyond the park. The rural character of the land between the park and also surrounding the follies was (and is) significant to the character of the planned historic landscape. In addition it is possible that the ruins of St John’s Church (a Scheduled Monument) also provided a further gothic “folly” on the fringe of the landscaping (along with its setting by the historic landscape feature of Boughton Green and its maze, the latter surviving until the early 20th century).</p> <p>Relevant quotes from Historic England’s Register description, List Entry Number: 1001297:</p> <p>“A feature of the site is the set of gothic buildings which decorate the park and the wider landscape setting, focusing primarily on the valley to the north of the site. These formed a key part of the second Earl’s landscaping activities and, although several of them have not been included within the registered area, standing beyond the more formal park, their interconnection with the site is a highly important part of its character..... Standing on Spectacle Lane, the parish and the estate boundary, 1.7km east of the Hall, is a gothic folly known as The Spectacle (listed grade II), erected by the second Earl in 1770..... The church of St John the Baptist, first mentioned in records in 1201, stands 1.5km to the south-west of the Hall. By 1719 the church was in ruins and as such may have been appreciated by Strafford as a ‘real’ gothic ruin in his landscape.”</p> <p>Spatial Option 1c- Northampton North – West of Moulton - Residential (3,000 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>Option 1c lies somewhat to the east of Boughton Hall Park (Registered Grade II), west of Moulton village, but is of concern because potentially it has a greater impact than Options 1a and 1b on the wider designed landscape beyond but still part of Boughton Hall Park. The western sections will surround and obscure The Spectacle in particular but also the ruins of St John’s Church and Holly Lodge. Consideration of this option would need to include careful assessment of planned sight lines looking east from Boughton Park as for Option 1b. Boughton Hall Park is remarkable for its collection of gothic follies and eye-catchers; some of these were located well within the park (eg. The Hawking Tower, Listed Grade II), others at the fringes of the park (eg. New Park Barn, now called Fox Covert Farm, Listed Grade II), and more were sited within fields beyond the park (eg. Bunkers Hill Farm and The Spectacle, both Listed Grade II). Such structures were intended to be seen from within the parkland, providing eye-catchers to focus views outwards into the countryside, and/or sometimes as features</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>of interest on recreational journeys beyond the park. The rural character of the land between the park and also surrounding the follies was (and is) significant to the character of the planned historic landscape. It is possible that the ruins of St John’s Church (a Scheduled Monument) also provided a further gothic “folly” on the fringe of the landscaping (along with it’s setting by the historic Boughton Green and it’s maze, the latter surviving until the early 20th century). In addition the construction of the gothic Holly Lodge (Listed Grade II), whilst not built as part of the suite of park-related follies clearly takes it’s location and design cues from the earlier gothic structures.</p> <p>Relevant quotes from Historic England’s Register description, List Entry Number: 1001297:</p> <p>“A feature of the site is the set of gothic buildings which decorate the park and the wider landscape setting, focusing primarily on the valley to the north of the site. These formed a key part of the second Earl’s landscaping activities and, although several of them have not been included within the registered area, standing beyond the more formal park, their interconnection with the site is a highly important part of its character..... Standing on Spectacle Lane, the parish and the estate boundary, 1.7km east of the Hall, is a gothic folly known as The Spectacle (listed grade II), erected by the second Earl in 1770..... The church of St John the Baptist, first mentioned in records in 1201, stands 1.5km to the south-west of the Hall. By 1719 the church was in ruins and as such may have been appreciated by Strafford as a 'real' gothic ruin in his landscape.”</p> <p>Spatial Option 1d - Northampton North – North of Moulton - Residential (1,600 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>Area north of Moulton and east of the A43. No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 1e - Northampton South-East - Residential (3,000 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>Area south-east of Grange Park. No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 1f - South of M1 Junction 15 - Employment</p> <p>Option 1f lies north of the nationally significant Courteenhall Park (Registered Grade II) and south of the M1 motorway and is of some concern because of it’s potential impact on Courteenhall Park.</p> <p>Consideration of sight lines northwards from the park is needed, however it is possible that these views have already been obscured by dense belts of tree planting within the northern boundary of the park, presumably to reduce impact from the construction of the M1.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Quote from Historic England’s Register description, List Entry Number 1001029: “PARK Courteenhall stands on high ground towards the centre of a roughly circular park c 1km in diameter. The northern third of the park is arable; a few parkland trees survive in the fields sloping down to Washbrook Lane east of Watermill Spinney. The arable land is largely separated from the rest of the park by a broad belt of ornamental planting of the mid to late C20.”</p> <p>Spatial Option 1g - South M1 Junction 15a – Employment Area south of M1 and either side of A43. No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 1h - Land at M1 Junction 16 - Employment Area north of junction of M1 with A45. No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 2a - North of Daventry - Residential (1,200 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>The north-west part of Option 2a comes very close to the historic parkland of Bragborough Hall, on the north side of the Welton Road. Whilst the parkland is currently considered to be of local importance it does provide the setting for three Listed Buildings (Bragborough Hall List Entry Number 1076481, The Old Lodge List Entry Number 1045846, and a Wellhead List Entry Number 1076482). Further assessment of the impact on this designed landscape is recommended.</p> <p>Spatial Option 2b - North and West of Daventry – Employment No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 3a - Land to the East of DIRFT – Employment No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 3b - Land at M1 Junction 18 - Employment No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 4a - Brackley North West Expansion - Residential (3,000 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>Option 4a potentially impacts on the setting of the historic parkland of Steane which lies on the west side of the River Great Ouse, towards the village of Farthinghoe. The park is currently considered to be of local importance but it provides the setting for three Listed Buildings (Steane Park House List Entry Number 1286523, Stable Block List Entry Number 1192660, and St Peter’s Chapel List Entry Number 1371825), as well as earthworks of the Scheduled Monument of the deserted medieval village of Steane. Furthermore landscaping within Steane Park and immediately north of the Listed Buildings includes important earthwork remains of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>medieval and post medieval fishponds, ornamental ponds and a possible moated site, mostly still water-filled. Further assessment of the impact of Option 4a on this historic designed landscape is recommended.</p> <p>Spatial Option 4b - Towcester South and Racecourse Expansion - Residential (4,250 dwellings proposed)</p> <p>One section of Option 4b is of major concern, ie. that part of the proposal for residential development which lies within the nationally significant Grade II* Registered area of Easton Neston Park. The damaging impact of such development upon this important heritage asset would be considerable and irreversible, effectively removing that entire southern section of historic park which lies beyond the River Tove. Development would also isolate the outstanding Grade I Listed Chain Lodge entrance gateway from it's function and setting, and would remove parkland views from the historic parkland north of the River Tove to the south and east. Relevant quotes from Historic England's Register description, List Entry Number 1001032:</p> <p>"PARK The House lies in the central-northern part of its park, the southern part of which is occupied by Towcester racecourse. Both halves of the park slope down towards the River Tove which runs from west to east through the park. Alongside the drive east of First Lodge the Tove has been broadened as the slightly serpentine Broad Water. The park is bounded to the south-west, along the A5, with a tall brick wall..... In or soon after 1819 the park was extended to the south, across the River Tove, to take in Heathencote Field. This is the part of the park where Towcester racecourse was later established. North of the River Tove there is extensive ridge and furrow beneath the permanent pasture. Around the racecourse the ground is largely levelled and improved, and within the course itself is a lake dug in the 1990s..... Close to the southern tip of the park is the most impressive of the entrances, the Chain Lodge (listed grade I) of 1822-3, also by Raffield and based on the screen at Sion House. Of Coade stone it is signed by William Croggan. From this a drive passes northwards across Towcester racecourse, which occupies the southern third of the park, via a bridge to the east of the Waterhall fishponds, before curving north-west to pass by the south side of St Mary's church on the south edge of the pleasure grounds. All five drives were present by 1806, probably having been established since 1791."</p> <p>Spatial Option 5a – Growth at Long Buckby - Residential (up to 5,000 dwellings proposed)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 5b - Growth at Milton Keynes North West/ Old Stratford Milton Keynes North West (Old Stratford) Expansion - Residential (6,000 dwellings proposed).</p> <p>No comment.</p> <p>Spatial Option 6 - Rural Areas</p> <p>Land to the South of Market Harborough - Residential (2,000 dwellings proposed).</p> <p>Although no mapping has been provided for this option there are concerns for the potential impact of development on locally significant historic parklands to the south-west of Market Harborough, most notably at Thorpe Lubenham Hall and Marston Trussell Hall. It is recommended that forthcoming options in this area make provision for assessment of impact on these parklands.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Alnwick Castle	Northumb erland	E21/1637	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) pursuant to planning permission 18/00079/FUL to allow changes to the design Location Land North Of The Treehouse The Alnwick Garden Denwick Lane Alnwick Northumberland NE66 1YU.MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2021</p> <p>We maintain our objection to this commercial development in the heart of the historic pleasure ground to the east of the castle. It is devoid of sympathy with the historic designed landscape at Alnwick. The development will sunder the historic layout and the earthworking required to attempt to reduce the visibility of the development will alter the topography which informed the historic layout of paths, drives, viewpoints, water features and plantings. It will remove the possibility of conserving this significant area of the Grade One Registered designed landscape and the future potential to present this part of the historic landscape to visitors.</p> <p>It appears that the layout variations proposed in this latest application will mean that the taller elements of the proposed development will be even more visible from the wider designed landscape.</p> <p>Section AA shows the roof ridges of "Trolls", "Pixies", "Elves" and the "Village Wall" higher than the background woodland. Section BB shows the "Village Wall" and "Santa's Grotto" overtopping the background woodland. The sections indicate that central elements of the play structure will overtop the proposed screening bund to the north and will therefore be visible from the wider parkland, particularly the historic carriage drive circuit following the higher ground of the North Demesne across the Aln</p>

					<p>valley.</p> <p>The development will be highly visible from what will remain of the historic layout of the eastern pleasure ground to east and west. The visualisations confirm that the play structure will be particularly incongruous from the wider Registered landscape.</p> <p>The service buildings outside the village wall to the west of the development, standing 0.5m below the bund top at ground level, will presumably also be widely visible. Perhaps the token new clump planting shown to the north is an attempt to provide some screening for "Operational Facilities" from due north at least?</p> <p>We would wish to reinforce the concerns expressed by Historic England to this variation in their letter of 21 December.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Harry Beamish Chair The Northumbria Gardens Trust</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E21/1437	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of agricultural building to B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or distribution) use.</p> <p>Allerton Grange Farm Allerton Park Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0SE</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2021</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>Within the Registered Park, there are 19 listed buildings including Allerton Castle (grade I), Temple of Victory (grade II*), Lady's Cave Folly (grade II), and Bridge (grade II). As far as we are aware recent restoration work carried out at Lady's Cave and the Temple of Victory utilised some funds which originated in the public purse. Both Allerton Castle and the Temple of Victory are sufficiently elevated to be further harmed by massing of yet more agricultural/general industrial/storage or distribution buildings. It is contrary to what the public would expect from the moneys spent.</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</p> <p>This application for Change of Use of agricultural building to B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or distribution) use is for the most southerly of</p>

					<p>the line of agricultural buildings approved this year. We have raised this matter with your colleague Christopher Kedde, Enforcement Officer cc in; Enforcement case reference - 21/00461/PR15, for the 8 agricultural buildings (20/04649/FUL, 20/04650/FUL, 20/04651/FUL, 20/04652/FUL, 21/02572/FUL, 21/02574/FUL, 21/02575/FUL and 21/02576/FUL).</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have very strong objections to this application; the continuing development by the applicant on land within the setting of Allerton's highly designated heritage assets and Registered Historic Park and Garden. According to the Application Form work started on 11th October 2021 and as far as we are aware the building has not had any agricultural use. It seems that this area owned by the applicant is to become a warehousing and distribution site in the guise of being for agricultural use.</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-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. 2. We have already expressed doubt about the applicant needing so many agricultural buildings; we have not seen any justification. 3. The buildings could not be more unattractive in appearance. 4. Access and parking. How will access and egress of the site work for all the buildings approved and the current proposals? 5. Hedges. 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. 6. This 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>We would like to underline NPPF (July 2021) Paragraph 189. We consider that the proposal 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.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p>
Howsham Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1507	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Works to trees within TPO no. 1/1955 - T1 Ash, G2 Elms(5), T3 Ash, T4 Holly, T5 Elm, T6 Beech all to be removed. T7 Horse Chestnut - minor pruning. T8 Elm - remove. T9 Sycamore - reduce by 30% or remove. G10 Cypress(2) - reduce 30% with minor trimming. G11(8), G12 Elms(2), G13 Elms(7), T14 Ash, T16 Sycamore, T17 Elm-all to be removed. G18 Woodland area suitable for thinning.</p> <p>Land At Howsham Park Village Street Howsham Malton North Yorkshire</p> <p>TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Howsham Hall at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Howsham Hall is situated on the south bank of the River Derwent. The river curves along the north and west boundary of the registered park and garden with the Hall (listed grade I) near the bank of the river and facing south over its parkland which rises to the south. Woodland boundary plantations form the south and west boundaries of the registered site with Low Lane at the south and the village of Howsham to the east. Howsham is a Conservation Area and lies within the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site is adjacent to the lowland section of the River Derwent, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which is also a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Upper Park at Howsham (ie within the boundary woodland of this application) is designated a UKBAP Priority Habitat (Lowland Wood Pastures and Parkland) because of the possible survival of remnants of the medieval deer park including three massive pollard oaks (when I last visited some years ago). Between 1775 and 1779 the famous landscape designer, Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown (1716-1783) was consulted by the owner Nathaniel Cholmley, regarding a new phase of landscape design at Howsham. At a cost of 50 guineas, it is likely that Brown paid a visit and made a plan but no document has been found. However, the remodelling of the grounds with sinuous curves instead of straight lines (of the earlier period as shown on a map of 1705) and the careful placement of buildings and trees in the English Landscape Style is typical of his type of approach. The 1792 Plan of the Manor of Howsham (see Refs below) shows the east and south boundary woodland which are the subject of this application indicating that the age of the woodland is probably in excess of 230 years. The works to the trees are all in the east and south woodland boundary</p>

					<p>plantations that are along the public roads. The elms, a holly and beech tree are dead, a multi-stemmed sycamore has limbs over the road and some ash trees are suffering from ash-dieback; all are potential safety hazards. We do not think that their removal will leave significant gaps. The other work is to remove ivy from the base of the trunk up to 300mm, on mature roadside trees, which will prevent the trees becoming shrouded in heavy ivy growth, benefit their longevity and make it easier for future inspections. G18 is woodland near the historic main drive to Howsham Hall and the two pairs of gate piers each flanked by six-sided lodges (listed grade II). This should be borne in mind for any thinning work and gaps are not left.</p> <p>We have no objection to the proposed work but have not noted whether this is part of a management plan and whether some young trees of appropriate species for this historic site will be planted for the future. We recommend that this is the case.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Tudor Croft, Guisborough	North Yorkshire	E21/1633	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 65 HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING, PARKING AND DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE. LAND OFF TREFOIL CLOSE AND MEYNELL AVENUE, GUISBOROUGH. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2021</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly objects to this planning application which will permanently damage the setting of Tudor Croft, Stokesley Road, Guisborough; a significant Arts and Crafts designed house with associated gardens.</p> <p>Tudor Croft was built by the well-known brick manufacturer, Ronnie Crossley in 1934 in the Arts and Crafts style. The garden was laid out to complement the house and covers an area of c.2ha. Its significance is such that it has featured in a long article in 'Country Life' (August 30th 2007) in which the author wrote:</p> <p>"The result is a richly harmonious Arts-and-Crafts garden in keeping with Crossley's house, and containing a number of facets after the style of Lutyens and Jekyll"</p> <p>"... Tudor Croft is perhaps the only large private garden built in Teesside during the 20th century and it is a fine example of a garden of its time".</p> <p>This is a unique house and associated garden in our region, is much visited for the many 'Open Days' and other charitable events that are held in the gardens, raising in the region of £250,000 for charity.</p> <p>The garden is very artfully laid out along a shallow valley with the Hutton Beck flowing through it. To its south is the land that is the subject of this</p>

					<p>planning application; an area often referred to as Hutton Meadows which is also the corridor of the Hutton Beck. It is the last large area of green open space left in Guisborough and its medieval ridge and furrow (what would have been part of the settlement's open field system) is still evident. This indicates that it has not been ploughed out for hundreds of years and is a reservoir of wildlife; something that we should be celebrating and enhancing not covering in concrete. In the 1970s, Guisborough Town Council, stated their intention to keep it as public open space. In the 1980s their successors, Langbaugh Borough Council agreed. At the 1999 public inquiry into the refusal of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council to grant permission to Persimmon, a council spokesman said that there had been "a long- standing commitment to achieving public open space on this site." "The issue of housing development on the site was debated at the Local Plan Inquiry (1977), where the Council argued that it should remain allocated for public open space, incorporating a footpath, and that housing was not needed in light of other allocations", and later:" the site is allocated as a new recreational area with a footpath". However, sadly this has not happened; now is the opportunity to rectify this omission. Regarding the need for housing, we note the following from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Shlaa) for Redcar and Cleveland: '...housing completions have heavily overachieved against the local plan minimum requirement, which is also reflected in the ongoing strong performance against the annual housing delivery test; and there is a substantial supply of ongoing commitments which, if augmented by prospective major permissions, would be sufficient to maintain a relatively high deliverable supply over and beyond the next five years. This is contrary to what Newell Homes wrote in their community consultation leaflet which stated: 'These plans will provide much needed new housing, including affordable homes.' There is no need for any more homes in Guisborough... but there is a need to retain valuable open green space.</p> <p>The garden of Tudor Croft is home to a huge collection of plants from across the temperate regions of the world, almost all catalogued and labelled. The description 'Botanic Garden' is often applied to it, though it is not officially a Botanic Garden. It also holds a collection of almost 300 species and hybrids of snowdrops which attract large numbers of visitors during February, is home to beehives and takes a significant part in annual moth surveys. Tudor Croft has a natural synergistic relationship with</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Hutton Meadows for the conservation of plants and animals.</p> <p>Part of the 'borrowed landscape' of the Tudor Croft garden is Highcliff, which dominates the views from the garden to the south and towards the moors. By building houses on raised ground between the gardens and Highcliff, the unique setting and beauty of this special garden would be lost for ever and would undoubtedly result in ecological damage.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust wishes to register its strong objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Mrs Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Telford & Wrekin Local List Validation Review	Shropshire	E21/1581	N/A	<p>LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2021</p> <p>Question 1. Do you agree with the proposed local validation requirements? Not wholly</p> <p>Question 2. Do you think there are any requirements that should be added to the local validation list? Yes. The initial validation list refers to developments within a Conservation Area or affecting its setting, or affecting a Listed Building or its setting, but makes no initial mention of development within a Registered Park & Garden (RPAG) or affecting its setting. This is inconsistent with information later on 'Heritage Statements' (p.46) which does refer to RPAG's. We often are forwarded planning applications that affect RPAG's either directly or by affecting their Setting, from applicants who do not appear to realise that a Heritage (Impact) Statement is required. It would thus be helpful if a statement to this effect was added into the initial guidance, which refers them to the later more detailed pages.</p> <p>Shropshire Gardens Trust</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E21/1348	II	<p>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</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding Mr Bonham-Christies's Heritage Statement relating to the application site. Our earlier responses requested that the applicant provide details of 'the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting' (NPPF Para 194) and that armed with this information your officers would be able to 'identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset...' NPPF Para 195.</p>

					<p>This information is a requirement of the NPPF and necessary for any application which has the potential to affect a registered park or garden (RPG) of any grade.</p> <p>I visited Marston in August 2019 and as well as walking through the parkland still belonging to Marston House, I drove around the perimeter several times, so am familiar with the topography. You can clearly see from the detail of the application site taken from the 1st edition OS map, available on Know Your Place (below), why the area was designated within the RPG (coloured pale mauve) as it was part of the main drive with an avenue of trees leading to Marston House. The OS map also shows that there was a Pound immediately to the south of where the access to the proposed barn comes off the road, so the area has obvious historic significance.</p> <p>As always, Mendip DC's officers base their planning decisions on their own observations whilst bearing in mind comments received from statutory bodies and members of the public. Given the demonstrable national importance of the site, combined with the route of the tree avenue leading to Marston House, we would urge your officers to ask the applicant to consider other less sensitive potential sites for the barn. The Gardens Trust and Somerset Gardens Trust believe this current application constitutes inappropriate development within the RPG and maintain our objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dunster Castle	Somerset	E21/1483	II*	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land East of King's Hedge Coppice	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the above Felling Licence Application which affects Dunster Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>We have considered the information provided in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Somerset Gardens Trust. On the basis of this we confirm we have no further comments to add.</p> <p>With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Cannon Hall	South Yorkshire	E21/1478	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Rebuilding of leaning garden wall.	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>

				<p>Repairs to loose and unstable stonework of plunge pool (Listed Building Consent) Cannon Hall Museum, Bark House Lane, Cawthorne, Barnsley, S75 4AT REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, in this case Cannon Hall at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>As you will know John Spencer was responsible for extensive works on the house (listed grade II*) and grounds in the 1760's, which were executed to designs by Richard Woods (1716-93) who produced a map showing his proposals in 1760. The kitchen garden is shown on Wood's plan. The family were nationally important figures, very notable gardeners and Cannon Hall holds the National Collection of Pears. In 1775 John Spencer's nephew, Walter Spencer Stanhope inherited Cannon Hall and continued his uncle's work of developing the gardens and enlarging the park. In 1807 Walter Spencer Stanhope built the North Range Glasshouse. The leaning kitchen garden wall extends behind the glasshouse and to the west. We presume that the wall has no evidence of hot air heating ducts and we have no objection to the proposals which should be a sympathetic solution.</p> <p>The plunge pool lies c.200m south-east of the Hall in an area of the pleasure grounds with shrubs and woodland embellished with architectural fragments brought to the site in the late 19th Century. The pleasure grounds were laid out by Woods and shown on the 1760 map. We note from the Historic Building Record and Watching Brief March 2020 Draft v0.1 2018 that there was a community excavation of Cannon Hall Plunge Pool (CFA Archaeology, 2018). However, we do not have the results of the excavation and we are unsure as to whether the current plunge pool is a Victorian development of an earlier pool. We have in our records the attached drawing but do not know where it originated without further research. The drawing is not unlike the Tower Cottage drawing (by John Carr), but possibly indicates rougher stone and less detail. Cowell (Richard Woods) and Wragg/Worsley (John Carr) do not give any firm confirmation of a bath house ever being built, rather than intended. But a plunge pool without an accompanying dressing room would be unusual in the 18th Century at the time Woods and Carr were working at Cannon Hall, and both designed many bath houses in their landscapes. Did the community excavation give any indication that there might have been a building associated with the plunge pool?</p> <p>We have no objection to the proposals in this application but advise that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the work may be an opportunity to look at the area and possibly do some further excavation to find out if there was ever a building associated with the plunge pool.</p> <p>Although not part of this application, we note the recommendations for the Cascade from Mason Clark Associates to remove broken tree/tree debris from above the weir which we strongly support.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.12.2021 ADDENDUM LETTER</p> <p>Further to our letter today, 10th December 2021, we have been able to confer with our colleague Jane Furse who in 2001 wrote Cannon Hall, An Historic Survey with Heritage Landscape Proposals for the S.W.Fraser 1992 Settlement Trust and we offer the following information and advice: Kitchen Garden Wall.</p> <p>We support the proposal to dismantle and rebuild in like materials this leaning section of John Spencer's kitchen garden wall, designed by Richard Woods. The loading of earth behind and the close proximity of sheltering trees is concerning and we would strongly support reduced loading at the rear and new long term shelter planting at a suitable distance.</p> <p>We are however, concerned at the lack of detail supplied concerning the supposed 30% replacement material, for the more public face of this wall. We are very surprised to hear that there is no evidence of tying between the two layers, either of brick or stone and would urge archaeological monitoring from the outset whilst the dismantling of the section specified is carried out, so that any discrepancy or evidence of historical ties is used to inform the actual reinstatement in line with any new evidence.</p> <p>We are unsure about the use of metal ties because of the risk of corrosion. The wall has stood for 250 years from its original construction. If after investigation wall ties are required, we can only support non-ferrous ties to ensure the work lasts for a further 250 years.</p> <p>Back filling of voids is another comment we would wish to be informed by the proposed archaeological watching brief. Any voids would imply an original hot wall which should not be altered but rebuilt as per the original (for this section) in recognition of the wall's Grade II listing. John Spencer's diaries from the 1760's & 1770's make specific mention of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>commissioning quantities of “Long Bricks” for his new landscape from his brick making contractors. As they were never used for dwellings, (personal comment from Ivan Hall, expert on John Carr c.1998) their presence within this C18th walled garden is highly likely, precisely for the job of tying walls together, either over voids, e.g. hot walls, or between different materials as seems most likely in this instance.</p> <p>Plunge pool</p> <p>The plunge pool is thought to date from the C17th or early C18th, before John Spencer inherited the estate. It is likely to have been the site for his proposed cold bath house, for which a drawing survives within the Spencer Stanhope Archives (see attached and as sent with our earlier letter today). As the source of this spring feeds four ponds in the garden (two lower ones in the park were removed during the 1760’s under Richard Woods proposals) we would urge its sensitive repair and retention as a major part of Cannon Hall ‘s pleasure garden. The centuries of its existence and the water’s continual use and popularity with present day garden visitors will we hope make the restoration of this top pool high priority to its current form.</p> <p>We note the reference in the attached Archaeology Report by Jessop Consultancy March 2020 to the Community Dig re the plunge pool carried out by/with CFA archaeology in 2018. No record of their findings is attached to this planning application, or to whether the associated bath house was ever built as implied by the 1766 map. We hope that detailed findings regarding the age and history of 8.7&8.8 (bridge and pillar) were also described in that documentation.</p> <p>Since the bridge and pillar are very likely to be contemporary in their placement with the listed ecclesiastical structures (see Jessop buildings 8.3-8.6)* within Cannon Hall’s Fairyland, we are concerned that work is being planned without explicit mention of their importance. The close proximity, provenance and probable historic value of 8.7&8.8, bridge and pillar, deserve careful protection during the plunge pool works.</p> <p>*Buildings 8.4 - 8.6 (see Appendix photos 2.138 - 2.145) show the above ground pieces from the church which have all been listed Grade II by English Heritage (then the Department of Historic and Ancient Monuments and Buildings aka DAMB) since the 1970s.</p> <p>C18th Cascade</p> <p>We made a note in our previous letter supporting the removal of broken tree/tree debris from above the weir. We would also support the sensitive</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>repair of this C18th cascade with its stone cobbling as a further contribution to the restoration of Cannon Hall's park and the designed landscape of Daking Brook within Cannon Hall's parkland carried out with major financial support from the HLF by 2017.</p> <p>In an age of global warming and climate change the gradual erosion of the stone cobbling over more than the last five years (see Plinke report included with this application re photos from 2016) makes this another timely task. There are no drawings in this application showing the position of the proposed dam however and so, although we would urge high standards of restoration and materials including replacement of all stone cobbling below the weir, we feel unable to comment favourably or otherwise without sight of more detailed proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Biddulph Grange	Staffordshire	E21/1675	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for the proposed installation of wrought iron balustrade around the internal perimeter of the existing Bandstand to prevent falling. Biddulph Grange National Trust Grange Road Biddulph BOUNDARY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.12.2021</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 consulted Julian Gibbs, who was instrumental in saving the gardens at Biddulph when he was Gardens Adviser for the National Trust.</p> <p>Mr Gibbs undertook a risk assessment when he was working at Biddulph which showed there was minimum risk of anyone falling off the bandstand. Healthy and Safety concerns have clearly become more stringent since then. Having looked at the online documentation, the current option of railings only part way round does not seem very balanced, and in our opinion it would look more sympathetic if the railings carried on all round the bandstand. We would also suggest that there is scope for taking a design cue for the ironwork from gates in Egypt or the Ice House to make the structure less utilitarian in appearance. All the metalwork at Biddulph was designed and made by Dave Broadbent of Mobberly, sadly now retired, but we feel sure that the National Trust's architect will be able to find and employ a similarly skilled blacksmith to undertake this work. We hope these comments will be helpful when your officers consider this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>

					<p>Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2021</p> <p>Biddulph Grange park and gardens are a grade I registered historic landscape of mid 19th century date, within a designated conservation area. They are of international significance. The Grange itself is a grade II* listed building and the adjoining steps and terraces around the house, an important part of the architectural structure of the parkland, are either individually listed at grade II or are deemed to be listed within the curtilage of the principal listed buildings. The gardens have been carefully restored in recent times by the National Trust and are now an important public attraction. The “bandstand” is an integral part of the composition of terraces and walks around the mansion house and forms a low sided viewing platform overlooking both the lime avenue and tulip garden . As indicated in our letter to you dated 1 March 2020 in connection with the previous (undetermined) applications SMD/2020/004 and 005LBC SGPT accepts that although the low perimeter wall to the bandstand is an integral part of its historic design it does present a potential health and safety hazard today given the increased usage by visitors. The Trust has no objection in principle to erecting a safety barrier to prevent risk of accident while retaining public access.</p> <p>SGPT is pleased that the applicant has reconsidered the design of the safety rail discarding the overtly modern previous approach in favour of a more conventional metal railing as suggested in our previous comments. We are however very disappointed in the currently proposed design and fully endorse the criticisms made by The Gardens Trust in their letter to you dated 24 December 2021. The new design does not reflect any historic precedent for pedestrian railings and more closely resembles a modern highway railing in mild steel than one to be expected in a designed historic landscape. In particular we draw attention to the close spacing of the intermediate balusters which would give the structure a very “solid” appearance, to the clumsy, oversized corner and intermediate stanchions, and to the unhistoric profile of the top rail. The design of the railing would cause harm to the significance of the RPG, conservation area, and setting of the adjacent grade II listed building and requires further reconsideration.</p> <p>SGPT supports the Gardens Trust’s suggestion of seeking cues from other metalwork elsewhere on the Biddulph Grange estate as a model to work</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>from. A simple conventional park railing with two horizontal rails would act as a barrier against falls while offering maximum transparency. Alternatively an open design with posts and a top rail enclosing a saltire infill would be consistent with the period of the garden. If the applicant is insistent on using the submitted theme it is suggested the proportions of the corner and intermediate uprights be substantially reduced and that the spacing between the rails be increased to circa 300mm.</p> <p>SGPT would be pleased to comment further on any amendments submitted.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman</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 02.12.2021</p> <p>Further to our original letter regarding the above application dated 2nd November 2021, we are grateful that the applicant has now provided a Heritage Statement. This adequately addresses our concerns, and we are satisfied that the tree belt provides sufficient cover to mitigate any impact the extension may have upon the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Old and New Cemetery, Ipswich.</p> <p>We therefore withdraw our holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E21/1438	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of bar to cafe with additional outside terrace, alterations to front windows and installation of ramps to front and new accessible toilet. Temple Newsam Golf Club Templenewsam Road Halton BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Temple Newsam registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The wide extent of the registered landscape at Temple Newsam is significant as the setting to the grade I listed Temple Newsam House and a considerable number of other listed buildings. Britain's most famous landscape designer, Lancelot 'Capability' Brown made a plan for Temple Newsam in 1762, which was the first for West Yorkshire. This has survived and, in spite of his design not having been fully implemented, it sheds light</p>

					<p>on the design approach of this foremost landscape designer.</p> <p>Temple Newsam Golf Club House lies just inside the north western boundary of the Registered Park and Garden, just south of housing. It is accessed via Temple Newsam Road with gravel car parking behind the Club House (north side). The Golf Course runs south from the Club House through Temple Newsam Park with Temple Newsam House to the east. We are surprised that the Design and Access Statement makes no mention of the Registered Park and Garden or of the other significant heritage assets and the museum which are important to the people of Leeds and the wider community.</p> <p>We note that the proposals include making the windows at the front facing the golf course, full height, moving of a door to allow better access to the new terrace at the front of the building and new double doors. It is proposed to extend and raise the terrace forming two 'wings' each with a red brick retaining wall. We note that the drawings show railings round the terrace. We have not noted detailing of the colours for much of the proposals.</p> <p>Whilst we have no objection in principle to this application, we would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>We do have some concerns about the additional visual impact of the proposals on Temple Newsam Park, and request that the materials and colours are subdued ie for the windows, doors, the railings and the furniture to be use on the terraces.</p> <p>We are pleased that the lighting will be LED with the external lighting on a time clock and light sensor to reduce the light pollution and impact on surrounding properties and wildlife.</p> <p>We note on the Application Form Section 10 'are there trees or hedges nearby that are important as part of the landscape character? - NO'. We find it impossible to judge if this is correct given the lack of information provided. However, we advise that some new shrub and tree planting near the southern front of the Club House as part of this work, would help the terracing to sit more comfortably in the registered park, and be beneficial to wildlife. The type of planting and species should reflect the planting in the historic park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Bretton Hall	West	E21/1688	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2021

	Yorkshire			<p>Woodland Creation Consultation on Tree Planting (Woodland Creation) at Smithy Ridge Farm, Yorkshire Sculpture Park. SE292 127</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Bretton Hall, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Bretton Hall is a unique heritage asset combining as it does a number of listed buildings including the mansion; pleasure grounds of late 18C and early 19C, parkland of the 18C with earlier origins and links with two notable landscape designers/gardeners, Richard Woods (1716-93) and Robert Marnock (1800-99); and the Yorkshire Sculpture Park laid out on part of the pleasure grounds and parkland.</p> <p>The subject of this consultation is an area of 1.2ha running north from Smithy Ridge Farm to north east of The Pheasantries, within the boundary of the Registered Historic Park and Garden alongside the Huddersfield Road, A637. The land is currently species poor cattle grazed pasture. The tree planting is proposed to be sympathetic to the nearby Woodpasture and Parkland BAP priority habitat and will be low density. There are currently no veteran trees but several mature and over-mature parkland trees of oak, lime and sweet chestnut which will be retained. The new planting will not crowd the mature trees.</p> <p>The landowners have planted additional trees over recent decades including restoring the existing avenue alongside the A637 in the late 1960s and restoring a copse on the western boundary in the 1970s. The objectives for this planting are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increase biodiversity by planting a range of native species to benefit wildlife and the adjacent Local Nature Reserve · Enhance the local landscape in a way that is sympathetic to the existing Grade II Registered Parkland · Mitigate for climate change using trees for carbon sequestration · Improve air quality adjacent to the A637 · Provide aesthetic benefits for the local community as the site is adjacent to an extremely popular Sculpture Park <p>The proposals include the new avenue of trees to be planted adjacent to the existing avenue to create a staggered double avenue of trees in the future. The avenue to be planted with 25xCommon Oak and 25xSmall-</p>
--	-----------	--	--	--	--

					<p>leaved Lime; ie an avenue of 43 trees plus 7 to gap up the existing avenue. The main tree species are proposed to be Hornbeam, Small-leaved lime, Common Oak, Scots Pine, Sweet Chestnut and 25x Walnut, with Bird Cherry, Crab Apple and Rowan at the edges.</p> <p>The very low planting densities e.g. 500/ha will produce open woodland and we understand that the groups of trees will be surrounded by shrub 'mantles' ie shrubs will be concentrated round the edges of the groups, to increase the new woodland's habitat value, and improve the visual aesthetic.</p> <p>We have not been able to go out on site. The Ordnance Survey maps 25inches:1mile 1892-1914 indicate an avenue of trees alongside the road from about the middle of the proposed length north and with a number of scattered trees, set in what is probably grazed land, so apart from the extended avenue not dissimilar to the current aerial photographs. From our limited knowledge of the site and with the sound proposals we have no objections, but we recommend that Ms Jane Winter who is writing the updated Parkland Management Plan for the Yorkshire Sculpture Park is consulted. I have recently forwarded your e-mail and attachments to her but not had a response as I write. jane.winter@collingtonwinter.co.uk</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p>
Hazelbury Manor	Wiltshire	E20/0918	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal Agricultural Building that will house a 60 head dairy herd and 1 milking robot; Manor Farm, Wadswick, Corsham, Wiltshire SN13 0NY. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2021</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) about amendments to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Wiltshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this joint response. They have made a site visit and I have been sent photographs showing the site from the public bridleway.</p> <p>Despite the applicants supplying a very basic outline of the heritage of the site, they have merely quoted Historic England's register entry for Hazelbury in the Heritage Justification Statement (HJS) and made no attempt to link this with the impact that their proposals will have upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG). The HJS says 'it is unlikely that the proposed agricultural building would be visible' (para 44). This seems questionable given the size of the proposed building and the fact that it lies approximately 20m from the eastern boundary of the RPG in a field which shares a boundary with the RPG. The photographs we have been shown of the tree cover which the applicant says will (para 48) 'limit any potential views between the heritage assets and the site' is sparse, and in our</p>

					<p>opinion is unlikely to provide much in the way of mitigation or screening, especially if any of the trees should succumb to disease, in particular ash die back. This is borne out by comments made by Caroline Ridgewell, Wiltshire Council's Senior Conservation Officer, in her report dated 20th September 2020. We also disagree strongly with the applicant's assertion (Para 56 and repeated in Para 74) that 'the contribution made by the setting is minimal'. The map regression undertaken by Donald Insall Associates' letter of 23rd Sept 2020 shows that originally there were specific views intended from the garden surrounding the house into the wider countryside, and any intensive dairy activity with its associated smells, noise and traffic, would negatively affect the current tranquillity of the garden/RPG which is often open to the public.</p> <p>We would like to repeat comments from our previous letter (3rd October 2020) regarding the effect of such a proposal upon the RPG, as they are still pertinent. In Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views, (SHA) (p2) it states 'Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity' - clearly relevant here. P4 goes on to say : 'significance is not dependent on numbers of people visiting it; this would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting' (again corroborated by Ms Ridgewell's report). P5 has two more relevant statements : 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive' as is the case here. The site 'which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it' would unavoidably be adversely affected by a potentially growing dairy herd business, harming the experience of the asset, particularly by (p11) 'Visual dominance, prominence ..; Noise, vibration and other nuisances' and 'Busyness, bustle, movement and activity.'</p> <p>The applicant has failed to appreciate the impact that these proposals will have upon the heritage assets, and has not provided a Statement of Significance, or a considered heritage impact assessment. We are unable to find any demonstrable public benefit to justify the harm which this</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>application would have upon the RPG and other heritage assets, amongst the online documentation. The GT/WGT therefore continue to object to this application. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2021 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Wiltshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this joint response. They have made a site visit and I have been sent photographs showing the site from the public bridleway. The applicants' new Heritage Statement (HS) is an improvement on the one which accompanied the earlier withdrawn application for a 60 head dairy building. However, there is an immediate anomaly as the HS states on p1 of the Summary that the new building is designed to house 60 cattle and one milking robot – twice as many as the description accompanying the application number. It also contradicts itself as to the eventual size of the proposed building as again on p1 of the Summary, it says the agricultural unit is c 9.14m x 36.58m and on p25 (Para 7.1) it gives a completely different size for the proposed building : 48.8m x 13.7m – considerably larger. We are glad to see a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The introductory chapter (Para 1.4) mentions that the site lies within the Cotswolds AONB and that it is also within the Western Wiltshire Green Belt (Para 1.5), but does not state that the application site also lies in a field immediately adjacent to the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Hazelbury Manor. The LVIA touches on the chapters of the Wiltshire Core Strategy considered during the assessment, including (p17/18) The Conservation of the Historic Environment but whilst mentioning the RPG in passing it does not directly address how the application site relates to the RPG. The Baseline Landscape and Visual Study states that the surrounding landform is (4.1.7) 'flat and low-lying ground ... where the landform dips away slightly to the north and the west.' The application site is on higher ground than the RPG which increases intervisibility, and Para 4.2.15 acknowledges its 'proximity to Hazelbury Manor and its adjacent Registered Garden.' Para 2.3.9 states that 'not all potential visual receptors</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>will be recorded during the field survey (e.g. if there is an obvious lack of intervisibility)'. The LVIA (p35) notes that 'The wooded setting of Hazelbury Manor is visually containing, resulting in very little intervisibility between it and the surrounding landscape, including the application site.' Crucially there is no photograph or viewpoint taken from the site of the proposed barn directly towards the RPG of Hazelbury or one from within the RPG looking towards the application site, and the photographs were 'taken in mid-September 2021 when leaf cover was still at its maximum.' This is an unfortunate omission as the barn will be visible from the listed ramparts within the RPG and its bulk will have a large impact upon the openness of the surrounding landscape, to its detriment. It is also visible from several public footpaths, altering the setting and experience of walkers.</p> <p>Para 5.1.6 of the LVIA states that 'The change of agricultural use will not affect the wider landscape setting of Hazelbury Manor and adjacent gardens, and the proposed new agricultural building is not intervisible with either due to tall and dense intervening tree cover (neither the Manor nor the adjacent gardens were visible in any of the selected representative viewpoints). The photographs we have been shown separately of the tree cover, indicates it is sparser than the LIVA implies, and in our opinion is unlikely to provide complete screening, especially if any of the trees should succumb to disease, which is highly likely as many are ash which are suffering from widespread ash die back across the country. What is also not mentioned is that the tree screen between the application site and the RPG is largely deciduous, meaning that for approximately six months of the year there will be little mitigating tree cover. The map regression undertaken by Donald Insall Associates' letter of 23rd Sept 2020 (accompanying the previous withdrawn application) shows that originally there were specific views intended from the garden surrounding the house into the wider countryside, and any intensive dairy activity with its associated smells, noise and traffic, would negatively affect the current tranquillity of the garden/RPG which is often open to the public. Your officers would need to satisfy themselves that the use of the public bridleway to the south (PRoW BOX51) is suitable for any traffic that the change of use would necessitate.</p> <p>There is one paragraph (p12) in the Planning Statement which assesses the impact of the proposals upon the RPG. This states that the 'proximity of the Grade I listed building and gardens has been considered earnestly when trying to find a suitable location for the building.' Visibility from the main</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>road and 'negative press from anti-dairy protesters' is considered by the applicant to be more important than any impact that the building may have on the setting of the RPG or other heritage assets, and the paragraph concludes that 'Though the listed building is close by, (no mention of the even closer RPG) the site is well protected by hedges and trees, so the effects of the proposal on the listed building (again no mention of the RPG) should be minimal ...'. The GT/WGT disagree with this statement.</p> <p>Apart from visibility, another impact will be the imposition of new hedging and trees in what is historically a very open landscape with distant views. In our opinion, this would not enhance the setting of the heritage assets and would be at odds with the surrounding landscape character. The impacts upon the RPG which we mentioned in our previous response to the withdrawn application, are still pertinent. In Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views, (SHA) (p2) it states 'Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity' - clearly relevant here. P4 goes on to say : 'significance is not dependent on numbers of people visiting it; this would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting.'. P5 has two more relevant statements : 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive' as is the case here. The site 'which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it' would unavoidably be adversely affected by a potentially growing dairy herd business, harming the experience of the asset, particularly by (p11) 'Visual dominance, prominence ..; Noise, vibration and other nuisances' and 'Busyness, bustle, movement and activity.'</p> <p>We are unable to find any demonstrable public benefit to justify the harm which this application would have upon the RPG and other heritage assets, amongst the online documentation.</p> <p>The GT/WGT therefore objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

