



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JANUARY 2022

The GT conservation team received 201 new cases and re-consultations for England and four for Wales in December. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 76 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Sneyd Park	Avon	E21/1781	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing public toilet block and construction of single storey building comprising café (use class E), education booth (use class F1[a]) and replacement toilets (resubmission of planning permission 18/04727/F). Public Conveniences Circular Road Sneyd Park Bristol BS9 1ZZ DEMOLITION, MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting The Downs Conservation Area, The new, mainly glass, single storey building will be set within The Downs, a designated site of nature conservation [SNCI] and it will be adjacent to a listed heritage asset, the drinking fountain donated by William Hind in 1883. The Avon Gorge is immediately to the south and west of the site and is designated [SSSI]. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that you have provided and on the basis of this, and the fact that planning permission for the 2018 proposal expires in March 2022, AGT have no objection to the scheme, 21/06762/F. Yours sincerely,

					Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Dodington House	Avon	E21/1836	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations to existing water course to form new pools, installation of 1 no. bridge, with associated landscaping and works.</p> <p>Land At Dodington House Dodington Lane Dodington South Gloucestershire BS37 6SL</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Dodington House, a Grade II* registered park and garden. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that you have provided. However, it is difficult to provide any constructive comments at this stage. Most of the drawings provided on the web site are very faint and the layout and construction details almost illegible. It is not clear to us how the proposal relates to existing features of the park and garden and whether some which are cited in the official list entry will be affected, for example:- 'A second bridge with a cascade beneath it lies c 50m south-east. The cascade emerges from under an ogee arch with a keystone mask, and was evidently designed to be seen from the approach; its design has been attributed to Christopher Bethel Codrington (Mowl 2002).' Will this feature be affected by the proposed works? In one location the new rills or streams appear to cross, and it is not clear whether a new structure would be needed to accommodate this.</p> <p>In general, it would seem that the proposal will be rather gardenesque and even over fussy, and we are not sure how this will sit within the character of the wider park. Example plant species are provided and some may be too ornamental for this setting. Buddleia in particular may prove to be invasive.</p> <p>The technical note on trees that has been submitted with the application is dated March 2020 and is expressed as being for pre-application advice. We cannot see that a full impact assessment of the numbers of trees to be removed / transplanted has been provided and would expect that by this stage of the design, and submission for planning, that information would be available. In particular, it is not clear whether the existing oak tree at leaning oak pond would be affected by the proposed works there. We do not consider that a 'supervisory brief' to the arboriculturalist at the construction stage is sufficient for the purposes of planning consent.</p> <p>We also note that protected species are present along the stream, and</p>

					<p>query whether the stream edge details, including structures to retain marginal planting, will create suitable habitats for these.</p> <p>We hope that further information can be provided so that we may comment in more detail on the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Langley Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/1695	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey detached outbuilding for use as classroom</p> <p>The Langley, Uxbridge Road, George Green, Wexham, Buckinghamshire, SL3 6DU</p> <p>EDUCATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust whose local knowledge informs this joint response, and we would be grateful if you could bear our comments in mind when deciding this application.</p> <p>Langley Park House is Grade II* listed property designed by Stiff Leadbetter set in a Grade II registered park and garden designed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown in the 1760s. The formal gardens surrounding the house were created between 1882 and 1899.</p> <p>We have previously noted the proliferation of applications for assorted works at Langley which is not aided by the name change and different postcode references giving the impression of separate works when, in fact, any proposals for works in the grounds should surely be considered as a whole.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not helpful that the Heritage Statement accompanying this particular application contains little detail as to the heritage asset but instead refers to the 'extensive' planning history on the planning website and, more particularly the 2007 planning application for the main house but without reference to any specific document. On reviewing the application in question 07/01164/FUL, there are in excess of 80 documents. We would therefore ask the planning authority to seek confirmation from the applicant what specific documents they are referring to, or require them to submit the relevant ones as part of this specific planning application. We believe that the responsibility to provide the information relating to this site lies with the applicant and there should be no expectation that anyone wishing to review this application should have to find the relevant information for themselves.</p> <p>With regard to this specific application, there is limited detail other than</p>

					<p>the application seeks to construct a lightweight and portable pre-fabricated structure for classroom use and positioned adjacent to the rear of the hotel in a grassy area. The proposal is to review the situation after 12 months to assess whether further mitigating planting is required. Given the significance of both Langley Park House and the registered park and garden, the Gardens Trust wishes to object strongly to this application on the grounds that the proposed structure is entirely inappropriate in this area. The fact that the application site is to the rear of the house and that further mitigating planting may be proposed is not an adequate solution. We consider that all other options should be explored in order to provide these facilities. The suggested structure is completely unacceptable. A temporary portable structure should remain subservient in design and character to the historic structures, but nonetheless whatever is proposed should be of a better design which befits the significance and setting of the site. If the planning authority are minded to approve a temporary portable structure, any such permission should be subject to a time-constraint.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Draft Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document	Buckinghamshire	E21/1700	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site/s listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) as per the above application. On this occasion, the Gardens Trust has passed this consultation to colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) for our specialist understanding of the area and I am hereby responding on behalf of the BGT. We would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration as this consultation develops. We are not responding to any specific section of the draft but to the aspects of the draft which have the potential to impact on the public parks in this area which, whilst being non-designated, are nonetheless significant areas of designed landscape. This includes Bletchley Park, Waterhall Park, Blue Lagoon and Eight Bells Park.</p> <p>The Bucks Gardens Trust (BGT) has read the draft consultation and noted the areas of public park as follows: Bletchley Park is to the west of the site, to the immediate north of the College site. Waterhall Park is about 14/15 km to the south east of the site. Other green spaces are the Blue Lagoon Park, about 5km to the south west, across the railway line, and there is a</p>

					<p>small local park, Eight Bells Park on the western edge. We note that the proposals seek to open up routes west/east through Bletchley; improve public transport, pedestrian and cycling links; provide higher density housing; increase tourism; improve the accessibility of green spaces and generally enhance the quality of experience for those living in, or passing through, the area. In terms of the interests of the BGT, the proposals reference the importance of Bletchley Park and its heritage value for the area. This is both in terms of how locals feel about their neighbourhood and the opportunity to attract more visitors. They also set out plans for better access to adjoining open spaces and this includes one map where Waterhall Park is included, as well as the Blue Lagoon and Eight Bells Park. We note the proposal for a building height of 15 storeys, but this would be about 5/6km away from the lake at Bletchley Park. Closer development is planned to be six storeys. Any new station buildings serving the east and west sides of the railway should be modern and striking and those on the east side should take design cues from Bletchley Park. There is a small area of green space on the corner of Sherwood Drive and Buckingham Road, now in private ownership which is described as a remnant of the former Bletchley Park site (which is to the north on Sherwood Drive adjoining the current College buildings) and includes remains of a cricket pavilion. The plan proposes that this area should become a new public open space and that the footprint of the pavilion could be referenced by a possible work of art together with a plaque, or information board. In conclusion, the BGT would not necessarily wish to see any changes to the draft consultation but would like to stress the following points;- ∅ We support the proposals to enhance access to greenspace and to make some small improvements ∅ We welcome that the heritage value of Bletchley Park is recognised. ∅ We welcome the recognition of the land which was formerly part of Bletchley Park and recommend some commemoration of this in the proposed new park. ∅ We request that we are consulted further as the proposals develop ∅ We request that we are consulted specifically regarding any proposals which have the potential to impact on any RPG or public park.</p>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/1737	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 12 (CD.03A Wedding Cake Roof Plan Rev 1, CD.04A Wedding Cake Elevation Rev 1, CD.05A Wedding Cake Ground Level Rev 1, CD.06A</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.01.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs</p>

			<p>Wedding Cake Level I+II+III Rev 1, CD.07A Wedding Cake Section Rev 1 , CD.08A Wedding Cake Facade Planification Rev 2 , CD.09A Wedding Cake Section Detail Rev 1) attached to planning permission 20/03609/APP (Installation of sculptures by Joanna Vasconcelos: "Wedding Cake" and "Lafite," and an 18th century Centaur, together with associated upgrading of car parking) The Dairy Queen Street Waddesdon Buckinghamshire HP18 0JW MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>this response.</p> <p>As we have previously stressed, Waddesdon is an internationally significant Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the proposed application site sits to the north of the main house and formal gardens. The GT/BGT note that the site contains the former dairy building complex which was constructed around 1874 and each building is listed separately at Grade II. The complex was altered significantly between 1992-5 by the garden designers Julian and Isobel Bannerman, which involved extensive rebuilding, extension and restoration.</p> <p>The original application involved the relocation of two sculptures by Joanna Vasconcelos and the relocation and extension of the car park from the east of the building complex to north of Queen Street.</p> <p>The current proposals have been revised as a result of an evolving design process on the part of the artist. It is not clear if this is in response to any of the comments made to the previous planning application and therefore, it is difficult for us to ascertain whether our original points have been addressed. Therefore, we would simply like to reiterate our previous comments and request that the planning authority consider this revised planning application with these comments in mind;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We support the relocation of the car park to the proposed new site and would encourage the planning authority to ensure that adequate planting is introduced to mitigate the impact of the car park in views into and out of the RPG - We support the landscaping of the former car park to create an appropriate setting for the introduction of the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture - We support the relocation of the 'Lafite' sculpture to the proposed new position at the entrance to the dairy - We do not object to the proposed position of the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture but are concerned about the possibility that it will be visible above the tree line from views around the RPG, particularly from the higher ground around the house, and would recommend that the planning authority ensure that any visibility is mitigated by additional planting - We would also request that the planning authority continue to attach a temporary permission to these works in order that their position and retention can be reviewed in the future. - We would like to understand better the proposed future of the rose garden now that the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture is no longer going to be situated there.
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>We are aware that a time constraint was imposed as part of the approval. If any of the other comments we previously made have already been addressed, we would be grateful to be directed to where they are.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E21/1745	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolish existing timber shed. The erection of a proposed two storey garage with home office over including roof lights and single storey rear extension with lantern roof light 6 Garden Lane Tyringham Newport Pagnell MK16 9ED DEMOLITION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2022</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 we would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application. Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding but the application came in over the Christmas period and as my colleagues in the BGT are volunteers, we have not had the capacity to respond until now. Tyringham Hall is by Soane in 1793-7 (Grade I) and sits within a late 18th century park (Grade II*), probably laid out by Repton with later works by CF Rees (c 1910) and Edwin Lutyens (1924-28). The main approach to the house is from the South under Soane's stone gateway and across Soane's simple stone bridge along the lime avenue and straight forward to the south-east front of the house. To the north-east of the house is the stable block also by Soane and the rear north-eastern wall forms one of the walls of the seven-sided kitchen garden.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement submitted as part of this application does acknowledge the presence of the listed structures associated with Tyringham Hall but notably fails to identify the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Tyringham Park which wraps around the rear of the property.</p> <p>The application site, 6 Garden Lane, backs on to The Shrubs. The historic significance of this part of the parkland is identified in the Grade II* listing as follows; "North-east of the house, partly surrounding the walled garden, is an area of woodland known as The Shrubs, containing various paths and ornamental trees and shrubs, which may have been part of Repton's pleasure grounds, and leading north from this Long Plantation, along the west side of the northern section of the Filgrave Lane"</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposals for a rear kitchen extension with a lantern roof and the construction of a two-storey garage with an office over. The</p>

				<p>proposed garage is a substantial brick-built structure with a hipped roof on the front elevation only, an up and over garage door, and an aesthetically displeasing large expanse of brick between the door and the hipped roof. The footprint of the garage has increased substantially and its scale seems incongruous with the surrounding properties. On the rear elevation, there are a pair of double doors giving access to a lobby area and a grey gable window at the upper floor. The ground floor of the proposed new garage is substantially larger than the existing garage and in our opinion, would result in overdevelopment of this site.</p> <p>As we are not familiar with the site, it is not clear whether it would be visible from the RPG. However, we do note that the housing development was constructed to include single storey garages which create a sense of space and separation between the properties and allowing views into The Shrubs behind the houses. The introduction of higher two storey structures into the 'gap' between the properties will result in a more continuous built form which is not appropriate in this setting.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned with the proposed introduction of the substantial grey gable window and the two rooflights into the rear elevation and roof of the two-storey garage which will result in light emittance and reflection which would be detrimental to the setting of the RPG.</p> <p>With regard to the kitchen extension, we note the proposed lantern roof and extensive fenestration in the form of large French doors in both open sides of the structure which, again will result in both light emittance and reflection which would be detrimental to the setting of the RPG. Whilst we have no objection to the principle of the kitchen extension, we strongly object to the lantern roof and would ask that this is removed from the proposal. The French windows do continue the form of fenestration as seen in the rear elevation of the house and would provide ample light ingress into the kitchen.</p> <p>Therefore, the Gardens Trust strongly objects to this application. The proposed garage is much too large in this setting and the gable window and rooflights would result in detrimental light emittance and reflection. The kitchen extension is more acceptable subject to the removal of the lantern roof.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E21/1782	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building application for repairs to the lean-to structure at the rear of the building</p> <p>West Boycott Pavilion Stowe School Stowe Park Stowe Buckinghamshire MK18 5DD</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.01.2022</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 bear our comments in mind when deciding upon this application.</p> <p>The applicant is replacing a corrugated tin roof and an existing corrugated glazed 'roof light'. We ask that a proper conservation rooflight flush with the roof is used, with a central glazing bar.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1832	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey side extension to existing workshop and replacement of an existing single storey building and container with a detached single storey outbuilding</p> <p>Workshop Little Yeat Farm Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire HP18 0QH</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2022</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>The application is for the construction of a single storey side extension to the existing workshop and replacement of an existing single storey building and container with a detached single storey outbuilding at the Workshop, Little Yeat Farm. Little Yeat Farm sits adjacent to the former North Drive for Wotton Underwood and the drive and a little land either side therefore falls within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG).</p> <p>In our response to application 20/02967/APP dated November 18th 2021, the GT/BGT stated 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>We are therefore disappointed to see a further two applications coming in for this site, still without either a Landscape Character Assessment or a Masterplan. We would strongly urge the planning authority to require the applicant to adopt this approach. We note that the applicant has made greater reference to the RPG as part of their Planning Statement, but this still does not allow for a proper assessment of the combined impact of these proposals across the site.</p>

					<p>With regard to this specific application, the proposed single storey extension is modest, and we therefore feel that we could offer support to this part of the application providing that if the application is approved, your officers impose a condition that after this there will be no new windows and/or rooflights and that this is the final alteration to this structure.</p> <p>With regard to the proposal to demolish the single storey building and container and replace them with a detached brick built single storey outbuilding, we would also be minded to offer our support to this, again on condition that no windows or rooflights are at any point, introduced into this structure, and that its footprint remains the same or less than the total for the structures being replaced. We would again encourage the planning authority to ensure that this is the limit of alterations and extensions.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1833	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of agricultural barn Little Yeat Farm Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire HP18 0QH AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. . We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>The GT/BGT note that the proposal is for a new agricultural barn at Little Yeat Farm in Woodham. Little Yeat Farm sits adjacent to the former North Drive for Wotton Underwood and the drive and a little land either side therefore falls within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG).</p> <p>The North Drive is lined with trees and the field has small trees and hedges delineating the boundary with woodland to the north. There are no built structures until the North Drive reaches Ham Lodge and the A41. Whilst the North Drive is no longer used as an access to the mansion, it is part of the significant designed landscape covered by the Grade I status.</p> <p>Therefore, any development in the setting of this section of the RPG will be damaging.</p> <p>In November 2021, the Gardens Trust objected strongly to the construction of a new pole barn on the other side of the North Drive in a position adjacent to the North Drive due to its damage to the fabric and setting of the RPG. We also commented that, in response to a number of other</p>

					<p>applications relating to this site, there is a need for 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. With regard to this specific application, this proposed application site is within the Registered Park and Garden and parallel to the avenue of trees delineating the North Drive. On reviewing the documents accompanying this application, we were surprised to note that there is no reference whatsoever to the fact that the application site is within the RPG. There is also no Design and Access Statement or other accompanying assessment. In the application form, the applicant has stated that there are no "trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character." This is entirely inaccurate given that the application site sits within the RPG and alongside the avenue of trees.</p> <p>Whilst we have no objection in principle to the introduction of new agricultural buildings, any such structures should be carefully positioned to minimise their impact upon the RPG. In this setting, any new structures should be positioned as closely as possible to the existing farm complex which lies to the north of this application site and away from the North Drive.</p> <p>We note that there is an application for Lawful Development (21/04776/CPL) regarding alterations to the main dwelling and the construction of a three-bay open-fronted carport and extension of hard standing. Given the number of previous and current applications pertaining to this site, we wish to reiterate strongly yet again that the applicant has entirely failed to recognise the significance of the site and, depressingly submitted further applications seeking inappropriate development without sufficient documentation to enable your officers to fully appreciate the harm this would cause to the RPG.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust are therefore writing once more to strongly object to this proposal for a new agricultural barn.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E21/1840	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of a proposed self-supporting timber fence with bar-gates</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.01.2022</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</p>

				<p>Tyringham Hall Filgrave To Gayhurst Road Tyringham Newport Pagnell MK16 9ES ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) whose local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The Historic England listing for this site says : ‘Grade I Tyringham Hall is by Soane in 1793-7 and sits within a late 18th century registered park and garden (RPG) (Grade II*), probably laid out by Repton with later works by CF Rees (c 1910) and Edwin Lutyens (1924-28). The main approach to the house is from the South under Soane’s stone gateway and across his simple stone bridge along the lime avenue and straight forward to the south east front of the house. To the north-east of the house is the stable block also by Soane and the rear north-east wall forms one of the walls of the seven-sided kitchen garden.</p> <p>A spur north off the drive close to the forecourt, Back Drive, runs north-east, past the stables and red brick estate houses (Rees c 1910), around the walled garden, to emerge on the Filgrave lane, flanked by banded brick gate piers and wooden gates 250m north-east of the house.</p> <p>The rectangular, stone stable block (Soane 1793, listed grade I) lies 75m north-east of the house, surrounding a cobbled courtyard entered through a pedimented carriage arch on the south-west side, facing the service wing of the house. The rear, north-east wall forms one of the walls of the seven-sided kitchen garden. Tyringham parish church (medieval, rebuilt E J Tarver 1871, listed grade II) lies 400m south-east of the house, adjacent to the Filgrave lane, surrounded by a small churchyard with mature trees on the boundaries. It is visible in views from the park, drive and house.’</p> <p>The application site appears to be just to the north of the stable block and the proposals are to restrict access beyond this area with timber fencing accessed via a farm gate. Unfortunately, the submission with the application offers no explanation why this is required. Perhaps it is to restrict access to the surroundings of the Hall and the main South approach from the residential properties along the northern section of Garden Lane? An explanation would be helpful.</p> <p>The angle of the fencing seems to have been designed to accommodate a driveway to No.19, a residential dwelling that runs to the north of the Coach House. We are not familiar with the application site but, on Google maps, it appears that there is already a hedge delineating the driveway to No.19 and then some form of lightweight boundary treatment at a right angle to the hedge to meet the southern end of the curved hedge in the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>formal gardens.</p> <p>Primarily the GT/BGT find it regrettable that the setting of the Stables and Coach House has already been sectioned off in this way and we consider that Soane's magnificent stables and their relationship with the registered park and garden, the access drive and views from and towards Tyringham Hall should be kept as open and unrestricted as possible to maintain the original setting.</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge that some historic structures have been converted to residential use and new development has been permitted to the north section of Garden Lane, the impact of this should not be allowed to creep any further nor have any detrimental impact on the setting of the RPG. If, however, the LPA considers that some form of boundary is permissible here, it would be preferable that any such boundary treatment continues the line of the existing hedge alongside the driveway at No.19 and follows a straight line across the lane to the northern end of the curved hedge. Furthermore, the GT/BGT object to the proposed chunky timber fencing and gates. We would prefer the use of traditional style metal fencing and gates which would be much more architecturally appropriate in this part of the RPG as well as having a lighter, less intrusive impact in the immediate formal setting of the Stables and Coach House and the wider setting of the access routes and the Hall.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/BGT object to the principle of a boundary in this position and urge the Council to refuse this application. However, if a boundary is permitted, it should continue the line of the driveway hedge and be marked by traditional-style metal railings and gates.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E21/1918	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Discharge of condition 31 on application 13/2935M - Outline application with all matters reserved except for means of access, for the erection of a high quality residential development (use class C3) with associated woodland buffer, ecological mitigation and enhancements,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</p> <p>Cheshire Gardens Trust is responding on behalf of The Gardens Trust (a statutory consultee) on the discharge of conditions 9 and 31 related to the above planning application. It should be noted that considerable time has been given to site visits, meeting with the developers and commenting on this application. The Trust has previously expressed its concern with detailed comments over the treatment of the boundary adjoining Tatton Park estate in terms of security and visual impact.</p> <p>The Trust has offered advice and written comments on the boundary treatment and it is disappointed that it appears that this advice has been</p>

				<p>and open spaces Land North of Parkgate Industrial Estate, Parkgate Lane, KNUTSFORD, CHESHIRE, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>diluted or ignored. There are continued concerns over security and while Ilex (holly) hedging may prove suitable in the future, a more substantial barrier needs to address the immediate problem of unauthorised access. Parkland and structures are subject to theft and vandalism, along with poaching; Tatton is no different in this sense to other estates as it is not possible to patrol and fully secure. The current proposals will in effect, promote illegal access, vandalism and theft.</p> <p>The other key issue which the Trust has previously made comment relates to visual impact. The adjacent woodland is an important economic resource for Tatton Estate and woodlands require long term management strategies which include thinning, felling and replanting. Harvesting of trees should be seen as both an economic benefit and one that can produce bio-diversity. Again, the Trust has previously commented that additional planting is required on the Parkgate Farm land to mitigate the negative impact of managing the woodland. A more substantial planting along the border would benefit both the Estate and the new residents by visually softening and reducing the impact.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust does not support the Discharge of Conditions 9 and 31. E M Bennis Cheshire Gardens Trust CGT Planning Committee</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E21/1812	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single and two storey extensions to provide accommodation associated with the existing furniture restoration, manufacturing and education business; and the regularisation of 2 flats Wheathills Farm Brun Lane Mackworth Derby Derbyshire DE22 4NE BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.01.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation relating to the modifications on the north side of Wheathills Farm facing towards Kedleston. What is currently a low-key rear elevation will be transformed into a considerably larger array of gables and windows, visible from Vicar Wood on the south side of Kedleston. The applicant has confirmed that Vicar Wood is visible from the property - it is visible on Google Street View, but in summer it may be screened by deciduous broadleaved trees, although these are not very dense.</p> <p>The applicant's HIA is inadequate and does not appreciate that Vicar's Wood is part of the Grade I registered park and garden (RP&G) of Kedleston Hall and is not merely a screen to hide it. From the documentation provided it is not possible for us to ascertain to what</p>

					<p>degree the proposals might actually be visible and to what extent they may impact negatively on the setting of Kedleston.</p> <p>In order for the GT and your officers to adequately establish whether or not this application causes harm to the setting of the RPG, we would ask that your officers request the applicant provide proper images from the south side of Vicar Wood towards the development site to demonstrate the existing degree of visibility & hence the likely impact.</p> <p>Until we are able to satisfy ourselves as to the impact of the proposals upon the setting of Kedleston RPG, we would like to submit a holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Parnham House	Dorset	E21/1753	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erect 6 no. Orchard Cottages and installation of a new bridge Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster DT8 3LZ RESIDENTIAL, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with colleagues in the Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>This is the second application for a small part of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Parnham within just over a month. In commenting on P/FUL/2021/05299 (24.12.21) for four units, the GT/DGT commented that, while there was no real objection to the proposal in that particular location, there was also no objective assessment of the entire estate, but only a justification for the development of a small area. We suggested that there was a need at Parnham for a more comprehensive plan setting out how the designated park/garden area was to be managed. This is a second proposal on the same lines as the first one. Again, the documentation submitted, including the Heritage Report, does not look at the whole designated area, but is a justification of the proposal on a small area. We would like to reiterate that we strongly urge the submission of a Masterplan as part of any consideration of this or any other planning application. The site must be considered as a whole.</p> <p>Development at Parnham therefore appears to be taking place piecemeal. Until there is evidence that a more comprehensive approach is being taken at Parnham, the Trust objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Weald Park	Essex	E21/1733	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Provision of a sporting village with focus on clay pigeon shooting, including the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a separate clubhouse and country store together with twelve stands around the perimeter of the woodland and associated hard and soft landscaping works. Bennets Farm Weald Road South Weald Brentwood Essex CM14 5QR</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This application is for the development of a sporting village, with a focus on clay pigeon shooting. Existing buildings of an agricultural character at Bennets Farm would be replaced with new ones on a similar footprint. Car parks would be created and the access lane from Weald Road widened. The site is in the Green Belt, and at the southern edge of the Grade II Weald Park registered park and garden (RPG). In origin Weald Park was a manor belonging to Waltham Abbey, and after the Reformation passing through the hands of a series of owners. In the late 17th century, it was acquired by the Smith family who improved the house and grounds. A 1738 map attributed to the French surveyor Bouginion who worked at the nearby Thorndon Hall shows walled gardens and an extensive formal park landscape with a belvedere tower on a mount. The house was demolished in 1951.</p> <p>In 1973 much of the estate was acquired by Essex County Council for use as a Country Park which is located in the area of the deer park north of Weald Road and the former house. Bennets Farm is situated south of Weald Road in what was known as the Front Park.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets,</p> <p>Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views. Page 11 of this document relates to the experience of the heritage asset, in particular 'Noise, vibration and other nuisances; Tranquillity ... and Busyness, bustle, movement and activity.' Although the proposed development can be seen as marginal to the Country Park and the main registered landscape, its cumulative effects of noise, traffic and more intensive use on a sensitive area are contrary to HE's Advice Note and would be such that we cannot support this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Highnam Court	Gloucestershire	E21/1779	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 95 dwellings and up to 3ha of commercial space associated with the expansion of Highnam Business Centre as well as associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except for access. Land North And South Of , Newent Road, Highnam RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.01.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. This set of proposals as an Outline application only seeks to gain consent from TBC for a land-use without any specified detail, and highway access. In short the devil will be in the detail. The principle of an extension to the Highnam Business Centre was accepted in the made Highnam Neighbourhood Plan. This proposal extends that approved area and makes little necessity for any certain construction of a landscape screen and buffer to shield its visual impact from Highnam Court and its park and gardens, and from The Church of the Holy Innocents (Grade1). It would be vital to ensure that any development in this part of the submission accords with the made NDP, and the scale and character of the existing Business Centre. Large sheds and inappropriate materials would certainly be matters for objection. The development north of the B4215 does not in itself cause too many problems of visual impact and loss of character in relation to the heritage assets located to the south, However, reading the objections and knowing the area, the Borough should take the issues of highway safety and inevitable future damage to the village cohesion of Highnam very seriously. There seems to be the distinct possibility that creative long-term planning opportunities will be missed again in the absence of a master plan for the future IF development is anticipated over the TBC Local Plan period.. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Syon Park Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Osterley Park	Greater London	E20/0868	I I II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the demolition of existing building and car park and erection of buildings to provide up to 1,677 residential homes, plus up to 5,000 sqm flexible non-	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.01.2022 Summary of Case for the following applications: Planning Inspectorate APP/F5540/V/21/3287726: Homebase site, Syon Lane: Local Planning Authority reference: 00505/H/P19 Tesco site, Syon Lane: Local Planning Authority reference: 01106/B/P137 The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee for development affecting a site of any grade included by Historic England (HE) on its

				<p>residential space comprising commercial, business and service space, and/or learning and non-residential institution space, and/or local community space, and/or public house/drinking establishment, and/or a mobility hub, along with associated access, bus turning, car and cycle parking, and landscaping arrangements. TESCO SUPERSTORE, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5NZ. MAJOR HYBRID OUTCOME 13.12.2021 CALLED IN FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY 15.03.2022 REF APP/F5540/V/21/3287727</p>	<p>Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG). The GT strongly objected to both these applications and asked for them to be called-in for public inquiry. We have been asked to summarise the main points which we will be making in our representation to be submitted later in January in advance of a case conference you are holding on 10th January. Please find below our summary.</p> <p>Our main point is that the applications will cause an unacceptably damaging degree of harm to the views from three of the most important sites on Historic England’s Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (RPG) in England: Osterley Park (Grade II*), Syon Park (Grade I and part of the RBG World Heritage Site Kew Buffer Zone) and the RBG, Kew (Grade I and WHS) and key listed structures within those designs.</p> <p>Reason for Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We do not object to the principle of redevelopment of the proposed areas. <p>We do object to the prominent visibility of the scheme in views from three parks of high national significance (two are additionally of international importance) which will be damaged to a high degree. Listed structures of the highest significance which form key elements of these designs will also be affected including at Syon Grade I Syon House, Pepperpot Lodges, and London Gateway, and at Kew, Grade I King’s Observatory and Grade II Isleworth Ferry Gate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. All three parks survive intact and are of national, and in the case of Syon and Kew, international significance. Only 1700 sites in England are Registered, 40% of which are Grade II* and 10% Grade I. 3. These three sites are rare and valuable cultural artefacts. The principal design phases affected in each date from the C18 at the height of the English Landscape Style as exemplified by the work of Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown, Britain’s foremost and internationally influential C18 designer. This style has been identified as Britain’s greatest contribution to the visual arts worldwide, of which the pastoral character of the views is a key feature. Despite C19 modifications, key C18 views survive to a great degree from the sectors of these sites which will be affected and are seminal to their significance. 4. Reflecting guidance in the NPPF, Para. 199, in considering the impact of the development on the significance of the range of nationally and internationally significant designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation, bearing in mind that the more important
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the asset, the greater the weight should be, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The identification of the levels of significance of the heritage assets affected and effects of the proposals on these significances has not been supplied by the applicant but credible research and analysis by members of the Gardens Trust and others has identified multiple high significances and the greatly damaging effect of the proposals.</p> <p>5. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that ‘Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.’ Such justification has not been demonstrated in the documentary evidence submitted by the applicant and in any case is unjustifiable.</p> <p>6. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal’. The harm is not outweighed by the public benefits.</p> <p>Our objection is based on three elements of the effects of the proposal:</p> <p>A. The Level and Extent of Harm to Views in Three Nationally Significant Landscapes</p> <p>7. The level of harm inflicted on three nationally significant designed landscapes is unacceptable.</p> <p>The applicant did not identify the true extent of the damage to historic assets, nor accurately identify the level of damage caused to views in their setting.</p> <p>8. Our initial objections and assessment of the inaccuracy of the applicant’s TVIA (Dec 2020) have been confirmed and amplified by analysis of specially commissioned verified photographic views. These views are to be submitted to you as part of evidence by OWGRA and the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew.</p> <p>9. Since our initial objections, additionally in all three sites we have identified further significant damage to their pastoral views which form such a key element of their respective designs. In our representation we will set out the significance of the major affected features and viewpoints and demonstrate the damaging effects.</p> <p>10. The affected sectors of the respective settings of all three sites are visually relatively undamaged. Because of visual damage to sectors</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>elsewhere in each site, these sectors are all the more valuable to the individual sites and key features within them. The situation of the development on a high point will have a considerably worse effect than existing developments which are currently visible from these designed landscapes.</p> <p>11. Sample night-time shots from the riverside at Kew over Syon and from the present main drive at Syon, demonstrate that these views will be considerably damaged by night-time light pollution. They also indicate the manner in which the other key views from all three sites which are affected in daytime will be damaged at night.</p> <p>12. Syon Park will suffer further damage to its significant designed views and setting beyond that which we originally identified from the current main drive. Elsewhere the development will be damagingly visible from at least the main vista over the park aligned on Syon House between the Grade I Pepperpot Lodges; and the view out over the Grade I Robert Adam main gateway (Lion Gate) from the former main (north) drive across the park and the park lake. The latter is</p> <p>1 Para 199 NPPF July 2021: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.</p> <p>one of Syon's surviving iconic scenes of cattle in parkland, with Brown's lake, and the Lion Gate as the backdrop. There will be other views as badly affected.</p> <p>B. Damage to the setting of the last undamaged reach of the Arcadian Thames between RBG Kew WHS and Syon Park Buffer Zone</p> <p>13. This reach of the Arcadian Thames flanked by RBG, Kew and Syon Park has been celebrated nationally and internationally since the early C18. In modern times it has been identified by many scholars as being of key significance in the development of the English Landscape Style. Key views which remain without modern intrusion will be considerably damaged, particularly the internationally significant views of Syon Park from Kew and the riverside towpath, identified in both the RBG Kew WHS Management Plan (2020) and the Syon Park Historic Landscape Management Plan (2011) as well as by various scholarly authors in their publications.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>14. Elsewhere Kew's relationship with its setting as the backdrop to the adjacent Arcadian Thames has been considerably damaged by intrusive modern development, particularly to the north alongside Brentford town. This is the last surviving, and most important, sector of its Thameside setting to survive undamaged.</p> <p>15. The Grade I King's Observatory was built specifically for observing the sky from its elevated dome by George III in 1768-69, set in the Old Deer Park, now within the Grade I Kew RPG and in the WHS Buffer Zone. From the dome, designed for internationally significant pioneering scientific purposes, the panoramic view is remarkably well preserved as an almost unbroken tree/sky line. This view will be significantly damaged by the development visible in alien form above the tree line.</p> <p>16. The applications will harm the outlook from south-western parts of RBG Kew, in particular the outlook from the seminal C18 Capability Brown Syon Lawn across the Arcadian Thames to Syon House and Park. The development will appear above the tree line forming the backdrop to both internationally significant landscapes, and Grade I Listed Syon House which forms the main eye-catcher in RBG Kew's borrowed views of Syon Park. This outlook is at present, remarkably almost entirely unaffected visually by modern development, with an unbroken tree line along this reach of the river. These areas of Kew's setting possess priceless attributes, which contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of Kew as set out in its WHS Management Plan 2020-2025, and ratified by this government in 2020.</p> <p>17. The significance of the work at Kew and Syon by Britain's foremost and internationally influential C18 designer Lancelot 'Capability' Brown, has been heightened by research and analysis carried out resulting from the 2016 festival celebrating his tercentenary. This confirmed their uniqueness as a pair of landscapes linked in design terms by Brown in such a prominent and influential position. The design of each draws on the other as well as the river setting as reciprocal borrowed landscapes. They occupy a social and geographical position of great renown on the river at the C18 heart of the nation and its international context which acquired acclaim, publicity and influence worldwide. The quality and contribution of his Syon design are such that it has been suggested for inclusion within the WHS in the 2011 Syon Park Management Plan.</p> <p>C. Visual Mitigation is Impossible</p> <p>18. Visual mitigation of the upper level of the development above the tree</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>line is impossible and key views will be permanently damaged. The trees forming the screen for the lower level are not a long term and sustainable solution.</p> <p>19. The upper level of the development can never be adequately screened. It will breach the line of the existing vegetation screen seen from all three designed landscapes and their affected heritage assets at large scale. The alien form and materials will badly damage the Arcadian characteristics with an imposing modern intrusion.</p> <p>20. In all three sites, to screen the lower level of the structures the proposals rely in large part on mature and over-mature tree belts and lines remaining. The retention of the vegetation is not guaranteed, and may not last long, given age, condition and increasing extreme weather events. Loss will expose still further the alien structures.</p> <p>21. Replacement like-for-like screening trees in these three sites is neither guaranteed by ownership or management agreements nor necessarily historically or ecologically appropriate. The trees in the SSSI of Syon Tidal Meadow are likely to fall and cannot be replaced, as part of the management agreement with Natural England.</p> <p>22. Replanting and views management in the three sites should respect the C18 planting schemes which have been supplemented and some cases overtaken by more dense screening which is historically inappropriate and if removed would leave the development still more starkly visible.</p> <p>D. Conclusion</p> <p>23. Our decades of experience show it is extremely rare that three such highly significant designed landscapes containing such important key component features and structures are affected to this degree by irreversible damage from a scheme, with a consequent highly damaging effect on the cultural heritage of England.</p> <p>24. This scheme would be unacceptable were it to damage any one of these landscapes in this way. The level of damage caused to the setting of three sites of such significance is sufficient that with reference to NPPF Paras 199 and 200 the scheme should be refused.</p> <p>25. Regarding Paragraph 202 of the NPPF this development proposal will lead to damage at the upper end of 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of many designated heritage assets. In weighing this harm against the public benefits of the proposal the harm is not outweighed by the public benefits.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Syon Park Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Osterley Park	Greater London	E20/0871	I I II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for the demolition of existing building and car park and erection of buildings to provide 473 residential units, a replacement retail foodstore with additional commercial, business and service space, and a flexible community space, and ancillary plant, access, servicing and car parking (400 customer spaces and 105 residential spaces), landscaping and associated works. HOMEBASE LTD, SYON LANE, ISLEWORTH TW7 5QE. MAJOR HYBRID OUTCOME 13.12.2021 CALLED IN FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY 15.03.2022 REF APP/F5540/V/21/3287726	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.01.2022 As per E20/0868 above
Clissold Park	Greater London	E21/1404	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of a splash pad to the bowling green and amendments to the bowling pavilion to create water treatment plantroom with new toilet and showering facilities. Bowling Green Pavilion, Clissold Park Green Lanes, Hackney MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2022 I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Clissold Park * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). We welcome this investment in the facilities on offer to park users at Clissold Park. The designs as shown do no harm to the historic character of the park which is listed in its own right. We would however, caution any future

					<p>fencing off of the facility which would start to fracture the character of the park. We also request that a watching brief be applied to the construction to watch out and record any hard landscaping uncovered during works. Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we be of any further help,</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Victoria Tower Gardens	Greater London	E21/1455	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Detailed Tree Protection Method Statement and details of arboricultural site supervision and record keeping pursuant to Conditions 8 and 9 of planning permission called in and approved by the Minister of State for Housing dated 29 July 2021 (ref: APP/XF990/V/19/3240661). The Victoria Tower Gardens, Millbank, London, SW1P 3YB TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.01.2022 Further to Mr and Mrs Peck's letter on behalf of the Save Victoria Tower Campaign and local residents, I wanted to thank you belatedly too for including me in your meeting of 20th December with local residents and to wish you both a Happy New Year! The meeting was helpful and I noted the feedback from Councillors' about the difficult position Westminster City Council finds itself in with regards the special conditions and the statutory timeframe for assessing these. I also noted the Council's intent to clarify its position in the S288 Appeal where WCC is listed as a Defendant. I am grateful to WCC lawyers for writing to the High Court. The WCC currently has a number of outstanding HMLC scheme Planning Conditions showing as live and pending on its planning portal, which have extended beyond the decision target date. The Trust has already fed back concerns over some these. We continue to ask that the Council dismisses the special conditions we flag on the basis of what has currently been presented particularly the application relating to Construction Logistics 21/05887/ADFULL which now has out of date proposals. As discussed, we are particularly concerned that some of the enabling works are potentially irreversible such as the cutting of tree roots. At our meeting I mentioned that I had asked The Royal Parks about the enabling works and they provide more detail as follows: "UKHMC has outlined their enabling works which TRP split into 3 levels as follows. Level 1 – site surveys Level 2 - Welfare and trial holes Level 3 – More significant enabling works None of the above constitute the main Construction Works. Level 1 site surveys (non-invasive) are to be commence in January 2022.</p>

					<p>These will comprise non-intrusive visual surveys and inspections of artefacts and entrances, GPS survey of the Gardens, and visual inspection of the Thames Water Sewer.</p> <p>Level 2 works – These have been rescheduled to February, and commencement cannot begin until the Construction Logistics Plan has been discharged by WCC.</p> <p>Level 3 works include the relocation of the Spicer Memorial and other key invasive enabling works, which will now obviously be dependent on the outcome of the review.</p> <p>Anything related to the trees, i.e., pruning and associated works, will all be contained within the Arboricultural Method Statement. This must be submitted to Westminster City Council and nothing may commence until WCC approval.</p> <p>This is a planning condition. Barrell Consultants – who have had similar roles in Green Park on construction of the Bomber Command Memorial, and the construction of the new park wall - have been appointed by F.M. Conway to oversee the works.”</p> <p>The Trust believes that the trial holes proposed as part of Level 2 works could give rise to irreversible and undesirable impacts on the health of the trees. These should not be agreed to until all legal proceedings are complete or there is sufficient evidence to show the limitations of this work and prove no damage likely. Clearly Level 3 works should not be progressed at all without certainty over the legal proceedings.</p> <p>In their correspondence with the Trust, you may also be interested to know that that the UKHMLC has now indicated to the The Royal Parks, that the programme is not likely to commence until spring 2023.</p> <p>The Trust agrees with Save Victoria Tower Gardens and local residents, that there has been insufficient detail provided about the proposed scheme site boundaries during construction and the access arrangements to remaining parts of the public park – these should remain as open as possible for the longest period of time.</p> <p>The Trust supports the residents in the additional concerns they raise about Trees and Flooding. In particular, the Trust supports the residents desire to see the river wall repairs take place sooner – repairs as part of the enabling works would make the site safer for construction workers too.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Monger Director</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Cannizaro Park	Greater London	E21/1614	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of new pathways, the reconfiguration of existing paths and the creation of new flower beds in existing rose garden. Cannizaro Park, West Side Common, Wimbledon.</p> <p>FOOTPATH</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2022</p> <p>Further to our earlier correspondence, I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Cannizaro Park * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>We understand the need for this redesign and raise no objection to the replanting.</p> <p>However, although we also agree that the Rose Garden is a later addition to the grounds listed Grade II* on the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) we do not consider it to be of no importance and therefore welcome this sensitive reconfiguration.</p> <p>The new designs as shown do no harm to the historic character of the park which is, of course, listed in its own right. We do, however, ask for the present planting to be recorded – the choice of the original rose varieties being of some historic interest, even if it is now appropriate to replace them with more modern varieties for display and health reasons. We also request that a watching brief be applied to the construction to watch out for and record any historic hard landscaping features uncovered during works.</p> <p>Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we can be of any further help,</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Trent Park	Greater London	E21/1662	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 2 of 16/04324/FUL (as varied under reference 20/03992/VAR) to allow 1) amendments to the Walled Garden comprising</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2022</p> <p>Further to our earlier correspondence, I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic</p>

				<p>reduction in the number of homes from 32 to 22, revised housing mix, increase in build footprint, alterations to the design of the buildings, increase in the size of private gardens, removal of private terraces at first floor level, decrease in the size of the communal garden with changes in layout ; 2) amendments to the Gardeners Cottage comprising a new private garden and alterations to window and door openings ; 3) amendments to the Energy Statement and; 4) amendments to the Landscape Masterplan. Former Middlesex University Trent Park, Bramley Road, N14 4YZ. MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Trent Park and Trent Country Park * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>We have little to comment on this variation except to regret the increase of building footprint and reduction in size of the communal gardens. We would also reiterate the importance of the Pergola restoration (renamed Wisteria Walk) and the hope that this is tightly conditioned to happen in an appropriate and timely manner. And ask that all retained trees and hedges be protected by planning condition and future fencing and buildings in gardens also be conditioned to avoid further loss of the garden character. Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we can be of any further help,</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Syon Park Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Greater London	E21/1710	I I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of five blocks ranging from one to eight storeys, to provide 209 residential units (Use Class C3) together with 1,190sq.m of floorspace at ground floor level, comprising; up to 1,190sq.m (Use Class E); at least 186sq.m (Convenience Store - Use Class E(a)); up to 176sq.m (Hot Food Takeaway - Sui Generis), with associated hard and soft landscaping, parking and servicing, cycle and refuse stores, boundary treatments and other associated works.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.01.2022 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. As such, it has longstanding experience of managing change within historic designed landscapes established over many decades. Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding. The GT is the leading scholarly organisation dedicated to the history and conservation of designed landscapes internationally. It originated over 55 years ago at an early stage in the study of this subject, as its predecessor organization, The Garden History Society. It has since published numerous scholarly articles on subjects worldwide in its peer reviewed and internationally respected journal Garden History. The GT therefore has not just a national, but an international understanding of this discipline and the wider context of England's designed historic landscapes. The GT strongly objects to this application and urges it be refused. We have visited Kew and seen how the proposal relates to RBG Kew Grade I RPG and World Heritage Site (WHS). We have independently identified its</p>

				<p>CHARLTON HOUSE ALBANY ROAD BRENTFORD TW8 0NG DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>effect on the combined C18 Arcadian and C19 botanical garden characters which dominate this scene at Kew. It is seen in the gap between Kew Palace and the kitchen block of the White House.</p> <p>Our concerns relate to the height and massing in relation to the incremental effect the development would have specifically on the setting of RBG Kew RPG and WHS, focussed on views from and the extensive designed setting of the Grade I listed Kew Palace. The present single building is replaced with a wall of building, hardening the backdrop of Kew Palace in views from it and views from the Great Lawn in front of it in a panorama including Chambers' Grade I listed Orangery. The development will be visible from the Broad Walk and Great Lawn in Kew looking towards Kew Palace. The scheme reduces the amount of clear sky around the Palace still further, incrementally contributing to the visible urban hardening to the boundary of the World Heritage site which is already damaged, and further damaging the RPG, and setting of both Kew Palace and to a lesser extent the Orangery. The upper levels of the proposed development would be visible above the interposing buildings north of the river. Whilst the scale would be slightly lower than the current building's roof and planting, the increased massing of the proposals would increase the perception of a single, visually dominant, building form behind the Palace. It continues to contribute to the presence of modern development behind Kew Palace, damaging the designed landscape and setting that forms a key component of the internationally significant RPG and WHS, Kew Palace and Orangery.</p> <p>We object to the visual effect of this application on the C18 Arcadian character and C19 botanical garden character in this part of the RPG, as well as the setting of key built structures including Kew Palace and the Orangery. This character is steadily being eroded by continual development in Brentford and as far afield as the elevated section of the M4 which is entirely unacceptable and highly damaging to the setting. The combined height, bulk, materials and massing of the proposal contribute yet another alien form of overdevelopment. This will increase the apparently unstoppable, incremental damage being caused by the current development, and seemingly unchecked, development scramble in Brentford to the significance of the World Heritage Site, RPG, other heritage assets and key areas of the landscape and riverside setting of the RPG/WHS.</p> <p>This is contrary to policies LP1, LP2, LP3, LP4, LP5, LP6 and LP18 of the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan and the Thames Landscape Strategy. It</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>is also contrary to the RBG Kew WHS Management Plan (2020), including a setting study, which is accepted by parties on the WHS Steering group including representatives of your own council. In the Hounslow Local Plan (2015) Policy CC4 Paragraph d) on Heritage refers to: 'Working with Royal Botanic Gardens Kew World Heritage Site to conserve and enhance the outstanding universal values of The Royal Botanical Gardens Kew World Heritage Site, its buffer zone and its setting, including views to and from this asset. This includes assisting in the implementation of the World Heritage Site Management Plan.' This proposal is also contrary to your own policy.</p> <p>Therefore I reiterate that the GT strongly objects to this application and urges it be refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Grange Lodge London Road, Wallington	Greater London	E21/1802	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Part demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a single storey side extension. Grange Lodge London Road Wallington SM6 7BT DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2022</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see Beddington Park and The Grange, including Carew Manor (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>This building is also within the Beddington Park Conservation Area and a positive contributor to the historic character.</p> <p>The existing Lodge is part of the Grange landscape which was originally created by Alfred Smee between about 1858 and his death in 1872. His son Alfred Hutchison Smee built a house within the garden about 1880 and the Lodge was almost certainly created as part of the approach to this. The building is therefore a significant part of the landscape of The Grange. Its contribution to the landscape is explicitly recognised in paragraph 3.24 of the Draft Character Appraisal of the Conservation Area dated October 2020 which says:</p> <p>Grange Lodge, adjacent to the Grange, is a single-storey building probably</p>

					<p>dating from 1880 when the original Grange was built. The modest lodge building is an attractive feature in the streetscape, featuring a cross-gabled structure of flint and brick construction with half-timbered gables and a tiled roof with two prominent brick chimney stacks.</p> <p>The application proposes to demolish more than half of the existing Lodge and to rebuild it as a larger structure with a greater footprint. The majority of the existing walls are of knapped flint and mortar which is a key feature of the protected character of the building, as are the use of flat tiles on the roof and the brown (probably) stone dressing around the windows. The drawings showing the existing and proposed elevations seem to suggest that the new build is to use similar materials to the existing. However, section 10 of the application form says that the existing walls are 'face brick masonry block cavity wall insulation' and that the roof is of 'corrugated curved roof tile'. This is NOT correct.</p> <p>The use of such materials would seriously compromise the character of the building and undermine the significant contribution it makes to the conservation area and the wider park and gardens.</p> <p>We fully understand the need by the occupiers to improve their living conditions but the position of the lodge in the park and conservation area, and its historic importance, means any extensions should be subordinate to the original footprint and character. Although on paper the proposed extension looks straightforward it does not reflect the disproportionate impact such works will have on the character, authenticity and quality of the heritage asset.</p> <p>If the plan is approved there should be conditions attached requiring;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use of flat roof tiles and flint facing on the outer sides of the walls. (as original) 2. Features such as the timber on the gables and the crenelations on the 'tiebeams' be retained. 3. Demolitions plans and methodology be agreed before works begin to avoid excessive loss of original fabric. 4. Basic recording of the building, inside and out, prior to works including measured drawings and photographs. <p>Failure to protect the present character of the building will greatly reduce the contribution the building makes to the conservation area and undermine the quality of the park at this point.</p> <p>Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we can be of any further help,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer
Victoria Park	Greater London	E21/1905	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of existing site to accommodate two-storey community centre comprising nursery and community facility, ballcourt, playground, community garden, community orchard, and two x four storey buildings comprising 13 self-contained flats (all affordable rent tenure), together with landscape and access works (including 1 x disabled parking space and highway safety measures). Canal Club Community Centre, Waterloo Gardens, London, E2 9HP</p> <p>EDUCATION, RESIDENTIAL, LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2022</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (Victoria Park * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER) VICTORIA PARK, Non Civil Parish - 1000178 Historic England. We were not consulted on this application even though it directly impacts on the setting of the Grade II* listed Victoria Park. Please amend your records to ensure The Gardens Trust is informed of all applications impacting on parks and gardens in your borough.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unacceptable loss of mature trees 2. Loss of community gardens with access to the canal 3. Imposition of large buildings in very close proximity to the canal side 4. Unattractive aspect when viewed from the Grade II* listed park <p>Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we can be of any further help,</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Embley Park	Hampshire	E21/1786	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Improvements to outdoor playground Embley School, Senior School , Embley Park, Romsey, SO51 6ZE PLAY AREA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.01.2022</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 Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the sparse online documentation accompanying the proposals and were surprised that there was no Heritage Statement or any</p>

					<p>acknowledgement in the Planning Statement (PS) that the application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Embley Park, which is also on HE's At Risk Register. The PS states incorrectly (2.0) that Embley Park is a 'known conservation area'. This is incorrect, it is an RPG. The NPPF Paras 194 and 195, as you will be aware, require an applicant to describe the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected and the impact any development may have on them or their setting. The PS also goes on to say (2.0) that 'There are no developments on the proposed land. From the attached documents, there is nothing that enables us to easily and accurately pinpoint where within the RPG this playground is to be sited. By comparing the applicant's proposed site plan (19-170-HAM-05) with HE's register map, it would seem that the application site lies to the NE of Embley Park House, and is just to the north of the drive.</p> <p>The GT is concerned that the applicant does not seem to have appreciated the sensitivity of creating a new playground in an undeveloped area of the RPG. Whilst we do not object to the principle of creating a playground for the children at the school, we would have liked to have seen an indication of which sites had been considered, what impact the different options would have had on the setting and significance of the RPG and finally what mitigation measures might be possible, if indeed as your Conservation Officer Margaret Bennett has pointed out 'It is likely parts of the development would be clearly visible from the drive and in views in the central area of the park, and from (and with) the mansion. No photographs from key receptors have been provided.' We entirely concur with Ms Bennett's summary of the situation.</p> <p>Your officers will also be aware of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). Particularly, bearing in mind that Embley is on the At Risk Register, we would urge you to bear in mind this statement from p2 of SHA : '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' as well as (p4) 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.'</p> <p>We do not think the application should be considered without a proper</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>assessment of the visual impact of the scheme on the listed landscape, with suitable photos and illustrations as to how it will appear from various directions. In our opinion, the applicant has not appreciated the impact that such piecemeal development within the grounds has on the RPG, and we would like to stress that the context of the whole site must be taken into consideration when making changes. We would suggest that the applicant commissions a Conservation Management Plan so that the whole site can be assessed and areas of most sensitivity identified. This will undoubtedly be worthwhile should they be considering future development, as they will have a clearer understanding of the areas which are less likely to impact upon the setting and significance of the RPG. The GT/HGT submits a holding objection until the applicant can provide a Heritage Statement, evidence of which sites have been considered and some justification for the choice of this sensitive area of the RPG for the playground.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Westwood Park RECONSULTATION	Hereford and Worcester	E21/0762	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement of existing wooden chalet The Boathouse, Westwood Way, Droitwich Spa, WR9 0HE GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) about amendments to the above application. We have again discussed this with our colleagues in the Hereford and Worcestershire Gardens Trust and would be grateful if you could bear our additional joint comments in mind when deciding this application.</p> <p>The application relates to an existing timber chalet of a simple rectangular design, possibly a relic of the Ministry of Defence during WWII when Westwood was an MOD headquarters. The Boathouse itself, which is a little to the west of the chalet, was extended and given a contemporary make over some years ago. This wooden hut lies within the curtilage of the Boathouse. In our opinion, the proposals are too extensive and the hut, if it is to be replaced at all, should be of a simple, rectangular design so as not to increase the amount of cumulative development within the Grade II registered park and garden. We urge your officers to ensure that if permitted, the proposed replacement chalet stays within the existing footprint.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Statement of Community Involvement for SW Herts Joint Strategic Plan	Hertfords hire	E21/1489	N/A	LOCAL PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust on the SCI for the SWHJSP. We have been authorised to respond on behalf of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, on planning issues in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>We welcome the joint plan and are satisfied with the consultation strategy set out in the SCI document.</p> <p>We would welcome clarity on the linking of Local Plans be each authority and the Joint Plan and whether comments made by stakeholders at various stages during the preparation of Local Plans by each authority will also be taken into consideration during preparation of the Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>We would also welcome more information on the additional documents and evidence base which will support this plan and how these documents from each Local Plan are to be reconciled.</p>
9 Codicote Road, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E21/1708	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alterations to ground floor layout and proposed first floor extension 9 Codicote Road Welwyn AL6 9ND</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE. 11.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have objected to previous applications for this site on the grounds that the overdevelopment proposed in not in keeping with the established character of the area, that it would adversely affect views and the setting of adjacent dwellings. It would also be inappropriate development in the Green Belt</p> <p>The present proposals do not address these concerns and we object to them.</p>
Hunsdon Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E21/1771	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We have examined the draft plan and associated documents available on the website.</p> <p>We commented to the Hunsdon NP leader, Mr Frank O'Shea, in April 2021 on an earlier draft of the plan. Our comments are appended here. Several modifications were suggested but, despite that, HGT is listed in the Consultation Statement Summary of Points Provided by Statutory Consultee as unconditional support. This is incorrect.</p> <p>We have also been in contact with the consultant advising the NP team (summer 2021) about inclusion of undesignated historic parks within the plan. This has not been done.</p> <p>The comments we have on the plan are thus summarised: Policy HHC2 should also include the settings of landscapes and other heritage assets</p>

					<p>Undesignated heritage assets should include undesignated historic landscapes including Hunsdon Park and Bonningtons. HGT has reports on both these landscapes which have been supplied to the team. These do not appear in the List of Appendices on Page 13.</p> <p>We support Policy HE3 on Views on Page 42 but note that important views along the Briggens canal, which is aligned to both St Dunstan's church and Roydon Temple have not been included. They are somewhat obscured now but could be visible in the future if the landscape was managed as at the time of the design of the canal. We note that The Setting of Heritage Assets Good Practice Advice Note 3.2 from Historic England has not been included in Appendix A Heritage Assets</p> <p>The List of Heritage Assets at Appendix A could usefully include undesignated heritage assets. As with Hunsdon ponds, these could well become designated in the future but need protection and recognition in this current plan.</p> <p>Stansteadbury Registered Parkland lies adjacent to the Neighbourhood Plan area which is thus part of the setting of Stansteadbury Park. It would be useful for this heritage aspect to be included in the plan</p> <p>Dear Mr O'Shea</p> <p>Thank you for sending this through, together with comments from Historic England, and apologies for the delay in responding.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic parks and gardens, and has been authorised to respond on their behalf to planning issues regarding sites in Hertfordshire. Our comments, therefore, are purely to do with historic parks and gardens within the Hunsdon Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Section 8. Heritage and Conservation. The introductory sentence mentions only built environment. The area to the north of the river Stort contained, at various times, 13 important designed parks, from hunting parks to ornamental grounds. Only Briggens is designated but the others are of equal historic importance. One of these, Hunsdon you mention but not the recently Scheduled Ponds along the brook. We would welcome some reference to the historic designed landscapes of the area as there are many landscape features (see Rowe Anne, Medieval Parks and Hertfordshire and Tudor & Early Stuart Parks in Hertfordshire for details) which are worthy of consideration in planning decisions. In particular, the Hunsdon Brook Ponds are part of Henry VIII's park which was not only for hunting but also for ostentatious display being very similar to Italian Renaissance pond</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>chains, especially Pratolino laid out by the Medici. These ponds would have been visible from the roof of Hunsdon House, a favourite stand to observe the chase (now hidden by woodland) We know there were other parkland features, such as the hunting lodge depicted in the portrait of Edward VI. Further investigation may uncover more remains worthy of national designation.</p> <p>In Section 8.18 you discuss Briggens House estate. Bridgeman was the King's Gardener and thus his landscapes were of the highest quality but nowadays neglect and ignorance can cause loss of significance due to lack of appreciation of his precise engineering of the topography, Briggens also has another garden era of great significance, uncovered since the HE listing which is way out of date (2009). This is at the time of Lord Aldenham. The Arts and Crafts Gardens were laid out to the south east of the house, both formal sunk garden and shrub beds as well as terracing. These are exactly comparable, as confirmed by an HR inspector (formerly at Tyntesfield) with Tyntesfield (Grade II*) and Aldenham House (Grade II) both by members of the Gibbs family using same soft and hard landscaping palettes.</p> <p>Hunsdon House There are still remnants of the Tudor building at Hunsdon House and the views across the historic Hunsdon Park from the roof remain</p> <p>Olive's Farm This has a number of springs in it which led to Henry VIII's purchase of the land to protect the water supply to the Ponds in the valley below</p> <p>Policy HHC1 Section IV talks about Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monument but mentions Historic Parks & Gardens without mentioning whether Registered or not. Whilst Registered Parks and Gardens should be covered along with other designated assets, similar protection should be afforded to undesignated assets which form the majority of the heritage with the area . these are mentioned in policy HHC2 so clarification of Registered in HHC1 would be useful</p> <p>Section V. Hunsdon Brook Ponds should be added to the list as these were Scheduled in 2018</p> <p>Policy HHC2 We consider that Hunsdon Park should also be identified as an undesignated heritage asset. The Hunsdon Brook Ponds have been Scheduled but further features (such as Hunting Lodge footings) may also be uncovered and it contains a series of designed views to take in Hunsdon House and church.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Policy HE3 Views</p> <p>There are a number of historic views from Briggens along the canal, to the Temple at Roydon, and back to the church spire at St Dunstons as well as from Briggens House across to Stanstead Bury. Views within Hunsdon Park include the one from the pond toward the church and towards Hunsdon House with reciprocal views of the ponds with the great terrace.</p> <p>Policy HHD3</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a Green Gap to prevent coalescence of the two settlements. You may be interested in the work of the Central Herts Green Corridor group which defined the attributes of a Green Gap or corridor, for Green Belt reasons, wildlife/Biodiversity and public access. I can let you have something on that if you would like to see it.</p> <p>We have read the rest of the document and welcome the measures to conserve and enhance the vernacular character of the area's buildings and to allow well-designed infill development in specific areas. We have no further comments to make on the plan and hope, that with modification suggested, you can take it forward to the next stage.</p>
Kingsmead Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E21/1777	N	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Pre Submission Draft	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE: 10.01.2022</p> <p>We welcome this policy for the protection on non-designated heritage assets but are concerned that they include only those listed as currently identified. We would welcome a clause to include any newly discovered or newly appraised assets in this policy. For example, the historic industrial landscape along the canalised river could be included, not just the lock buildings etc.</p>
Panshanger	Hertfords hire	E21/1790	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the construction of the spine road and related highways including supporting drainage, infrastructure and landscaping works of the approved outline planning permission</p> <p>6/2018/0873/OUTLINE dated 13 February 2020</p> <p>Land North East of Welwyn Garden City Panshanger Welwyn</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Our comments on 6/2018/0873/OUTLINE, included a recommendation for sufficient screening on the north of the development to protect the heritage assets of listed Marden Hill House, Marden Hill Park and listed Panshanger Park from harm to their setting, both by reason of the built form of the new development and light pollution from street lights and housing. We consider that the minimal screening proposed in this application is insufficient. Further, there is insufficient evergreen planting proposed to give cover during the winter months. The views from Marden Hill House and Park across the river to the southern slopes of the Mimram valley are a key aspect of their setting and significance. Historic England GPA3.2 'Setting of Heritage Assets' sets out the issues and the NPPF requirements.</p>

				Garden City AL7 2QJ ROAD	A more robust northern screening belt for this development should be part of any proposal which is given planning permission.
Woodhall Park	Hertfords hire	E21/1801	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of 1 single storey Portakabin building to be used as an additional classroom for a period of 26 weeks. Heath Mount School Woodhall Park Watton At Stone Hertford Hertfordshire SG14 3NG MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. Heathmount is set within the Grade II* parkland of Woodhall Park which surrounds, and is the setting for, Grade I Woodhall Park mansion. We are disappointed that the Design and Access statement does not mention the heritage of the site nor attempt to evaluate the impact the proposed development will have on the heritage, contrary to the requirements in the NPPF. The buildings of this section of the school are partially screened by woodland but the former dell is overdeveloped with permanent structures at present. We consider an extra building, especially one of such basic utilitarian design as a Portakabin, to be inappropriate development, even for a limited period. It will cause further harm to the Registered parkland and the setting of the Listed mansion.. We therefore object to this proposal.
Poles Park	Hertfords hire	E21/1821	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of glass smoking shelter to replace the former timber smoking shelter. Install glass covered walk way to access the proposed glass smoking shelter from the pub. Maltons Cambridge Road Thundridge Hertfordshire SG12 OST	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The siting of the proposed smoking shelter is within the Registered Park of Poles (now Hanbury Manor), which is also the setting for the Grade II* listed house. We would therefore expect a heritage impact statement to be included with the application. The rear of the proposed shelter would be adjacent to the historic lodge for Poles and the roof and top part of the walls of the current shelter are visible from the Lodge and cause harm to the setting of the Lodge and the RPG. Whilst we have no objection in principle to a well-designed smoking annex, which does not harm the Registered landscape in which it is situated, we are concerned that the tinted green and clear glass polycarbonate roofs as illustrated in these plans are inappropriate in this historic landscape. No screening is proposed along the boundary fence to mitigate the harmful effect of the glass on the southerly part of the RPG. We therefore object to the plans as currently projected and would suggest that amendments to reduce the harm caused by the smoking annex to the RPG be made.
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E21/1892	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a part single, part three storey front extension	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments to make on the ground floor front extension but do

				27 Great North Road Hatfield AL9 6LB BUILDING ALTERATION	have concerns about the 3 storey glass porch. The design of this feature is out of keeping both with this house and with the neighbouring properties along Great North Road, which are of traditional design and of two-storeys. The addition of this glass structure and its size would cause harm to the character to the area.
Pishiobury	Hertfords hire	E21/1896	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey side extension and two storey rear extension. Alterations to fenestration 30 East Park Sawbridgeworth Hertfordshire CM21 9EX BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The rear of 30 east Park overlooks the Registered Capability Brown landscape of Pishiobury which is heavily wooded on this part of the boundary. We do not consider that the alterations proposed in this application would cause harm to this landscape and have no objections on heritage grounds.
13 Woodgate Avenue, Northaw	Hertfords hire	E21/1897	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory 13 Woodgate Avenue Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4EW DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Woodgate Avenue has been built over the historic Barvin Park landscape, with number 13 being sited at the rear of the former outbuildings. On the basis of the information in the is application we do not consider that the development would cause any harm to the remnants of the historic landscape
127 Oakdale, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/1914	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Reduce Copper Beech Tree by 33% 127 Oakdale Welwyn Garden City AL8 7QS TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.1.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This application does not contain sufficient details for us to comment fully. As this copper beech is a feature in the local landscape, we would suggest that expert advice is sought from the WHBC Tree Officer as to the necessity and extent of works to cut this tree back.
Waldershare Park	Kent	E21/0976	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to Gypsy/Traveller Site for 8no. pitches with 1no. static, 1no. tourer, 2no. parking spaces and dayroom per pitch (part retrospective) Land North Of Eastling Down Farm Cottages And East Of Sandwich Road Waldershare CT15 CHANGE OF USE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.01.2022 Further to your email of 26th January 2022 asking if it is 'our view that the development causes harm to its setting – (and) in what way?', I am sorry if our original response dated 6th September 2021 did not make this clear. I had hoped that the additional images I sent on 26th January 2022 showing the position of the application site in relation to the drive as shown on the Historic England register map entry, would help. You can imagine that having the land directly opposite an important area of the RPG, which set the arrival scene for visitors to the estate, covered with 8 traveller pitches and associated paraphernalia, can hardly be said to enhance the setting. It certainly changes the atmosphere and way in which one can understand

				<p>and appreciate the historical background to the RPG.</p> <p>I am sure you are familiar with Historic England’s extremely helpful document 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.</p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/</p> <p>It explains how development within the setting of a heritage asset can affect its significance in many different ways. For example, p2, ‘The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, (my emphasis) and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places..’ or 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’. (also my emphasis). It also goes on to refer to the ‘Experience of the Asset’ and how development within the vicinity may detract from our ability to understand the site’s historic significance.</p> <p>In particular (p11):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset • Visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point • Noise, vibration and other nuisances • Tranquillity, remoteness, ‘wildness’ • Busyness, bustle, movement and activity • Diurnal changes • Sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy <p>I hope that this adequately explains to you why placing a Traveller site directly opposite the end of a historic drive to a RPG is not something that in our opinion would enhance either the experience of this asset or its setting and significance. I am again attaching the two images I sent you</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>earlier so you can look at them with this letter to reinforce what I am hopefully explaining a little better.</p> <p>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting (ie. the RPG), the local planning authority shall have special regard (our emphasis) to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting (our emphasis again) or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66(1)). The Courts have interpreted preservation as meaning to keep safe from harm.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Harris Knowledge Park (Former Harris Orphanage)	Lancashire	E21/1582	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of site for residential use,including conversion of the former Harris Conference Centre (to 3 dwellings),Clayton Hall,Pond House,the Lodge and six existing villas (namely; Holly House, Poplars, Chestnuts,Oak House, Glenrosa,and theLaurels),erection of 3no. new build dwellings in the eastern part of site,erection of 16no. new build dwellings in western part of site, following demolition of the former Laundry Room,Yewtree House and former Workshop,including associated vehicular access,parking,and landscaping</p> <p>Harris Knowledge Park,Garstang Road,Preston,PR2 9XB</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.01.2022</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 Harris Knowledge Park comprises the former Harris Orphanage (including its wider site and the Recreation Ground) which is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden on the Historic England List, as well as a number of Grade II listed buildings and structures.</p> <p>Historic England advised in recent responses that the site is an example of ‘a rare and intact purpose-built orphanage’ which importantly has a strong domestic scale. Whilst there are some extensive intrusions from recent car parking, on the whole the site survives demonstrating the intentions of the original design. In addition, the whole site is a Conservation Area, enlarged in 2007 and reviewed and confirmed in 2017.</p> <p>LGT objected to applications to redevelop this site for residential development in 2013, and in 2020. We continue to have concerns about the current application. The reasons for this are explained below.</p> <p>Historic England have reviewed the designation of the Registered Park and Garden in 2021, in response to representations from the owner, particularly in relation to the status of the western portion of the site (former recreation ground). The review confirmed the significance of the</p>

					<p>former recreation ground as an intrinsic part of the Harris orphanage site and an important contribution to its significance. In addition, in the listing description HE recognises that this is the only surviving orphanage of this type with its associated landscape. The question arises as to whether this site should be upgraded to Grade II*.</p> <p>The hybrid application for residential development in 2020 was refused in view of the ‘unacceptable suburban development’, and ‘the erosion of character of the historic landscape’. The current application is for a different and reduced scheme. However, whilst residential use may be the only realistic long term use for the site, regrettably the resulting suburbanisation of the site may be unavoidable. Of particular concern are plots 13, 14, 15, 16 which compromise the openness and informal character of the site and the ability to sustain the character of the heritage setting. Therefore the quantum of development in the current application is still too great.</p> <p>Important details of planting and detailed landform design remain to be provided, as well as the requirement for a management plan. Furthermore, mechanisms are required to ensure that any eventual approved scheme is delivered as indicated in the application, and not changed and diminished by subsequent amending applications.</p> <p>Apart from the restoration and securing of uses for listed buildings, there appear to be no public benefits arising from the scheme. Whilst being suggested as a possible public benefit, the proposal to relocate the war memorial and statue will separate the memorial from its context as a focal point in front of the principal buildings on the site and place it in a relatively insignificant and constrained position adjacent to Garstang Road. As the memorial is on private land to which there is no long term right of access, a more suitable location requires to be identified within existing public open space, where there is sufficient area to allow safe congregation of the public on appropriate occasions.</p> <p>LGT’s position remains that we object to the proposed development which represents a total change of character of the Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area, and a complete loss of that part of the Registered Park and Garden comprised in the recreation ground. This can only be concluded as substantial harm as defined in NPPF, and therefore requiring exceptional circumstances (paragraph 194) to justify approval.</p> <p>The scheme still represents a considerable degree of suburbanisation and has not overcome the original reasons for refusal of application</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>06/2020/0222. We understand that there is widespread local objection to this scheme and until all other options for finding a use for this site have been explored then the current application should be refused. In summary LGT objects to the proposed development. If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me, by email conservation@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson S E Robson BSc BPhil MA(LM) DipEP CMLI MRTPI Chair, Conservation & Planning Group</p>
Oxburgh Hall	Norfolk	E21/1744	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Insertion of 4 no ground anchors in 'The Stables' Oxburgh Hall Stoke Ferry Road MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.02.2022 The Norfolk Gardens Trust supports this application. The proposed anchors will enhance section for equipment necessary to maintain the estate.</p>
Gunton Park	Norfolk	E21/1854	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of artwork Land At The Gunton Arms, Cromer Road, Thorpe Market, Norwich, Norfolk, NR11 8TZ MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.01.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this application. The Trust supports the application. The artwork is not unduly dominant and is an added feature of interest in Gunton Park.</p>
Belford Hall	Northumb erland	E21/1798	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey extensions to the rear of dwelling house + associated works Belford Hall, Old Walled Garden Belford Hall Drive Belford NE70 7EY BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.01.2022 Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Belford Hall, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. It is disappointing that the applicant's Design & Access and Heritage Statement overlooks the fact that, while the modern house is "not listed" (para 4.0), the site surely lies within the curtilage of the Grade II Listed Garden Wall, the west wall of the walled garden (NHLE, LEN:1233321). The statement that the development will have "negligible impact on the nearby listed assets" cannot therefore apply in the case of this garden wall to the west. The site also lies within the Grade II RPG, Belford Hall (NHLE, LEN:101574) and the Belford Conservation Area. Fortunately, a brief look at the older OS plans (not considered in the above statement) suggests that the proposed development will lie to the south of</p>

					<p>any buried remains of the principal glasshouse, sited at the centre of the heated north wall of the 2 acre walled garden. Any evidence for the fountain shown on the same edition [Northumberland Old Series Sheet XVI.6, revised 1897] will presumably have been destroyed when the modern house was built.</p> <p>Given this, and the fact that the proposed additions are single storey and will hopefully be effectively screened by the garden walls and shelter plantings from the wider RPG, the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust do not object to the proposals but would wish that greater interest in the history of the site, a significant component of an historic estate such as Belford Hall (hence the conservation designations), had been given a little more recognition and consideration in the application details.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Nun Appleton Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1628	I	FORESTRY COMMISSION Nun Appleton farm - Felling Licence Consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.01.2022</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 Nun Appleton, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The history of Nun Appleton stretches back to at least the 12th Century when it was a nunnery. Following the Dissolution, the property passed to Sir Thomas Fairfax (1521-99) and his descendant Thomas, Third Lord Fairfax, as General Fairfax, commanded the Parliamentary forces from 1654-1650 when he retired. It is this mid17th Century period which is most interesting from a historic designed landscape and garden standpoint although we understand little or almost nothing seems to survive above ground. Like John Aislabie at Studley Royal in the early 18th Century and many others, Fairfax spent his retirement laying out his gardens at Nun Appleton designing them formally with a military theme. Andrew Marvell, tutor to Mary Fairfax dedicated his poem Upon Appleton House to her father, General Fairfax and emphasized the natural beauty of the site and the formal gardens. The park developed later during the ownership of the Milner family in the 18th Century and later in the mid19th Century when</p>

					<p>Lady Milner also created a formal garden with a fishpond. A little later she created a terrace along the south side of the house and linked the smaller parts of the garden together, along with draining the park and ordering the embankment of the River Wharfe. When Nun Appleton was in Fairfax ownership the land was described as ‘a noble park with splendid oak trees’ (ref: CR Markham). And the Andrew Marvell poem mentions shady woods and woodland with mature trees.</p> <p>The estate is very private, and we have never been able to visit.</p> <p>Compartments 1-10 are within the Registered Park and Garden, the other compartments are well beyond to the west. The felling licence is for thinning with only one small compartment no 4, (0.72ha) within the registered boundary to be clear felled. This is 100% Sitka spruce and European larch and is to be replanted with 70% oak, 15% lime and 15% hornbeam. The compartments seem to be 20th century woodland planting.</p> <p>Compartment 1 Home Farm Plantation embraces the east side of the pond at Home Farm and post-dates the 1906 OS map (published 1908). The thinning will be of sycamore and Scots pine.</p> <p>Compartments 2,3,4,5 are the Acaster Belt along with compartment 6. The southern part of this eastern registered boundary belt is called Walnut Grove. We don’t know if there have been walnuts in these compartments before the 20th century but it’s an interesting name and maybe historically walnuts were planted by the boundary track which was probably a pleasure ground ride from the Hall.</p> <p>Apart from compartment 3 which has pedunculate oak and Scots pine, the other compartments for thinning are broadleaves (sycamore/ash) with conifers and we note that the conifers are mainly Scots pine; a good designed landscape tree.</p> <p>Compartments 7 and 8 are Sicklebit Wood, birch, pedunculate oak and sycamore, to the south of Walnut Grove and near the River Wharfe.</p> <p>Compartments 9 and 10 are sycamore, ash, Norway spruce and Scots pine woodland forming part of the southern registered boundary, and east of the serpentine fish pond which is part of the pleasure gardens extending east from the terrace.</p> <p>Compartments 2-6, 9 and 10 are depicted on the 1906 OS map (published 1908), little has changed. Some conifers are marked on the 1906 map, but we don't have any information about which species may have been planted originally. We can only note for future reference that new exotic</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>conifers became very fashionable following introductions from North America from the 1850's. But the conifers currently in the compartments have probably been planted relatively recently and we understand not well-managed.</p> <p>Where the woodland edge faces onto the park it will be important in views, so we recommend particular care there. Where possible the woodland edge should reflect all the species planted in the compartments.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposal. Our references below may be of interest.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Valley Gardens and South Cliff Gardens	North Yorkshire	E21/1709	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building repairs to the clock tower Holbeck Clock Tower Esplanade Scarborough North Yorkshire YO11 2AF REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</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, in this case Ripley Castle. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are very pleased that these roof repairs are being carried out and we have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ripley Castle	North Yorkshire	E21/1795	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Repair the roofs of Ripley Castle including additional sump, lead chute and cast iron downpipe, new internal launder to central roof, change roof covering on study and porch roof from lead to terne coated steel, replace rooflights and glazed lantern, install maintenance walkways and change roof slate on Knights Tower to Burlington Kirby Blue. Ripley Castle Hollybank Lane</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</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, in this case Ripley Castle. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are very pleased that these roof repairs are being carried out and we have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>

				Ripley HG3 3AY REPAIR/RESTORATION	
Rudding Park	North Yorkshire	E21/1798	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Partial demolition of existing driving range building, erection of two storey driving range building including retail provision, teaching facilities, cafe / bar and associated areas (Use Class E(a), E(b), E(d), F2(c) and Sui Generis). Reconfiguration and extension to existing car park, earthworks relating to the reconfiguration of existing ground contours and golf bunkers with all associated landscaping, ancillary storage and apparatus and all engineering, drainage works and operations. Rudding Park Driving Range Follifoot North Yorkshire</p> <p>DEMOLITION, SPORT/LEISURE, PARKING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.01.2022</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 – Rudding Park 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>Rudding Park is notable for its links with Humphry Repton who drew up a Red Book in 1790 for its then owner Lord Loughborough, and then later the work on the gardens by James Russell in the mid- 20th Century.</p> <p>Rudding Park Golf Club, Academy and Trackman Driving Range (which this application relates to) is located to the south-west of Rudding Park Hotel within the registered boundary where there is a tree belt/screen separating the registered park and garden from the A658 road and also Rudding Lane. It is some way from what remains of the Repton Park area which is further up to the north- east where it forms the setting for the mansion (now part of the hotel).</p> <p>Rudding Park and the application site also lies within a ‘Special Landscape Area (SLA)’ under Harrogate BC Plan Policy NE4 and is recognised for its high-quality landscape and important contribution to the setting of Harrogate.</p> <p>The site is located within an established golf course with a clubhouse and associated buildings. A planning permission relating to the Trackman Driving Range (ref: 16/03890/FUL) was granted in 2017 for the “Extension and formation of new golf driving range bays”. This planning permission was not implemented and lapsed in February 2020. We understand that the current built area has a total footprint of 741m2. This proposal to redevelop and extended the Golf Academy will have a total footprint of 1086m2. Additional car-parking is proposed to the South of the Golf Academy building, taking the total number of spaces from 60 to 90 (incl. 4No. Accessible bays). This area will be accessed via an amended hard landscape link to the immediate West of the existing Academy building.</p>

					<p>Inevitably the extended parking areas and larger building will have some impact on the landscape views but as it is at some distance from the mansion and the main Repton Park area, we have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
General Cemetery	Nottinghamshire	E21/1736	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Five storey attached building to accommodate 4 three bedroom HMOs. Canning Chambers , Canning Circus, Nottingham RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.01.2022</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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation and were surprised to note that the Design and Access Statement (D&A) made absolutely no mention of the fact that the application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Nottingham's General Cemetery. The application site lies on the south-eastern corner of the RPG and the HE register description states that the 'cemetery occupies part of a long shallow valley which rises gently towards the south-west.' The application site is therefore in a prominent position which is extremely visible from the entire RPG. The proposed building is a further extension to the surrounding student accommodation and is considerably taller than the building to which it will be 'attached'. There is very little tree cover in the cemetery in that area so it will be quite dominant.</p> <p>The Nottingham City Land & Planning Policies, Development Plan Document, Local Plan Part 2, Jan 2020, echoes Para 194 of the NPPF in stating (Para 2, p 113) that 'Where proposals could affect a heritage asset and/or its setting the applicant will be expected to describe the asset's significance (and the contribution made by its setting) in a proportionate level of detail, to the asset's significance that allows the impact of the proposals on its significance to be sufficiently understood.' The failure to comply with the NPPF in this instance and also with Para 195, means that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF in its current state. The applicant should provide this information along with a Heritage Impact Assessment, ideally with wire frame montages showing the application site from various important viewpoints within the RPG. Until this information is provided your officers will not be able to ascertain</p>

					<p>whether the above application (which is in addition to permitted development 12/03192/PFUL3) is likely to cause further harm to the setting and significance of the RPG.</p> <p>In our opinion, there is no doubt that the height of the development viewed from within the cemetery is going to be an issue that requires examination. There is also very little acknowledgement of the impact on the adjacent listed buildings or the wider conservation area, three heritage designations that all need to be examined fully and the impacts demonstrated to be not harmful. In the absence of the documentation above the GT/NGT would like to submit a holding objection until we are able to better assess the impact of the proposals upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E21/1686	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application for a certificate of lawful existing use of site for various leisure/recreation activities and construction of 8No. hides, 2No. pontoons, creation of parking area, access track and installation of access gate Marston Park Bulls Quarries Road Tytherington Frome Somerset MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have read the online documentation and appreciate that procedurally the application for a Certificate of Lawful Use is not considered against planning policies in the same way as more general planning applications. The case must be decided on whether the applicant has used the area in question for more than ten years in the manner described.</p> <p>We do not contest that the applicant has allowed fishing and shooting on their land around the lake for many years, which has occasioned the use of a couple of pontoons. The 'fisherman's carpark' is also visible on aerial photos (from Google Earth's Historical Imagery in 'View') going back some years. However, we do challenge the implication that these activities have necessitated the use of various large structures which have remained in situ for more than the occasional night's ad hoc camping and barbeques by fishermen (shooting is more of a winter pastime so is less likely to attract overnight campers) which are shown in the attached photographs and depositions.</p> <p>The aerial photographs from Google Earth attached at the end of this letter demonstrate that until 2020 the area around the lake was free of any significant structures. In 2020 some white tents appeared, and in 2021 these tent-like structures had multiplied considerably. This is confirmed by</p>

					<p>an article in the Somerset News https://www.somersetlive.co.uk/news/somerset-news/somerset-pop-up-camping-site-5321212 dated 21st April 2021 which states that :’ Marston Park started offering tent accommodation for two months last summer as an “experiment”’. These glamping structures would have required planning consent, and if this was applied for, the Gardens Trust as statutory consultees, were not notified. The Marston Park website https://marstonpark.co.uk/ is illustrated with several images of large white tents and other structures, with the lakeside illuminated by fairy lights. In our opinion, the prior existence of fishing and shooting per se on and around the lake is not sufficient to enable or justify the legal erection of structures such as these. Whilst the documents on line for the above application for a Certificate of Lawful Use (CLU) make no mention of the substantial tent like structures shown on the aerial images and the Marston Park website (which would not appear to have been in place long enough for them to qualify for a CLU), the GT does have concerns, perhaps unjustified, that this application for a CLU is an attempt to avoid having to ask for retrospective permission for the glamping business, citing the occasional overnight camping stay by fishermen as prior examples of camping on the lakeside shore. See https://www.gov.uk/guidance/lawful-development-certificates#establishing-whether-a-proposed-or-existing-development-is-lawful. The GT fears that a CLU could open the gates for future more permanent structures around the lake as per 2017/2814/FUL which the GT has objected to several times.</p> <p>The GT strongly opposes any attempt to commercialise camping or glamping with associated holiday/leisure activities at Marston Lake, which is a key element in Marston Hall’s Grade II Registered Park & Garden and is specifically described in W.S.Gilpin’s seminal work ‘Practical Hints on Landscape Gardening (1832)’ as contributing directly to Marston’s ‘Beautiful’ scenery.</p> <p>Our letters of opposition to 2017/2814/FUL explain in more detail the harm which this would cause to the Grade II Registered Park and Garden, and we would not wish to see such an enterprise enabled in a round-about manner via the granting of a CLU.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Wentworth Woodhouse	South Yorkshire	E21/1705	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of the estate from a private residence to use class Sui Generis, opening to the public for house guided & non-guided tours, garden visits, weddings, events, education workshops, ancillary café within the mansion house & location filming. Change of use of Camellia House to a café and event space (use class E) & associated facilities & services including changing place pod, bin store, 4 No. disabled car parking spaces & new landscape setting to Camellia House. Demolition of teaching accommodation and provision of a new car park to the North West of the stable block to serve the estate together with temporary coach parking on former tennis court to the East of the main house. New pedestrian and cycle route between stables and the main house and Change of use of part of Stables building to a production kitchen and café area and resurfacing of Mews Court courtyard. at Wentowrth Woodhouse Cortworth Lane Wentworth Cortworth Lane, Wentworth Rotherham S62 7TQ</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE, DEMOLITION, PARKING, ACCESS/ROUTES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Wentworth Woodhouse, which is registered grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We responded to the previous application RB2021/1729 on 22nd September 2021 and note that this application was withdrawn on 21st December 2021. The application above, RB2021/2278, is a similar Change of Use but with the addition of the pedestrian and cycle route and café in the stables plus resurfacing of Mews Court that we responded to in our letter of 22nd September 2021. We presume this RB2021/2278 is a replacement application.</p> <p>Wentworth Woodhouse (Listed Grade I) is the magnificent centrepiece and focal point within a hugely impressive Grade II* Registered Park and Garden. The surrounding parkland and the wider landscape with its assemblage of highly significant buildings many listed grade II* all combine to form an almost unparalleled historic landscape design in England. The Camellia House, Listed Grade II*, north- west of the Ionic Temple (Listed Grade II*) and to the south- west corner of the former baroque garden, began its life as the early 18th century garden buildings, which formed part of the Menagerie created there. It has gone through two changes since then, following the fashions of the time; the Camellia House being a remodelling by Watson and Pritchett in 1812 of an early 18th Century greenhouse.</p> <p>The demolition of Lady Mabel College Teaching Accommodation will enable the provision of a new 205 space car park (187 standard bays and 18 DDA bays), to the North- West of the Stable Block to serve the Estate together with Temporary Coach Car Parking on the Former Tennis Courts to the East of the Main House. The Stables, Riding School and Mews (Listed Grade I and II) were built in a style, and of a quality, that offered an appropriate compliment to the Mansion. They are of exceptional significance in relation to their physical stature, design as a set piece by a national architect of great note, and their substantial survival. They were</p>
---------------------	-----------------	----------	-----	--	--

					<p>designed to form an aesthetic part of a substantial remodelling of the gardens and wider landscape.</p> <p>We strongly support the aims of the Wentworth Woodhouse Preservation Trust to sustain this nationally important heritage and make it accessible for the nation and future generations.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we have not had sight of the Landscaping Masterplan, can't find a Landscape Designer's Drawing, planting schedule for the car park and the details in plans by The Landscape Agency in the Transport Statement are impossible to read on screen. We have not noted any details about the future husbandry and management of the camellias when the camellia house becomes a café.</p> <p>We have the following comments:</p> <p>Main Car Park and New Paths</p> <p>As noted above this is to be situated adjacent to the Stable Block and Riding School and at the pedestrian entrance to the site. It is hoped that this will not intrude on the garden and that it will not be visible in the garden vista from the baroque façade of the mansion, or from the walk from the Camellia House to the Riding School/Stable Block.</p> <p>We assume that this car park is exclusively for visitors to the historic site, and that it is not also intended to cater for the commercial occupants of the Stable Block and Riding School?</p> <p>We note from the Planning Statement at 3.40 'The car park is to be laid out with tar, spray and chip surfacing to parking areas to promote a heritage aesthetic with buff coloured, locally sourced gravel top dressing. A high-quality natural York stone paving is proposed to the footpaths and building thresholds with existing areas of stone to be retained and restored where necessary. Contrasting, high quality natural stone paving setts are proposed to high pedestrian crossing and the entrance/exit to the car park.' The Site Access Proposed plan indicates that there is to be some additional tree/shrub planting, but we are not aware of the detail. It is important that this whole new area does not negatively impact the heritage assets.</p> <p>The Site Access Proposed plan shows overflow parking is to be accommodated on the grass to the north of the access road/stables using protective ground matting but is this only for large events? We note from the Planning Statement at 3.46 'Additional overflow parking is located on the (grass over hard-standing) hockey pitch adjacent to the current "main" car park on the east front.' This sounds a less than ideal situation/location</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>in terms of the heritage but is it for the short-term?</p> <p>We are pleased to learn from the Planning Statement: 3.42 'As a result of discussions with officers and concerns raised regarding the shared use of the main drive by estate vehicles and pedestrians, it is proposed to develop a new shared pedestrian and cycle route between the Stables block and the main house from a crushed stone material. Access and Parking Management 3.43 Carborne visitors to Wentworth Woodhouse will enter the site via Cortworth Lane at Octagon Lodge. Once they have parked in the new car park, they will be directed through Mews Court into the Stables yard. An electric land train will pick people up from the turning point in the stable yard and deliver them to the Mansion, thereby minimising both vehicular and pedestrian traffic along the drive beyond the carpark.</p> <p>3.44 This route was decided after extensive discussions with representatives from Historic England, who wanted to ensure that visitors experience the stable yard in order to get a more complete historic story of the site, and not just visit the Mansion. It also allows for better control of people on the drive as the electric land train will pick people up from the turning point in the stable yard and deliver them to the Mansion, thereby minimising both vehicular and pedestrian traffic along the drive beyond the carpark.'</p> <p>That visitors will be given the amazing experience of seeing the great Palladian facade across the lawn in front of it is to be applauded. We trust that great care will be taken with new shared pedestrian and cycle route – see our comment at the end of this section below.</p> <p>Visitors to the garden only, can enter through the pay point in the Stables. We note that temporary coach parking on the former tennis courts to the east will be retained for the time being.</p> <p>We would expect a planning application seeking permission for the development of a new car park or introduction of new paths within a Grade II* registered park and garden and within the setting of Grade I listed heritage assets, to include an assessment of potential impacts, including impact on views, and considerations for any mitigation. We have been unable to find this information.</p> <p>Stables/ Riding School</p> <p>While the façade of the Stable Block has a spectacular relationship with the park, the façade of the companion Riding School has a discrete relationship with the garden. Any proposed service parking for the Riding School should</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>not intrude on the historical relationship between architecture and the garden, or on the garden vista from the baroque façade of the mansion, or from the walk from the Camellia House to the Riding School/ Stable Block. In the applications absence of parking for the commercial occupants of the Stable Block and Riding School, our assumption is that this must be in the courtyard of the Stable Block. If so, access would presumably have an impact on the wrought iron gateway from the park and thus on the visitor's view of the building's façade.</p> <p>We assume there will be future planning applications for these buildings. Once again, it would have helped to have seen the landscape masterplan proposals now so that an understanding of the plans for the whole site could have been reached.</p> <p>Camellia House</p> <p>We understand about disabled access and the importance of making the site accessible for all, however we remain concerned about the proposed disabled car parking, Changing Places Pod etc outside the Camellia House. It would be preferable for all cars to be in the main car park and for buggies to take disabled visitors to the Camellia House. This would minimise the intrusion of vehicles in the garden and in the garden vista from the baroque front of the mansion. However, if this parking is deemed absolutely necessary, it should not be visible from the historic Camellia House. Like the bin store, it should be carefully screened from harmful impact on the Camellia House.</p> <p>It is important to appreciate that the rear of the early 19th Century Camellia House is, in fact, the façade of the earlier, 18th Century, garden building which is a very important landscape feature.</p> <p>In the previous application RB2021/172 (our letter dated 22nd September 2021) we supported the sympathetic hard landscaping treatments, the new grass path and existing fountain to the south of the building that is to be restored. We have not seen them in this application.</p> <p>Similarly, we wrote that we have no objection to the removal of the small number of trees.</p> <p>We remain concerned about the necessity for the Changing Places Pod which seems, along with the disabled car park, and new bollard lighting to be an intrusion into the historic area of the Camellia House. In the proposals there is provision for male, female and an accessible WC within the rear area of the Camellia House and there is level access throughout. The Camellia plants are important in the history and significance of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Wentworth Woodhouse and probably date from the early 19th century. They need to be carefully looked after in the future including being well-watered during the summer months after flowering so that the flower buds for the following year are laid down and then in the winter when they are dormant being kept at a cool ambient temperature. What arrangements have been made to ensure that any heating system that is incorporated into the Camellia House will have no ill effects on the camellias? If necessary, advice could probably be sought from those who manage the camellia collection at Chatsworth or Sheffield Botanical Gardens.</p> <p>We trust that our concerns will be addressed and look forward to being consulted on further proposals as they develop.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Culford Park	Suffolk	E21/1778	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Planning application - a. Installation of a golf short practice game area comprising two bunkers and seven pitching/chipping tees b. one all weather tee box on existing driving range Culford School Culford Park Culford IP28 6TX SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have looked at the online information accompanying this application. The Design & Access and Heritage Statement (D&A) states (2.3) 'Culford School's vision is to make the "Culford Golf Academy the first choice for golfers in independent education. All year round premier coaching facility.' This is at odds with their claim (D&A 2.11) 'The area could also be easily returned to its existing landscape, should this no longer be required in future'. In this instance, as the main views within the parkland are to the south from the hall over the lake and west to the Iron Bridge, we do not feel that the application will compromise the setting of these. However, we would be more concerned should this be the start of the School wishing to make more substantial changes to the Grade II registered park and garden in order to fulfil their vision to make the grounds more geared towards golf provision.</p> <p>In this instance we confirm we do not wish to comment further on the proposals but would like your officers to note our comments should further applications be submitted by the school in future to extend the golf offer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Wherstead Park	Suffolk	E21/1837	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline Planning Application (All matters reserved except access) for a Class E "business" and B8 development of up to 6,000 sqm, along with up to a maximum of 8no. dwellings</p> <p>Land North Of The Street Wherstead Suffolk OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.01.2022</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 Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This is an outline planning application for a development of eight housing units within an historic walled garden, with an additional area of business development on its north and east sides.</p> <p>The walled garden was an adjunct to Wherstead Park (also known as Wherstead Lodge) which was developed by Sir Robert Harland in the 1790s. He commissioned a Red Book from Humphry Repton in 1791 (which discusses 'where should we place the Garden? the Stables? the Offices and those appendages to a mansion which ought to be near, yet not conspicuous?'. The foundation stone for the main house (listed Grade II) was laid in 1792 and the stables (also Grade II) were probably built around the same time. The walled garden is built of red brick, in contrast to the white brick of the house and stables and faces the stables across what is now a public road – though when built virtually all the parish belonged to the Harlands, so the separation would not have appeared important at that time. The Wherstead tithe map of 1839 shows a shape that is analogous to the walled garden, suggesting that it was in existence by then, but with no water tower. The Ordnance Survey map of 1882 shows the walled garden as an area of 3.2 acres, making it one of the larger walled gardens in the county (see the Suffolk Gardens Trust's Walled Gardens of Suffolk, 2014. Within, it was divided into four quarters by tree-lined paths, with a round pool in the north-east quarter, a greenhouse in the north-west quarter, and a structure built against the north wall in the north-west quarter. The water tower is now shown. The tower is an imposing red-brick structure and bears some comparison with a taller example of similar date nearby at Woolverstone Hall, which is listed Grade II. The 1904 Ordnance Survey map does not show the internal paths, but marks the round pool as a 'fountain'. The 1926 Ordnance Survey map similarly does not show paths, but marks the pool/fountain as a 'tank' and shows two greenhouses to its west. There can be no doubt that the walled garden and the water tower form a significant historic unit with Wherstead Park, its stables and the associated</p>

					<p>cottages. As such, the walled garden and the water tower should be considered for formal listing, or, at the very least, being considered as for inclusion on a local list of heritage assets. So far as the SGT/GT are aware, no detailed recording has been carried out within the garden, or on the walls or the tower to assess the survival of significant historic features – this is something that we strongly feel should be carried out before any alterations are contemplated.</p> <p>The proposed development is on a scale that would have a substantial impact on the overall unity and nature of the historic unit. There may be scope for a sensitive domestic development on the walled garden site, but this would need to be approached as a detailed application, so that the impact can be fully assessed. Granting it outline approval would considerably lessen the opportunities to control any future development proposals. The GT/SGT therefore recommend that this application is refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E21/1696	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed relocation of car park at Leafields, comprising reinforced grass, with landscaping and associated works. Land at Leafields, Warwick PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.01.2022</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We appreciate being given a little longer to respond due to a backlog of applications caused by the Christmas holidays.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation carefully, and whilst we sympathise with the difficulties faced by tourism operators such as Merlin to provide sufficient car parking space for visitors, a Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) such as Warwick, with its numerous listed structures and irreplaceable designed landscape, requires a more imaginative solution if the significance and setting of this nationally important site is not to be further compromised for future generations.</p> <p>Whilst it is stated that this is strictly an overflow car park, we understand that there has been a public meeting about a hotel to be sited on the current main car park for the Castle. Quite apart from the proposed ‘overflow car park’ then becoming the ‘main car park’, both applications should be considered together, as if the hotel is allowed, the entire</p>

					<p>premise of the above application is dramatically altered. This is borne out by a comment by Mr James Allison, a member of the public, whose letter is amongst the application documents. He says : ‘Assuming they get planning for the hotel on the current car park then the ‘overflow’ would then become the main car park and used fully all year round.’ This is a matter of grave concern to us. Another member of the public (Mrs Abi Turner) says that the ‘current car park (is) illuminated with spotlights and noisy generators.’ Although the Design and Access Statement says (Para 3.4) that there will be no external lighting, would the larger overflow carpark require even more spotlights and generators, as it would seem dangerous for the public if there was no lighting when dark?</p> <p>We would also have liked to have seen a Visual Impact Assessment with wire frame montages done during the winter months to ascertain the true visibility of the car parking area from crucial view-points within the RPG and conservation area. The Heritage Statement (HS) seeks to reassure us that the proposed parking area is less damaging than the current overflow car park and ‘represents the least visually prominent location available within the grounds that can accommodate the number of parking spaces needed and which connects effectively to the surrounding road network.’ (Para 5.2) Para 5.3 goes on to say that it ‘would on balance enhance the reciprocal view between Spiers Lodge and the Castle’ and that the proposed parking site is screened from the Mound by mature trees. The documentation does not tell us whether succession planting has been undertaken for when these mature trees die, rendering the site more visible.</p> <p>The proposed site lies entirely within the RPG and the Conservation Area (CA). Para 1.5 of the HS states that the reconfiguration of the current car park, further from the river will return the existing overflow car park to open parkland. It does not mention that an even larger area of currently open parkland would then become a car park. The significance of this area of parkland is in our opinion downplayed in Para 4.7 which concedes that the site ‘contributes to the significance of the registered park and garden and conservation area as part of the wider landscape designed by ‘Lancelot’ Capability Brown, albeit it is located outside of the demise of Brown’s pleasure grounds and formal gardens by Robert Marnock and Harold Peto. It comprises an open area located between the River Avon and areas of 18th century woodland planted to enclose the park and frame views. The former carriage drive at its eastern boundary no</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>longer exists but is legible (largely from aerial mapping due to existing grassland) as a track with some trees and planting at its boundary, albeit without public access. The individual historic trees within the site have all been lost, reducing much of the design interest it may once have had.' We have several comments regarding this statement. The former carriage drive is of great importance as it sets the scene for visitors arriving at the castle, and so views on either side as one approached, enclosed by woodland and framing views, are of enormous significance. Although the individual historic trees have been lost, there is nothing to stop Merlin from reinstating them and once again allowing visitors to have a similar experience to people arriving 300 years ago. The fact that there is limited public access is irrelevant, as you will be aware from 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, which states on page 2 'The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting' and continues (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.' Warwick Castle has already undergone enormous cumulative change and parking for 1400 cars is an enormous imposition. The strength of the landscape design at Warwick is not solely down to the work of named designers. The application site is part of the 1790-1800 design implemented by the 2nd Earl, and the status of the RPG is not solely dependant on the work of Brown, Marnock and Peto.</p> <p>The Leafield site is not within the ownership of Merlin. We would like to see other options for car parking explored which lie further away from the RPG and CA. Whilst it is not something we would normally expand upon, there is a plot of land, locally known as 'Wimpey land' which lies between the boundary of the Park and Stratford Road, which whilst not ideal, would be better than the existing proposals. If the applicants were to install a park and ride scheme in this less damaging site, with regular electric vehicles transporting the public to and from the Castle and grounds, we would be prepared to consider this as an alternative compromise to the parking problem. The National Trust has installed park and ride at quite a few of their sites.</p> <p>We have very strong reservations about increasing the permanent parking</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>within the RPG (it is never likely to be removed once instated). We are also somewhat confused about the exact quantities of car parking in the current overflow site. The application documents states that the overflow car park holds 1300 cars with the new proposed area having space for 1400 cars. A member of the public (Mrs Peneli Grier) says that the current car park 'has 6-700 spaces about half of the 1400 spaces proposed in this application' ie. double the size of what is already there. This may be incorrect, but we would ask that your officers establish what the correct figures actually are.</p> <p>The GT/WGT object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Combe Abbey	Warwicks hire	E21/1769	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of barn to events function room,erection of building to provide toilets and ancillary accommodation and associated parking MENAGERIE (DEER BARN),BRINKLOW ROAD,COOMBE FIELDS,COVENTRY,CV3 2AB CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.01.2022</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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The application site lies within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Combe Abbey, on a broad promontory extending into the serpentine lake, created in the late C18 by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. The lake, which flows west from the house towards the western boundary of the park before sweeping south and south-east, dominates the west park. The late C18 Menagerie (listed grade II) stands on this promontory, overlooking an area of grass and scrub woodland which is enclosed to the north-west and south-east by late C18 brick walls (both listed grade II), and to the west by the lake. The Menagerie was constructed c 1770-8 to designs by Brown which were inspired by the Royal Menagerie at the Palace of Versailles, France; it is marked as the Menagerie on a plan of 1778. The Menagerie and its associated structures are a rare survival of a late C18 complex devoted to keeping rare and exotic animals. There is some confusion between the HE register entries regarding this building. In the Parkland description for the Combe Abbey RPG entry (List Entry Number: 1000408), the building is called the Menagerie (Grade II) but in the C20 the structure was converted to domestic use, at which time it was known as The Woodlands. It is separately listed as The Woodlands (List Entry Number:1233533) at Grade II*. Therefore, whether it is Grade II* or</p>

					<p>Grade II is unclear, but it is clearly of considerable merit and for clarity we will refer to it as the Menagerie.</p> <p>Given the clear importance and sensitivity of this site within the heart of a Grade II* RPG, the GT/WGT are surprised and concerned that the Design Justification Statement makes no reference at all to the RPG. The GT/WGT would have expected an application such as this to be accompanied by a detailed Heritage Statement as well as a Heritage Impact Assessment, accompanied by site photographs and mock-ups of what the new building and parking area would look like in situ from various important viewpoints. The accompanying documentation is not very clear and when comparing the online drawings (Existing Site 004) with Google Earth. The Menagerie Deer Barn (MDB) and the Timber Shed to the SW of the MDB, are not visible on the Google Earth photograph dated 6/2021 (see attached). We understand that this is due to the heavy tree cover in this area, but the site proposed for the new building lies closer to the open circular grassland area and will therefore be more visible.</p> <p>The GT/WGT object to further buildings here, and in addition object to the proposed extensive new fenestration proposed on the gable end of the MDB. This will cause light spill at night into the adjacent parkland. It would be preferable, if windows are permitted at all, they are confined to ground level, with barn style doors which should be shut at night-time to prevent light pollution.</p> <p>There is insufficient information regarding the proposed new parking provision. There is nothing to indicate what the surface will be or what methods are proposed to mitigate its visual impact upon the adjacent grassland. From what we can ascertain, the parking spaces will only be separated from the grassland by a simple wire fence with timber uprights - no further details are given. This very important and sensitive part of the RPG is being developed piecemeal to the detriment of the significance and setting of the western parkland.</p> <p>Without better documentation, we are unable to fully appreciate what impact the two recently erected buildings have already had on the RPG, let alone a third building to house the bridal suite and toilets, as well as new parking places. The GT/WGT strongly object to these proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Leonardslee	West Sussex	E21/0806	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective application for the construction of additional areas for visitor car parking.</p> <p>Leonardslee House Brighton Road Lower Beeding Horsham West Sussex RH13 6PP</p> <p>PARKING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.01.2022</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully studied the documents recently submitted including the rather limited Heritage Impact Statement and comments from the Conservation Officer, Landscape Architect and Arboricultural Officer.</p> <p>It is disappointing and worrying that commercial pressures have already combined with poor professional knowledge to cause significant harm to trees by the garden entrance. Leonardslee holds a world class collection of rhododendrons, camellias, magnolias and other trees, and this is one of the main reasons it holds a Grade I designation. Responsible custodianship of such a collection requires a detailed understanding of what exists and how it can best be managed.</p> <p>Without a proper Conservation Management Plan (as advised by Historic England), or broader Heritage Impact Assessment than that recently provided, pressures due to higher visitor numbers and commercial interests could cause significant harm to the tree and plant collections throughout the park.</p> <p>Before the application is determined, it is imperative the applicant fully assesses the horticultural and arboricultural harm higher visitor numbers will cause and describes how this harm will be mitigated. If the park cannot accommodate higher visitor numbers without substantial harm, there is no justification for a larger car park.</p> <p>Sussex Gardens Trust continues to object to the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.</p>
Knepp Castle	West Sussex	E21/1730	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed construction of landscape enhancement features using imported inert material, together with the provision of public access and amenity; comprising revised landform and details to WSCC/029/018/SP.</p> <p>Knepp Castle, West Grinstead, Horsham RH13 8LJ</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.01.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and also the Gardens Trust (GT) about amended plans for the above application. The Gardens Trust is the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, and is now working closely with County Garden Trusts such as SGT regarding commenting on planning policy and planning applications.</p> <p>SGT supported the original application and is content with the changes reflected in the present application.</p>

					Yours sincerely Jim Stockwell. On behalf of the Sussex Garden Trust.
Castle Grove Park	West Yorkshire	E21/1679	N	PLANNING APPLICATION RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 4 NO. DWELLINGS 19 Belle Vue Road, Wakefield, WF1 5NF RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.01.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) The GT is the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. This application to build four dwellings replaces planning application, 21/00793/FUL for a four-bed detached house in a garden area to the rear of 19 Belle View Road; (our response dated 3rd May 2021.) It is not within the setting of a registered historic park and garden and at some distance from Sandal Castle. We refer you to advice within your Authority. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning