



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES FEBRUARY 2022

The GT conservation team received 192 new cases and re-consultations for England and two for Wales in December. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 53 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Grendon Hall	Buckinghamshire	E21/0903	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for access and scale for the construction of a new Category C prison (up to 67,000 sqm GEA) within a secure perimeter fence together with access, parking, landscaping and associated engineering works on land adjacent to HMP Grendon and HMP Springhill, Grendon Underwood, Edgcott, Aylesbury HP18 0TL MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022 Further to our letter of 13th December 2021, and in the light of a recent site visit by members of the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust, there would seem to have been no significant changes to the application, just more details included. Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and the Gardens Trust (GT), wish to confirm our earlier objection. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Dropmore Nashdom Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E21/1850	II II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for single storey rear extension and	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.02.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by

				<p>construction of rear dormer window Coach House, Nashdom, Nashdom Lane, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NJ BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>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>Nashdom was designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens for Prince Alexis Dolgorouki and his wife, on a previously undeveloped field surrounded by woodland. The house and surrounding formal garden were built c 1905-9. The property subject to this application site is detailed in the Grade II listing is as follows:</p> <p>‘A gatehouse (?Lutyens c 1912, listed grade II) lies at the north-east corner of the site where Nashdom Lane meets Rose Lane, 100m north-east of the house. It is built of whitewashed brick, consisting of a single block whose centre is a carriage entrance and whose outer wings lie at an angle of 45 degrees to it. Immediately behind it, to the south-west, blocking the view from the gatehouse to the garden to the south-west, is the single-storey, L-shaped stable (?Lutyens c 1912, listed grade II), in similar style to the gatehouse and also of whitewashed brick.’</p> <p>The Coach House has been formed out of the single-storey L-shaped stable and was converted to residential use in the 1990s.</p> <p>One aspect of this planning application is the introduction of a new dormer window in the rear elevation. The D&A statement says that this is thought to be more sympathetic than a rooflight and is in keeping with the existing dormer windows. The Gardens Trust support this aspect of the proposals. The other part of this planning application is the addition of a rear extension with access from an existing opening. The proposed extension is very contemporary in triangular form style and is designed to follow and effectively fill the triangular shape of the garden space available in order to maximise the residential accommodation. The link almost abuts the boundary wall and leaves an uncomfortable space. The materials proposed for the link appear to be a metal structure with timber-cladding which are not in keeping with the whitewashed brick which is one of the key architectural features of this group of buildings.</p> <p>Furthermore, both the link and the triangular section of the proposed extension feature substantial expanses of plate glass. The proposed triangular extension is, in fact, mostly glazing with only a small area of wall. We assume that the existing windows in this elevation are part of the 1990s residential conversion. However, the style of multi-paned windows</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>and French doors is much more sympathetic with the style of the building and with the nearby Gatehouse which features both sash and casement windows.</p> <p>The proposed extension and link are set under a flat roof and it certainly seems that the extension will be visible over the garden wall and gate. Whilst the proposed extension may not be visible from the heart of the registered park and garden (RPG) at Nashdom, we conclude that the former stables and gatehouse were included in the RPG because of their architectural value and their contribution to the historic setting designed by Lutyens. Therefore, we consider the proposed extension to be over-development of this small site and the proposed architectural form is not appropriate for this significant site. Furthermore, we would be concerned that, if consent were given for this application, the neighbouring property which forms the other leg of the former stables might also seek to extend their property, at which point the original form of the stables, the space between the two wings of the stables and the space to the rear of the Gatehouse would be lost entirely.</p> <p>The D&A statement which makes no mention of the Grade II RPG, says "The rear extension does not attempt to compete with the existing dwelling by attempting to copy it but is its own contemporary addition." However, in our opinion, a contemporary approach is entirely inappropriate to this historically significant, modest building. Despite being converted to residential use, it is still possible to articulate the original Lutyens design. An extension to the Coach House will affect the setting of the RPG, and therefore the GT/BGT would have expected to have seen a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). Without this, we are of the opinion that we are not sure it is possible to extend this property at all.</p> <p>We therefore object to these proposals for an extension and link, and unless it is clearly demonstrated via an HIA that significant harm is not caused to the setting of the heritage assets, we further object to the principle of development in this position.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E21/1920	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for the proposed loft conversion with roof lights and internal	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2022 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

				<p>alterations 16 Gayhurst House Gayhurst Court Newport Road Gayhurst Newport Pagnell MK16 8LG BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Gayhurst Court (formerly Gayhurst House), a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) is an 18th century landscape park with mid c19 formal gardens around an earlier house. The gardens are attributed to Lancelot Brown c1750-60 with modifications by Repton c. 1793. The house and service building were converted to apartments in the 1970s.</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposals and, whilst we have no objection in principle to the proposed internal alterations, the Gardens Trust are greatly concerned about the proposed introduction of rooflights to allow for these internal works. GT/BGT strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Inaccuracies within the accompanying Design and Access Statement (D&A) and application form must be clarified to allow for a proper assessment of these proposals. These are as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The application form lists the application site as being 'Listed Grade II' · However, the official listing for Gayhurst Court states that Flats 13-26 are within the original house which is Listed Grade I. · The D&A confirms that the application site is within the Grade I mansion house. · But Figure 1 in the D&A has marked the application site as being within an area of the mansion house with a flat roof · The 'proposed elevations' show the adjacent section with a pitched clay tile roof. <p>It is difficult to identify the actual application site, and we request both photographs of the actual application site and accurate clarification of which part of the structure this concerns.</p> <p>The D&A does mention the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) but does not then include any reference to the RPG in its assessment of the impact of the proposals on the heritage asset. This assessment must be provided.</p> <p>The introduction of 5 rooflights across such a relatively small roofpitch has the potential to result in a detrimental impact to the RPG through light emittance and/or reflection.</p> <p>We cannot find any reference or assessment in the D&A and the accompanying documents as to whether the rooflights will be visible from any part of the heritage asset, either the mansion house or the RPG. The D&A merely concludes (6.4):</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>"The application site is later development phase of the Gayhurst Court and its historic and architectural value lies within its elevational design value which will remain" and yet makes no assessment as to whether the rooflights or the light they would potentially emit is visible from any part of the RPG. It is very likely they will be visible and damage the historic character of the RPG and so the GT/BGT strongly objects to this application. We may alter our position if the applicant provides more information demonstrating that the proposed rooflights have no damaging effect on the setting of the RPG. To do this we require the following information :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · confirmation as to the application site · photographs to show views to the application site from various points around the RPG · an assessment as to whether the rooflights will be visible from any part of the RPG. · We will leave it to the LPA to decide whether this would be best delivered through a Heritage Impact Assessment. <p>The Gardens Trust asks to be reconsulted as and when these further details are provided. Notwithstanding our objections, if the LPA overrule these and grant consent, we urge that the rooflights are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Considerably reduced in number · positioned on one roof pitch, ideally the side which is not visible from the RPG · it also may be worth considering whether the introduction of small dormer windows would be a more appropriate solution than rooflights. We note that the nearby Gayhurst Mews introduced eaves-line dormers as part of their conversion to residential in the 1970s · Finally we would strongly discourage the introduction of rooflights - we are concerned that approval of this application would set a precedent if further apartments within Gayhurst Court were to submit applications seeking alterations which involved the introduction of rooflights. The result of this would potentially be very detrimental to the setting of the RPG (as well as to the listed property itself) through light emittance and light reflection. Should your officers decide to allow rooflights, they should be conservation rooflights with an integral glazing bar sitting flush with the roof. <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Bulstrode Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/1965	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey detached outbuilding (amendment to part of planning permission PL/21/2786/FA) Ponders , 54 Hedgerley Lane, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, SL9 8SY MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</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 (BGT) and please consider this a joint response.</p> <p>Bulstrode, a Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG), is perhaps the best surviving non-Royal classic Dutch garden in the UK. William Bentinck, 1st Duke of Portland was William and Mary's collaborator and friend, who was heavily involved in the creation of their gardens at Het Loo and Hampton Court. Much of his garden at Bulstrode is still extant, in particular the western Pleasure Gardens. It is therefore a very important survivor, shown beautifully in the 1730s map/survey aerial view. When Repton worked at Bulstrode he importantly left the surviving Pleasure Grounds intact, retaining the surviving north-western trapezoidal Wilderness with its surviving two circular ponds and the Lime Avenue leading to the long canal (which might arguably be re-labelled the 'Bentinck Lily Pond' and 'Bentinck Lime Avenue').</p> <p>The application site, Ponders, sits within the RPG at the point the north and south sections meet. We were consulted about the previous application (PL/21/2786/FA) for a new outbuilding at this site and we objected to the proposals as follows:-</p> <p>"We are somewhat more concerned with the proposed construction of a new outbuilding for the storage of garden machinery. The ridgeline of the proposed new structure will be higher than that of surrounding structures and it is set into a lawned area further away from the existing and proposed garages shown in Plates 23-25 of the Heritage Statement. The site currently is a charming lawned area with established trees and hedges near to the walled garden. Whilst the style of the proposed new outbuilding (hipped roof) and proposed materials (brick) are considered to be appropriate, we do have concerns about the scale and position of the proposed new structure.</p> <p>The GT/BGT therefore object to the construction of a new structure, larger than all other outbuildings and in a currently undeveloped garden area. We do not object to the principle of a new storage outbuilding but in our</p>

					<p>opinion it should be smaller and positioned nearer to existing outbuildings. It would be helpful to have cross-sections to assess the impact of the proposed new storage outbuilding in the setting.”</p> <p>However, we note that the Planning Authority did not accept our objection and approved the proposals.</p> <p>This revised application seeks to construct a larger outbuilding as the applicant states in their covering letter “the depth of the outbuilding has increased by 500mm to 5600mm, all added to the front of the original proposal. This results in the roof ridge being 210mm higher than the original permitted application.”</p> <p>We therefore reiterate our previous concerns about the scale of the proposed structure which we originally felt should be smaller. We therefore wish to object to the revised proposals and ask that the Planning Authority does not permit any further change or increase to the proposed structure that they have already granted planning consent for.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tabley House	Cheshire	E21/1852	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New and replacement fencing to the boundary of the property, creation of new driveway. Red Lodge, CHESTER ROAD, TABLEY, WA16 0HD BOUNDARY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.02.2022</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. The Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations</p> <p>For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org. This document (p5) makes clear the distinction between designated and non designated heritage assets in the planning system, and the importance of non designated heritage assets in local plans.</p> <p>While we do not object in principle to fence renewal and a new driveway, we have serious concerns about the proposed choice of materials and details.</p> <p>We are aware of the site and are familiar with Tabley and its wider estate.</p> <p>Significance In brief, the significance of Tabley Park lies in the time depth of the historic</p>

					<p>landscape, home of the Leicester family for 700 years, site of their medieval moated manor house with island garden, Palladian mansion by John Carr of 1767 (Grade I) and 17th century family chapel (Grade I). The park is traversed by the route of the historic road to Knutsford which was replaced by a new road north of the park, Tabley Lane, c1770. The Peacock Lodges on Tabley Lane (listed Grade II) flank the north entrance, and together with other features such as the Folly Tower and Gothick boathouse add to the character and quality of this well documented historic designed landscape, recorded by artists such as Anthony Devis and JMW Turner. Red Lodge is situated at the entrance to Red Drive which was created post 1840s when the entrance arches were added beside the house by Robert Curzon. It is one of several listed lodges at the entrance to historic drives leading to Tabley House.</p> <p>Tabley Park forms part of a much wider estate landscape which is identified under Cheshire East Landscape Character Assessment as part of LCT 5: Wooded Estates and Meres.</p> <p>Impacts on Significance</p> <p>Red Lodge lies adjacent to the A556 on the boundary of the registered park, within the wider Tabley Estate. Together with the other lodges it forms part of the historic setting of Tabley, is part of the estate landscape, and a designated heritage asset that contributes to local landscape character experienced by people passing every day.</p> <p>The proposed change to the fencing on the frontage to metal park rail will diminish historic character, and excavation for the proposed parking area may have an impact on the mature trees. Crown lifting the conifers may be necessary for construction of new fencing but crown lifting the yew on the corner may be inappropriate (depending on the branch structure) and will increase the prominence of the existing speed camera by the highway. We are concerned that though the proposals are modest, they represent a change in character and will contribute to the steady degradation of Tabley Park as a result of cumulative change.</p> <p>We consider that the proposals are contrary to Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2017, policy SE4, The Landscape, 1 and 2, and Policy SE7 the Historic Environment.</p> <p>We request that consideration be given to replacing the roadside fencing on a like for like basis, that is, with a split chestnut timber paling.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Auckland Castle Park	County Durham	E21/1937	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Landscaping works to the Upper Walled Garden which forms part of the Grade II* listed Auckland Castle Park. Works include a new Glasshouse Building and a new Maintenance Block with Toilets. Refurbishment and modifications to Grade II Listed walls within the garden, including works within garden of Grade I listed Castle Lodge.</p> <p>Auckland Castle Market Place Bishop Auckland DL14 7NR LANDSCAPE, GARDEN BUILDING, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Auckland Castle Park, an historic designed landscape of national importance, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. This response is therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>We note the considerable changes to the layout of the upper terrace of the walled garden from that which was granted planning permission in March 2016, namely the omission of the restaurant, relocation and redesign of the glasshouse, inclusion of a sunken maintenance block at the western end, and the attempts to maintain key views and reduce the visual impact on the Auckland Castle complex.</p> <p>Having read the Heritage Statement submitted we do have some concerns about the impressions given and cannot agree with Section 7 the conservation principles for the site as articulated by Purcell in 2015 “remain unchanged”, as the majority of the Evidential Value (7.1) within the walled garden has been subsequently removed and the Historic Value (7.2) of the site is consequently diminished.</p> <p>In general we do not object to the amended layout of the upper terrace, welcome the removal of the restaurant and increased scope for public access, and accept that a space for maintenance operations will be necessary. Whilst we do not object to the redesigned and located glasshouse, we have slight concerns with its proximity to the Broadwalk and potential for the glass roof becoming a target for vandalism.</p> <p>Given that the fate of the complex archaeology within the walled garden has been “preservation by record” we very much welcome the news that a report on the extensive archaeological work undertaken in the walled garden by Archaeological Services Durham University (ASDU) in 2016 is “forthcoming” as ASDU Report 4309 [footnote 4 in the WSI accompanying the application]. Given the interest of the garden archaeology revealed by the investigation of the standing and buried remains within the walled garden ahead of their removal The Auckland Project may wish to consider a publication similar to that produced as a conclusion to the archaeological investigations of another regionally significant historic walled garden ahead of its redevelopment - Victoria Ridgeway and Jennifer Proctor, Parterres Bright with Flowers - A history of the walled gardens at Alnwick Castle as</p>
----------------------	---------------	----------	-----	---	---

					revealed through excavations and standing building survey. PCA, 2018. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Raby Castle	County Durham	E21/2027	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) comprising of revisions to the Coach House, Riding School, alterations to East Walled Garden Archway, store rooms and Vinery Caf�� pursuant to planning permission & DM/20/01184/LB Raby Castle Raby Park Staindrop Bishop Auckland DL2 3AH MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above applications which affect Raby Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The response is therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations. We would draw your attention to our comments contained in the GT-NGT responses to applications DM/20/01183/FPA and DM/20/01184/LB dated 15 June 2020, and DM/21/02722/FPA of 5 August 2021 i.e. particularly the need for recording, including material which is being removed and set aside for possible re-use. We confirm we have no further comments to add and no objections to these applications. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Raby Castle	County Durham	E21/2028	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) comprising of revisions to the Vinery Cafe, the Coach House, Riding School, creation of educational space, alterations to East Walled Garden Archway, Raff Yard House and garden, store rooms and gardener's store building pursuant to planning permission DM/21/02482/VOC Raby Castle Raby Park Staindrop Bishop Auckland DL2 3AH MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2022 As E21/2027 above

Brockhole	Cumbria	E21/1933	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Create 2 new ponds, 2 shelters and boardwalks</p> <p>Brockhole, Windermere, Cumbria, LA23 1LJ</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Brockhole, an historic designed landscape of national importance, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application but have been unable to undertake a site visit. The documentation is slightly confusing and a composite proposed site layout for both gazebos, boardwalk and ponds would have been helpful, together with a section from the house, through the garden terraces to the proposed shelter and ponds, illustrating the relative levels and likely visibility. We also note that, despite the closing date for comments given as 22 February, your report advising 'approval with conditions' has already been written.</p> <p>Looking firstly at the proposals for the southern site, the boardwalk and gazebo/outdoor classroom, we accept that, given the peripheral location and developments already established in this area of the Brockhole landscape, any additional impact on the registered park and garden is likely to be minimal and therefore neutral.</p> <p>We do however have some concerns about the centrally located site immediately adjacent to the formal gardens where further boardwalk, two ponds and a wooden shelter are proposed. This location is visible in views across the landscape, both to and from the house and terraces. Whilst the boardwalk and ponds are likely to have minimal visual impact, the timber shelter will inevitably intrude into these views causing some harm to the park and garden. However, we consider that this impact will be less than substantial in terms of the NPPF.</p> <p>We also note that this structure is temporary and will be removed after three years. Further, it would appear that mitigation measures have been offered by the applicant to reduce visual impact of the structure, through the use of timber staining and a sedum roof. As all these measures would now appear to have been adopted as conditions for granting any planning consent, on this basis, we have no objections.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Escot Park	Devon	E21/0814	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use from agricultural</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application</p>

				<p>land to outdoor leisure pursuits and associated operational development Land North Of The Shrubbery Escot Park Ottery St Mary CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>which affects Escot, an historic designed landscape which is included on the Gazetteer of Designed Landscapes of Regional and Local Significance. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon. In addition, and in conjunction with The Gardens Trust, Devon Gardens Trust responds to consultations affecting designed landscapes of regional and local significance, such as Escot.</p> <p>We have reviewed the information relating to this application on your website, and would highlight several concerns which we would ask your Authority to consider when determining this application.</p> <p>The designed landscape at Escot is of regional or local significance; it also forms the designed setting of several Listed structures all of which relate to the overall historic Estate. In these circumstances we consider that it is clear that the designed landscape should be treated, for planning purposes, as an undesignated heritage asset. As such, we consider your Authority's request for a full Heritage Statement and impact assessment to be entirely justified and necessary in order properly to fulfil the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (para 189). We do not find the Applicant's Agent's email on this subject dated 24th January 2022 to be an adequate or convincing response. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that, " In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset"; we do not believe that you have been provided with sufficient information on which properly to make this balanced judgment. Similarly, we do not find section 5.4 of the Supporting Statement (July 2021) to provide a sufficiently clear or adequate explanation of the significance of the designed landscape at Escot, and the role of the proposed development site within that designed landscape such as to fulfil the requirements of NPPF para 189. We conclude that the Applicant's Agent has failed to provide your Authority with the appropriate level of information to enable you properly to determine it in accordance with the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>We would ask that these observations be taken into consideration when</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>you determine this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Courtlands Lypstone Manor	Devon	E21/1335	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Siting of six shepherds huts with external decking, 3 boiler houses/log stores, one with decking area, and associated infrastructure (retrospective application) Lypstone Manor Hotel Courtlands Lane Exmouth HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your further consultation and additional information relating to the above retrospective application. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust, and responds to consultations on proposals affecting sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in the County of Devon. Devon Gardens Trust, in conjunction with The Gardens Trust, also responds to consultations relating to sites, such as Courtlands/Lypstone Manor, which are of regional and local significance, and which are included on the Devon Gazetteer. We have reviewed the additional information on your website comprising the Review of Flood Risk and Environment Agency Consultee Comments prepared for the applicant by Airey & Coles. This document addresses issues relating solely to flood risk and the consultation comments made by the Environment Agency, and therefore falls outside our remit. We must advise that we find nothing in the additional information which would cause us to alter our previous advice set out in our response letters dated 7th June 2021 and 29th November 2021, or our conclusion that the shepherds' huts have a negative impact on the Lady's Walk, and therefore on the overall significance of the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Powderham Castle	Devon	E21/1851	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land NE of Kenton</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above Felling Licence application which affects Powderham Castle, a site included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens at Grade II*.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have considered the information relating to the proposal on your website, and conclude that the work will not have any impact on the</p>

					<p>significance of the historic designed landscape; we therefore have no objection to this proposal which appears to constitute appropriate management of the designed landscape.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Saltram House	Devon	E21/1857	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retrospective application for the installation of floodlighting to existing sports pitch Plymstock Primary School The ide Plymouth PL9 7JA SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above retrospective application which affects the historic designed landscape of Saltram House, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have considered the information relating to the present retrospective proposals on your website and conclude that the installation of six flood lighting columns, each 12m high within the boundary of the nationally designated historic designed landscape causes actual harm to that heritage asset. For the reasons set out below, Devon Gardens Trust objects to the application for retrospective consent.</p> <p>We note the advice submitted to your Authority by Historic England, with which we find ourselves in agreement, and which we strongly commend to your attention when determining this application. We concur with the view that the addition of flood lighting to the existing all weather sports pitch (itself an incremental development from the originally consented playing field) constitutes damaging and unacceptable incremental development and erosion of the designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust would advice that the present application fails to provide an adequate assessment of the significance of the heritage asset (the Grade II* designated historic designed landscape) and the impact of the development proposal. We consider that the application conflicts with national planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular we advise that the development for which retrospective consent is sought conflicts with para 189, which seeks to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their</p>

					<p>significance so that they may be understood and enjoyed by this and future generations; para 195 which advises that local planning authorities should appraise themselves of the significance of any heritage asset affected by proposed development; para 199 which states that great weight should be given to an heritage asset's conservation when considering proposals for development; and para 200 which states that any harm or loss to an heritage asset through development or change require clear justification. For these reasons, Devon Gardens Trust objects to the development for which retrospective consent is now sought.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Arlington Court	Devon	E21/1913	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed timber bin store, pram store and shed to the rear of Arlington Court at Arlington Court Arlington Barnstaple Devon EX31 4LP MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above applications which affect Arlington Court, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon. In addition, and in conjunction with The Gardens Trust, Devon Gardens Trust may comment on proposals affecting sites included on the Devon Gazetteer of historic designed landscapes of local and regional significance.</p> <p>We have examined the documents relating to these linked applications on your Authority's website, and are satisfied that the proposals, will not have any adverse impact on the historic designed landscape. We therefore raise no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Bridwell	Devon	E21/1936	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Associated operational development, in conjunction with 17/00888/PNCOU for the change</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application, which affects the historic designed landscape at Bridwell. This landscape has been identified by Historic England as being of national significance,</p>

				<p>of use of garage to form additional residential accommodation, garage and car parking area Myrtle Cottage 3D Old Bridwell Uffculme CHANGE OF USE, PARKING</p>	<p>and is included on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon. We have examined the information relating to this application on your website. We note that the application site itself lies outside the boundary of the Grade II Registered landscape; we further note that due to the location of the proposed development site, the proposed works would appear to have little, if any impact on the setting of the historic designed landscape. We therefore make no objection to the application. Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Ugbrooke Park	Devon	E21/1943	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of small ground solar array CHUDLEIGH - The Old Stables, Ugbrooke SOLAR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above applications which relates to Ugbrooke Park, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website, including the Heritage Settings Appraisal and Impact Assessment (November 2021), and the consultation response to these applications made by your Authority's Conservation Officer, dated 3rd February 2022. We find ourselves in complete agreement with the comments of the Conservation Officer, which we strongly commend to your attention. While the proposed solar panels would introduce a somewhat incongruous element into the Grade II* historic designed landscape, we conclude, on the basis of the evidence of the Heritage Settings Appraisal and Impact Assessment, that this adverse impact would be limited in nature. In the light of this information, we conclude that the proposed</p>

					<p>development would have a less than substantial impact on the Grade II* designed landscape of Ugbrooke Park or the setting of the adjacent Listed buildings.</p> <p>We therefore do not wish to raise any objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Oxton House	Devon	E21/1982	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement windows and doors 12 Oxton House , Road From Oxton House To North Kenwood BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Oxton, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have examined this application on your website, and note that it relates solely to alterations to the Listed building. These works have no impact on the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust therefore raises no objection to the proposed works.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Central Park, Plymouth	Devon	E21/2003	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of Condition 1 attached to planning application 19/02038/FUL to allow landscape and drainage amendments, including changes to the, ponds, retaining structures, means of enclosure and planting Central Park Plymouth MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022</p> <p>We have recently been made aware of the above Section 73 application for a variation to consent 19/02038/FUL granted in 2019. As you will be aware, Central Park is included by Devon Gardens Trust on the Gazetteer of Historic Designed Landscapes of Regional and Local Significance.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we do not appear to have been consulted by Plymouth City Council on either the original application, or the present variation. We would certainly have engaged with the original application had we been aware of it at the time.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England</p>

					<p>Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultation in the County of Devon; the Trust also responds to development proposals affecting sites included on the Devon Gazetteer. We have considered the information relating to the present proposals on your website. While we generally welcome the commitment to improve and enhance Central Park through this overall scheme and particularly through the formation of a water body, we have concerns about certain aspects of the proposed variations.</p> <p>We note that the land form in Barn Park Field has been considered to be unsatisfactory. While this scheme of works offers a unique opportunity to address this problem, we would advise that the proposals do not seem adequate to the problem. The proposed new planting will help to somewhat mitigate the problem, but the proposed bund, which will limit views and horizons within the park landscape, will in contrast exacerbate and magnify the problem created by the raised ground level in Barn Park Field.</p> <p>We cannot support the introduction of a bund in the form proposed, and would strongly urge reconsideration of this detrimental aspect of the proposed design.</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust hopes that you will include us in all future consultations on the development of design proposals for Central Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
The Royal Pavilion, Brighton	East Sussex	E21/1921	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an additional storey to create 1no two bedroom flat and 1no one bedroom flat (C3) including extension to fourth floor to provide access staircase. Regent House Prince's Place Brighton BN1 1ED BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT). The Gardens Trust (GT) is a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. SGT 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>Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application.</p> <p>The site overlooks the Royal Pavilion Gardens which is included on the Register of Parks and Gardens with a Grade II designation and is also</p>

					<p>included on the Historic England “At Risk” Register – see https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/list-entry/25151.</p> <p>Although the proposals only provide for one additional storey, the building stands the south side of the Gardens’ west lawn and that part is already in deep shade for much or even most of the day.</p> <p>That results in poor lawn growth and the incidence of moss and mould on soil surfaces and a generally dank and gloomy atmosphere. We suggest that projections of shadow from the raised level onto the Gardens should be prepared as part of the submission and the impact of reduced sunlight light reflected in the heritage impact statement. The high level of visitor use and recreational pressure coupled with reduced natural lighting may combine to cause significant harm to the Gardens. Given the Gardens are on the “At Risk” Register, you may also wish to consult Historic England.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell On behalf of the Sussex Gardens Trust.</p>
Easton Lodge APPEAL	Essex	E21/0345	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline planning application with the details of external access committed. Appearance, landscaping, layout (including internal access), scale reserved for later determination.</p> <p>Development to comprise: between 1,000 and 1,200 dwellings (Use Class C3); up to 21,500 sq m gross of additional development for Use Classes: C2 (residential institutions care/nursing home); E(a-f & g(i)) (retail, indoor recreation, health services and offices); F1(a) (Education); F2(a-c) (local community uses); car parking; energy centre; and for the laying out of the buildings, routes, open spaces and public realm and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2022</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. The Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) 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 of Easton Lodge are set to the west of Little Easton, within an area of flat land which was historically used as a hunting forest. The Tudor mansion in the park was burnt and rebuilt on two occasions, and only a fragment, Warwick Lodge, survives today. The gardens here were designed by Edwardian garden designer Harold Peto in 1902 for Daisy Countess of Warwick. They included an Italianate sunken garden, a Japanese garden, a treehouse, formal lawns and flower beds, and treillage pergolas. The wider parkland setting was largely cleared to make way for a nearby airfield in WW2. The Gardens were untended from the 1950s, and lost many original features; however, they were restored in the 1970s and are now maintained by the volunteers of the Gardens of Easton Lodge Preservation Trust who have continued the restoration work. They are opened to the public one day a week during the summer, at special times such as the</p>

				<p>landscaping within the development; and all associated works and operations including but not limited to: demolition; earthworks; and engineering operations. All development, works and operations to be in accordance with the Development Parameters Schedule and Plans.</p> <p>Land East Of Highwood Quarry Woodside Way Little Easton MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>snowdrop season, and for group visits. They have proved a very popular public attraction. The gardens are a grade II Registered Park and Garden. The grade II listed Warwick House, the remaining west wing of Easton Lodge, is not open to the public. To the west of the Lodge are the late C19 stable yard, a terrace of cottages (listed grade II), stables, a former coach house and washhouse, as well as the red-brick water tower (listed grade II) and a servant's house. The gardens maintained by the Trust lie predominantly to the south-east and north of the house.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden's southern point is located approximately 550m west of the small village of Little Easton which is a designated Conservation Area. Paragraph 1.34 of the Conservation Area Appraisal states that:</p> <p>Designation of the nearby park and gardens at Easton Lodge as both a grouping of listed buildings and a Grade II Historic Park and Garden (List entry Number: 1001484) recognises the importance of the area and its sensitivity to change. The proximity of the expanding town of Great Dunmow and the A120 trunk road with its links to the M11 and other major settlements means that the area may in the future be subjected to development pressures and so now is an appropriate moment to be considering how to best protect its built and open space environment. The application site is located approx. 850m south-east of the park and garden. Built heritage advice dated 13th October 2021 identifies the potential for the proposal to cause medium harm to the setting and significance of the Conservation Area. Whilst the proposed development would not have a direct impact on the historic park and garden, due to its distance from it, it would affect its wider setting in the same way as that of the Conservation Area, which has historically always been rural and tranquil.</p> <p>Setting is defined by the NPPF as the surroundings in which heritage assets are experienced, and there can be no doubt that the surroundings to the east of Easton Lodge gardens would be irrevocably compromised. The Registered Park and Garden is already on Historic England's Heritage at Risk list. The Gardens Trust would therefore like to register an objection to the application.</p> <p>We also note the submission by the National Trust, drawing attention to pressure that is likely to result from such a large increase in housing on Hatfield Forest, one of their most popular sites. Hatfield Forest is also a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Registered Park and Garden. Both it and Easton Lodge Gardens are valuable public amenities which are likely to be adversely affected.
Rivenhall Place	Essex	E21/2002	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of solar farm and associated development. Land West Of Park Road Rivenhall Essex SOLAR	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022 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. The Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) 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 The medieval manor of Rivenhall had a large park located to the north of it. In the 16th century, the seat of the manor was moved into the park where a Tudor brick mansion was built by the Wiseman family. In the second half of the 17th century, Sir William Wiseman created a formal landscape round the house, whilst the parkland beyond was laid out on geometric principles with a 'goosefoot' plan. In the late 18th century, Lord Western remodelled the house and park, advised by Humphrey Repton whose design saw the house better related to the landscape, with lakes and a bridge to the south of it. The park by this time was reduced in size and most extensive on the south side of the house. Repton's Red Books showing design options are in the Essex Record Office. Of his work, there survive the lakes, the grade II listed bridge over them, and some veteran trees. This is a recognisably designed landscape which provides a delightful setting for the grade II* house. Rivenhall Place is included in EGT's Inventory of Historic Designed Landscapes in the Braintree District. As such the landscape is an undesignated heritage asset which is a material consideration in making planning decisions. The proposed development occupies a field to the south of Rivenhall Place. In pre-application consultation, it was acknowledged that there would be an impact on Rivenhall Place and so the centre of the field directly opposite the house has been omitted from the scheme. This would not, however, leave the solar farm completely concealed in views from the house. Furthermore, its presence would be only too conspicuous to the many people who use the footpaths in this field leading to Rivenhall Thicks. Indeed, the best views of the house and its setting are from these footpaths. These would be compromised by the solar farm, with corresponding harm to both the heritage asset and public amenity. Other negative aspects of the proposal are the use of grade 1 agricultural

					<p>land, and the impact on Rivenhall Thicks, a block of ancient woodland and a historic feature of the setting of the landscape. The solar farm would be visible in long views to the east, and would add to incremental damage in an area under pressure from development, gravel workings and a recycling plant.</p> <p>The NPPF requires planning decisions affecting heritage assets to be made by assessing the damage to them and balancing that against public benefit. Whilst there is a public benefit from solar farms, this is not the place for one. There would be damage to the setting and significance of heritage assets, and also to wider public amenity in the sense of damage to the enjoyment of that setting. We would therefore recommend that this application be refused.</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>The Essex Gardens Trust notified us of the above application and we have liaised with them in putting together this joint response.</p> <p>The medieval manor of Rivenhall had a large park located to the north of it. In the 16th century, the seat of the manor was moved into the park where a Tudor brick mansion was built by the Wiseman family. In the second half of the 17th century, Sir William Wiseman created a formal landscape round the house, whilst the parkland beyond was laid out on geometric principles with a 'goosefoot' plan. In the late 18th century, Lord Western remodelled the house and park, advised by Humphrey Repton whose design saw the house better related to the landscape, with lakes and a bridge to the south of it. The park by this time was reduced in size and most extensive on the south side of the house. Repton's Red Book showing design options are in the Essex Record Office. Of his work, there survive the lakes, the grade II listed bridge over them, and some veteran trees. This is a recognisably designed landscape which provides a delightful setting for the grade II* house. Rivenhall Place is included in EGT's Inventory of Historic Designed Landscapes in the Braintree District. As such the landscape is an undesignated heritage asset which is a material consideration in making planning decisions.</p> <p>The proposed development occupies a field to the south of Rivenhall Place. In pre-application consultation, it was acknowledged that there would be an impact on Rivenhall Place and so the centre of the field directly opposite the house has been omitted from the scheme. This would not, however, leave the solar farm completely concealed in views from the house.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Furthermore, its presence would be only too conspicuous to the many people who use the footpaths in this field leading to Rivenhall Thicks. Indeed, the best views of the house and its setting are from these footpaths. These would be compromised by the solar farm, with corresponding harm to both the heritage asset and public amenity. Other negative aspects of the proposal are the use of grade 1 agricultural land, and the impact on Rivenhall Thicks, a block of ancient woodland and a historic feature of the setting of the landscape. The solar farm would be visible in long views to the east, and would add to incremental damage in an area under pressure from development, gravel workings and a recycling plant.</p> <p>The NPPF requires planning decisions affecting heritage assets to be made by assessing the damage to them and balancing that against public benefit. Whilst there is a public benefit from solar farms, this is not the place for one. There would be damage to the setting and significance of heritage assets, and also to wider public amenity in the sense of damage to the enjoyment of that setting. We would therefore recommend that this application be refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Middle Temple	Greater London	E21/1563	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of one tree: small Prunus; pruning works to seven trees: two mature Black Mulberry (<i>Morus nigra</i>); five London Plane (<i>Platanus x acerifolia</i>) trees; works for sample collection to identify the cause of branch necrosis to two Acer trees (<i>Acer platanoides</i>) and resurfacing of the root environment to one tree (mature <i>Malus</i> sp.) Ashley Building Middle Temple Lane London EC4Y 9BT TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2022</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of its role as Statutory Consultee with regard proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The LGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations, Inclusion of a site in the HE Register, and as a locally listed heritage asset, is a material consideration in determining a planning application. As the gardens trust for Greater London, LGT 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 Gardens of Middle Temple * (including Fountain Court, Elm Court, Pump Court, Church Court, Brick Court, New Court) (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Thank you for notifying us of the above treeworks. These are important</p>

					<p>trees and some are subject to protection orders and we wholly support the planned programme of maintenance to protect them for future generations.</p> <p>The report makes recommendations which we hope are acted upon in particular the removal of bonded gravel from the tree pits to allow more air to the roots and avoid undue compaction of the soil surrounding them. The LPGT SUPPORTS this planning application.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Syon Park Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Greater London	E21/1710	11	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>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>CHARLTON HOUSE ALBANY ROAD BRENTFORD TW8 0NG DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2022</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 (Royal Botanic Gardens * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER) ROYAL BOTANIC GARDENS, KEW, Non Civil Parish - 1000830 Historic England KEW PALACE, Non Civil Parish - 1263073 Historic England</p> <p>The intensification of development between the Brentford High Street and the River Thames has drastically altered the historic landscape surrounding Brent Lock, the furthest reach of the tidal Thames. The site in question takes the overdevelopment beyond the High Street and creates a pinch point at the crossroads with Ealing Road.</p> <p>The proposed development creates chasms of overshadowed walkways and is a sad reflection of the original open setting of the point blocks of the Green Dragon Estate.</p> <p>Such overdevelopment creates a dark, wind-channelling pedestrian environment.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of mature trees 2. The closing off of the skyline and intrusion into the views from Kew Gardens.

					<p>3. The creation of an inhospitable pedestrian environment at the gateway to Brentford High Street</p> <p>4. The encroachment of tall, overdevelopment into the surrounding traditional residential street character.</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>
Portman Square and Manchester Square	Greater London	E21/1901	II	<p>GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</p> <p>Westminster City Council proposes to make Orders under sections 6, 45, 46, 49 and 124 of and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended:</p> <p>i, The City of Westminster (Prescribed Routes) (No. *) Traffic Order 202*;</p> <p>ii, The City of Westminster (Waiting and Loading Restriction) (Amendment No. *) Order 202*;</p> <p>iii, The City of Westminster (Parking Places) (F Zone) (Amendment No. *) Order 202*;</p> <p>iv, The City of Westminster (Car Club Parking Places) (No. *) Order 202*;</p> <p>v, The City of Westminster (Free Parking Places) (Disabled Persons) (Amendment No. *) Order 202*;</p> <p>vi, The City of Westminster (Motorcycle Parking Places) (Amendment No.) Order 202*.</p> <p>2. The general effect of the Orders would be to close the northern arm of Manchester Square to vehicles (between</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.02.2022</p> <p>I write on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group 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. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application.</p> <p>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 Manchester Square Gardens * (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Manchester Square is in the Portman Estate Conservation Area and Manchester Square Gardens is included in the National Historic List for England, Parks & Gardens at Grade II. The gardens are normally locked and only available to keyholders.</p> <p>However, Hertford House, on the north side of the square and housing the Wallace Collection, has an area in front that is open to the public and is a popular place for workers to sit in a part of Westminster with limited open space.</p> <p>The proposal to close the northern arm of the square to vehicles (except eastbound cycles) and create a public space between Manchester Square Gardens and Hertford House is welcomed by LGT.</p> <p>The LGT SUPPORTS this proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will provide additional open space <p>Yours Sincerely,</p>

				<p>Manchester Street and Spanish Place), except for eastbound cycles using the segregated cycle lane to be introduced at this location. The closure would facilitate the creation of a public space between Manchester Square Gardens and the Wallace Collection, Hertford House.</p> <p>3. The Orders would also:</p> <p>(a) remove the existing pay-by-phone and motorcycle parking facilities from the northern arm of Manchester Square;</p> <p>(b) revise the layout of designated parking facilities and waiting and loading restrictions in the remainder of Manchester Square, as detailed in the Schedule to this Notice; and</p> <p>(c) make various changes to parking and waiting and loading restrictions in Duke Street, Fitzhardinge Street, Hinde Street, Manchester Street, Seymour Mews, Spanish Place and Wigmore Street as detailed in the Schedule.</p> <p>PARKING</p>	<p>Hazel Morris DipBldgCons MRICS For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group planning@londongardenstrust.org</p>
Middle Temple	Greater London	E21/1926	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Works of pruning to one mature Black Mulberry tree (<i>Morus nigra</i>). Fountain Court Middle Temple London EC4Y 9BT</p> <p>TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2022</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of its role as Statutory Consultee with regard proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The LGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations, Inclusion of a site in the HE Register, and as a locally listed heritage asset, is a material consideration in</p>

					<p>determining a planning application. As the gardens trust for Greater London, LGT 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 Gardens of Middle Temple * (including Fountain Court, Elm Court, Pump Court, Church Court, Brick Court, New Court) (londongardenstrust.org)) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER).</p> <p>Thank you for notifying us of the above treeworks. These are important trees and subject to protection orders and we wholly support the planned programme of maintenance to protect them for future generations. Obviously, it is the habit of Mulberry trees to lean until supported by lower branches touching the ground and we would urge a balance between clearing the pedestrian way and allowing the trees enough room to follow their natural habit – within reason.</p> <p>The moderate crown reduction and bi-annual programme of planned works and monitoring of wounds for any signs of infection is supported. The report also makes recommendations regards other trees which we also hope are acted upon in particular removal of bonded gravel to allow more air to the roots and avoid undue compaction of the soil surrounding them. The LPGT SUPPORTS this planning application.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Peckham Rye Park	Greater London	E21/1974	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>T1 - Lime tree Fell the tree to ground level and poison the stump to prevent future regrowth. Replant 2 standard specimens of the Large Leaf lime trees in the neighbouring green open space of the gardens or Peckham Rye park Common after consultation with the local community's and LA to replace the removal of the TPO tree as there is insufficient space within the substation grounds to replace new trees. Due to the close</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2022</p> <p>I write as Planning Conservation Project Officer of the London Gardens Trust (LGT), formerly the London Parks & Gardens Trust. The LGT is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of its role as Statutory Consultee with regard proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The LGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations, Inclusion of a site in the HE Register, and as a locally listed heritage asset, is a material consideration in determining a planning application. As the gardens trust for Greater London, LGT 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 Peckham Rye Park * (londongardenstrust.org) PeckhamRye Common (londongardenstrust.org) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register</p>

				<p>proximity of the tree to the boundary walls and the annual growth the tree is producing on an annual basis the main stem is now causing visual physical damage to the corner of the boundary wall where the northern wall and eastern wall meet UKPN Substation Land 43 The Gardens London Southwark SE22 9QR TREE</p>	<p>(GLHER). Thank you for notifying us of the above treeworks. The tree to be removed is substantial and, as noted in the tree survey, in good health. We do not support the removal of a mature and healthy tree purely to save a modern brick wall of little interest and no historic importance. We recommend the damaged section of the wall be removed and either rebuilt using a root bridge and space to allow the tree to continue growing or replacement with a simple railing. We note the offer of two new trees elsewhere, but these are not certain to happen and would take many years to afford the visual amenity of the existing mature tree. The LGT OBJECTS to this planning application. Please keep us informed of developments and let us know if we can be of any further help, Yours Sincerely, Rose Wakelin Planning Conservation Project Officer</p>
Central Parks	Hampshire	E21/1870	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of the existing vacant department store and redevelopment of the site to deliver a residential-led development with the erection of 3 blocks 6-17 storeys in height comprising 614 residential units and 2 no. ground floor commercial units (Use Class E) to East Street, and associated car parking and landscaping and public realm. Former Debenhams, Queens Buildings Queensway Southampton DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022 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 studied the online documentation and share SCAPPS' concerns about the height of the ever-encroaching new high-rise buildings which change the atmosphere and understanding of the city centre Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Central Parks. Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (SHA), Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 Part I – Settings and Views. On p2 this document states that 'Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage' and goes on to say 'A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it' ... and that '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.' Central Parks is a Grade</p>

					<p>II* RPG and thus of considerable heritage importance, so great care must be taken to ensure that its significance is not further compromised. Central Parks has undergone considerable change over the past few years, and the cumulative effect of the ever-growing number of high buildings is increasingly apparent. P4 of SHA states that ‘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.’ The proposed buildings add to the intrusive and prominent changes to the previously oasis-like calm of the parkland within a busy urban environment and the increasing shade the new developments cast on the parkland. The GT objects to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Embley Park	Hampshire	E21/1938	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Soil engineering works to level site (retrospective) Halls Wood Copse, Gardeners Lane, East Wellow MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2022</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 and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The online documentation provided is extremely sparse and fails to make any mention of the fact that the application site lies in the centre of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Embley. There is correspondingly therefore no mention whatsoever of the impact that the works may have had on the setting and significance of the RPG, and as such fails Paras 194 & 195 of the NPPF. This omission also means that the application does not meet the criteria set down in the Test Valley Adopted Local Plan (TVLP) – 2011-2029, Section E9 (Heritage), in particular paragraph 7.75, which states that in order to show ‘an understanding of the significance of the asset, the council will expect the following assessment to have been carried out : an analysis of the asset to establish their historic, architectural and archaeological significance both as a whole and specific parts affected by the proposal; • an assessment, where appropriate, of the contribution made by the setting of the asset to its significance; • demonstrate that the assessment has informed the proposed use of the heritage asset and that it is compatible with its</p>

					<p>conservation.'</p> <p>We are given no information as to what form the smallholding will take, and whether any structures are planned. We also have not been given any information about the importance of the copse in screening any buildings on the application site and indeed other existing buildings that are currently hidden by the copse. It is also unclear who is responsible for maintaining the rest of the copse and the work already done seems likely to have caused some damage to the vegetation with the potential for more to occur. This is also relevant to TVLP Para 7.78 'The setting of heritage assets is often essential to their character. The setting can be the immediate surroundings but may often include land some distance away where the context of the heritage asset can be appreciated. Insensitive development or changes to the landscape can affect the significance of the asset and the ability to appreciate it within its surroundings. Proposals for development will need to address their impact on the setting and seek to preserve those elements that make a positive contribution to the significance of the asset.' In our opinion, NPPF Para 202 is also relevant : '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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'</p> <p>The GT/HGT therefore object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Eywood	Hereford and Worcester	E21/1931	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of single detached dwelling together with associated access, car parking, garden and landscaping</p> <p>Land to the east of Cherry Trees, Eywood Lane, Titley, Herefordshire, HR5 3RU</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.02.2022</p> <p>We learn from the Design Statement that this large plot, probably annexed from Eywood Park, has been minimally used for storage in the recent past. The new dwelling therefore represents a considerable intensification of the modern development, which has been allowed to develop around the eastern approaches to the Eywood registered parkland. It also sits close to a public right of way, which is one of the few means for the public to enjoy the historic parkland. They will now have access the park very close to a new dwelling, which is bound to create friction in the future. In more general terms we believe that this development intensifies the built environment, which has been allowed to damage the approach to the Eywood landscape in recent decades. We are thus, opposed to the application.</p>

					<p>The HWGT would like to emphasise that Eywood Park is one of the most precious gentry landscapes in Herefordshire and enjoys a high degree of protection being registered II for its association with 'Capability' Brown. This eastern approach to the parkland has recently been carefully considered in a recent Neighbourhood Development Plan, which specifically addressed the issue of new development on the eastern approaches to the park and tried to limit it. Unfortunately, Eywood Park is fairly unique Herefordshire in not having been the subject of a historic landscape survey, apart from the cursory details I put together for the Survey of Historic Parks and Gardens of Herefordshire (2001). Nor has it received the protection of a Countryside Stewardship award. It appears to have Brown-style landscape-park, surrounding a Romantic pleasure gardens of c.1790-1820 associated with Jane Harley, Lady Oxford and Lord Byron and Richard Payne Knight of Downton Castle. The Greenly Diaries (kept by Elizabeth Greenly of Titley Court) indicate Lady Oxford's great interest in her garden. All this makes Eywood and exciting landscape and one, which, to use a hackneyed phrase, is a veritable 'sleeping beauty'. Hence, we believe that the present application should be considered very carefully and priority given to the integrity of the registered parkland.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, David Whitehead, for the HWGT</p>
Croome Court	Hereford and Worcester	E21/2088	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Install four flood lights on lamp posts within the depot for security and health and safety reasons. Land At (Os 8982 4477) Defford MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2022 It is almost impossible the decipher where these lights will be situated in relation to Croome. This is because the location plan and the Heritage Statement are inadequate. I suggest that the applicant be asked to provide more detail</p>
Witley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E21/2089	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement windows, internal alterations and demolition of lean-to. Garden House Worcester Road Great Witley Worcester WR6 6JT BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.02.2022 This application is in the main for proposed alterations affecting the listed building and whilst some demolition is proposed it does not affect the registered park. The other part of the proposal affects sewage works and this does appear to be quite extensive but because the works are underground I do not think that the registered park will be affected</p>
Ashridge	Hertfords hire	E21/1764	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land surrounding Old Park Lodge.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

					<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) 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 area under consideration is part of the parkland, now entered as Grade II* on the Historic England Register, and laid out in the 17th century as a series of rides, altered in the 18th century by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown as a series of rides and woodlands radiating from the entrance front of the listed (Grade I) Ashridge mansion and further modified with grass rides added in the early 19th century.</p> <p>Old Park Lodge (listed Grade II) lies at the intersection of the 17th century rides and the early 19th century grass rides and was intended to act in part as an eyecatcher from the mansion, as well as from various points in the park.</p> <p>The following comprised an outer circuit.</p> <p>Old Park Ride leading into Pitstone Park Ride, connecting with Ash Riding & Brown Fence Ride Leads from Harding's Rookery Ride north in a curve past the wood yard into Old Park (the original park at Ashridge). It crosses Princes Riding to Old Park Lodge and continues as Pitstone Park Ride to meet Ash Riding. Both shown on 1762 map. Old Park Ride apparently replaces a road further west along the edge of Thunderdell Wood blocked in 1671 after the area was emparked shortly before in the 1660s. Old Park Ride largely lost beneath woodland but banks may survive and could be cleared and reinstated. Pitstone Park Ride now incorporated in golf course and fairway 9 runs along part of its length. (map attached to show these rides and Old Park Lodge)</p> <p>Many of the views along these rides towards the Lodge are now obscured. We welcome the removal of scrub sycamore and birch from this area and recognise that with ash die-back many of the ash trees will have to be removed in addition. We note that some oak is also to be removed. Area 2 contains a number of mature oaks which should not be felled unless diseased and dangerous. A boundary oak lies just outside the south eastern end of the plan, which marked the former boundary between Pitstone and Berkhamsted and is one of a number of these boundary trees still existing. As this area is not included in your map, we assume this tree is not affected but would hope that any other significant oaks within the plan area would also be protected.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We are familiar with the Management Programme of woodlands and park which was agreed between the National Trust, Ashridge Management College (housed in the mansion) and the Golf Course as part of the Ashridge Park Liaison Committee work some years ago, and of which the Golf Course was a signatory.</p> <p>We would hope that some of the now-observed views around Old Park Lodge can be opened up again as part of the thinning operations and the Golf Club will hold maps showing the details of the former views. We would hope that any replanting respects the heritage aspects of this designated asset to enhance and preserve the historic views.</p>
Watton-at-Stone Parish Draft Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E21/1834	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.02.2022</p> <p>WAS 22 Non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The Conservation Area and the designated heritage assets (called listed buildings in WAS21) have a policy which includes the setting of these assets as, rightly, an important part of their significance.</p> <p>WAS22 for non-designated heritage assets should also include setting as it is part of the significance of all heritage assets, designated or not.</p> <p>We have no further comments on this proposed Neighbourhood Plan which is very comprehensive.</p>
Poles Park Youngsbury	Hertfords hire	E21/1853	II II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Request for a Scoping Opinion Land North And East Of Ware (WARE2) Ware Hertfordshire MISCELLANEOUS	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2022</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. The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) 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>WARE 2 development could have an impact on many heritage assets in the area, including Registered Parks at Fanhams and Poles, but also on the views which give these assets, and those of Registered Park and listed mansion at Youngsbury, some of their significance. Locally designated heritage assets could also be adversely affected, for example in the Rib Valley at Thundridge which contains many heritage assets where development could affect the skyline to the south.</p> <p>We therefore agree that the Historic Environment should be scoped into the Environmental Statement, this should include the impact on the heritage assets and their settings, and include light pollution, noise and key views.</p>

Aldenham House	Hertfords hire	E21/1890	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Use of land for events in excess of 28 days from 1st April to 31st October, retention of wood stage, and changes to access off Aldenham Avenue.</p> <p>Land At, Home Farm, Aldenham Road, Elstree, Hertfordshire, WD6 3AZ</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2022</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. The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) 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>Aldenham Park is listed on the Historic England Register for its nationally recognised planting by the Gibbs family in the late 19th/early 20th centuries. Their planting included unusual tree and shrub species, also reflected at family homes at Tyntesfield and Briggens (both on the HE Register). The focus of the parkland is the ornamental informal woodland garden around Tykes Water, served by paths from the mansion and leading on to the model Home Farm, which has just received planning permission for limited development.</p> <p>On such as important site we would have expected to see both an arboricultural report for this area, including the significant woodland, and a Heritage Impact Assessment of the effect glamping and the events stage and infrastructure would have on the historic landscape.</p> <p>We consider that both glamping and the proposed Events area are totally inappropriate in a historic parkland. The GT has considered a number of cases where modest glamping proposals have been accompanied by robust plans for restoration of landscape to former condition after the glamping structures have been removed. This is all the more important where numbers of people attend outdoor events. No such proposals are included in this application.</p> <p>The area is also within the Green Belt and we consider that this application is contrary to the NPPF and Hertsme's own policies.</p> <p>We note that some glamping is already on site and that the former tree-dotted parkland has lost its historic character. Further provision for events would further harm the historic landscape.</p> <p>We therefore object to this planning application but, if planning permission is given, it should be on condition of a satisfactory arboricultural report and mitigation/protection scheme for the historic ornamental woodlands round Tykes Water and a Heritage Impact Assessment including robust plans for restoration of the land following each event.</p>
----------------	-------------------	----------	----	---	--

Kennel Cottage Tollgate Road, Colney Heath	Hertfords hire	E21/1976	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two-storey front extension and detached car port Kennel Cottage Tollgate Road Colney Heath St Albans AL4 0NZ BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2022 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. The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) 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. Kennel Cottage is the site of the former kennels for North Mymms Estate but little historic fabric survives. On the basis of the information in this application, we have no objection to the proposals
Markyatecell Park	Hertfords hire	E21/1998	II	PLANNING APPLICATION. Demolition of former residential care home (C1) 2 detached dwelling houses (C3) and construction of 4 x 2storey buildings forming 34 flats (12 affordable dwellings) with associated hard and soft landscaping, parking , bine store and main entrance gateway Caddington Hall, Luton Road, Markyate, St Alabns, Hertfordshire AL3 8BQ DEMOLITION. RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2022 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust. Caddington Hall is entered on the HGT List of Parks & Gardens of Local Historic Interest in Dacorum. The existing walled garden and tree cover merit conserving. We therefore welcome the proposal to adapt the walled garden for garden use suitable for the 21st century with vegetable beds and play areas. The site lies on the northern side of the Ver valley, overlooking the Registered parkland of Markyate Cell on the slopes below and in the valley. We welcome the decision to build blocks of only 2 storeys in height and with green roofs which will minimise the impact on the Registered landscape and the Arts & Crafts gardens laid out by George Dillistone c 1910. We note that the indicative landscape plan retains much of the tree cover and also augments it. We welcome this feature, not only to retain some of the character of the original site but also to screen the new buildings from the Markyate Cell landscape.
17 Danesbury Park North Ride, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E21/2004	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey rear extension 17 Danesbury Park North Ride Welwyn Hertfordshire AL6 9SA BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.02.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We have no comment to make on the effect the proposed work could make on the Locally Listed landscape as the gardens are screened from the wider views. We do note that the visual integrity of the new 'mews' development, which was carefully laid out to complement the listed mansion, would be compromised by the proposed extension to the detriment of the neighbouring properties and the mews as a whole.
Northaw House	Hertfords hire	E21/2018	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposal: Repair, refurbishment	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.02.2022 Thank you for consulting the Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the

				<p>and conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, construction of 2 new Gate Lodge dwellings, 4 new dwellings on the East Drive, 3 new dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 new dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure. Northaw House Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar, EN6 4NG</p>	<p>Gardens Trust. We have previously objected (6/2019/0217/MAJ,6/2021/0071/LB)to the substantial harm to be caused to the listed mansion, stable block and locally listed historic landscape by the overdevelopment of this site. The addition of more houses as detailed in this application would seriously harm not only the Northaw House landscape but those of Nyn Park setting and the open approach to Northaw village. East Lodge was designed to be The lodge for the estate and it would harm its significance to put in further lodges of no historical relevance. The addition of houses along the East Drive would harm this historic designed parkland by removal of the essential gap between lodge and mansion where the drive runs through parkland. The development is contrary both to the provisions of the NPPF (Chapters 13 and 16) and WHBC's own policies on heritage and Green Belt.</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/2033	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion and alterations to openings 9 Farm Crescent London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1UF BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2022 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. The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) 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. We have no comment upon the conversion of the garage as detailed in this application but do have concerns about the effect the proposed windows on the ground floor will have to the street scene, with the loss of the distinctive garage doors and small windows. A more sympathetic treatment of the windows on the front elevation to fit in with the streetscape would be welcome.</p>

Putteridge Bury	Hertfords hire	E21/2050	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Relocate existing front entrance door to side elevation, part single storey part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, erection of detached garage, conversion of existing garage to habitable space, and replace existing crown roof and dormer windows following demolition of rear conservatory</p> <p>East Lodge Lilley Bottom Lilley Luton Hertfordshire LU2 8NH</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2022</p> <p>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, should have been consulted on this application. The Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (HGT) 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>East Lodge lies within the Registered park of Putteridge Bury and is a key marker of the entrance to the estate. No heritage impact statement has been included with this application but we are concerned that the details proposed in this application; the excessive bulk of the building, the excessive amount of glazing and the materials proposed would cause harm to the Registered landscape as being of inappropriate design and scale for a lodge in this historic position. We note that a more modest proposal was granted permission under 21/03038/LDCP and would suggest that this current application be refused on the grounds of harm caused to the Registered heritage asset contrary to the NPPF.</p>
17 Danesbury Park North Ride, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E21/2063	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a single storey rear extension</p> <p>17 Danesbury Park North Ride Welwyn AL6 9SA</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE; 24.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Our comments, submitted on 22/2/2022, for planning application 6/2022/0235/HOUSE, also pertain to this application.</p>
Swainston	Isle of Wight	E21/1968	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Agricultural prior notification for proposed agricultural barn</p> <p>Ashengrove Farm , Calbourne Road, Newport, Isle Of Wight PO30 4HU</p> <p>AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2022</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. The Isle of Wight 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>We provided comment on the previously advertised application (21/02442/6PA) and this recent AGN application would seem almost identical. Our previous comments still stand.</p> <p>We appreciate that as a AGN this application has to be determined in terms of permitted development for the agricultural holding. We would ask that due consideration is given to the setting of the registered park at</p>

					Swainston in your determination and that whatever powers are available are used to ensure that this is the case. Yours faithfully Isle of Wight Gardens Trust.
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 14.02.2022 Further to my last letter of 27th January, from photos provided by a colleague from Kent Gardens Trust, the old drive to Waldershare is now substantially overgrown, so whilst currently its original function is not immediately apparent, this is a feature which could relatively easily be restored. The old drive was quite wide with significant depth of trees either side of it, which obviously has not been maintained so that now it resembles a wood. Should the application be permitted, especially with the unsympathetic 1.8m boarded fence, in our opinion, the development detracts from the setting of the RPG. One of the conditions of the planning (20/00498) for the stable block was that details of the boundary treatment were to be submitted prior to development. This has not been done, and from reading the various correspondence submitted, it would seem that Dover District Council instructed the applicant to remove the close boarded fence. This structure completely changes the atmosphere and way in which one can understand and appreciate the historical background to the RPG. Should your officers decide to allow the application, we would request that a condition is included for removal of the boarded fence and replacement with a mixed native hedge with a 10 year maintenance schedule. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Port Lympne	Kent	E21/1147	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION The erection of a pergola and the temporary siting of a glass marquee to facilitate weddings/functions Howletts & Port Lympne Wild Animal Parks Port Lympne, Aldington Road, Lympne, Hythe, Kent, CT21 4PD MARQUEE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2022 We very much appreciate you taking the time to meet our colleague Mike O'Brien from the Kent Gardens Trust on Thursday last week, and please accept my apologies for not getting a response back to you on Friday. I was working in London that day and due to the storms was unable to get back home to Gloucestershire until Saturday. The site meeting was extremely helpful and has given us a much better understanding of the complexities of the site and the future vision for Port Lympne. Should your officers be minded to grant approval for the glass marquee, then the effect of the conservatory should be mitigated by requesting approval of the colours of the major elements of the structure,

					<p>limiting the permission to three years (not temporary). Our previous comment would still remain.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Quenby Hall	Leicestershire	E21/1866	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an agricultural building, Quenby Hall, Barley Leas, Hungarton, Leicestershire. AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2022</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 appreciate being given a little longer to respond to the above application.</p> <p>This application follows on from an earlier one for two barns in the same location which we objected to on 21st May 2020. In this we queried the siting of the barns in such a prominent and sensitive location within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Quenby. It is disappointing that there is nothing to suggest that other places have subsequently been considered and this continues to be the chosen site.</p> <p>We have seen Hector Martin's detailed letter from Historic England outlining the impact of the proposals upon the RPG's setting and significance and their concerns about the siting of the new structure. The GT entirely concurs with HE's statements and will not repeat them for brevity. We also agree that a Management Plan for the estate would be extremely helpful in order to ensure that future applications are sited in less sensitive areas.</p> <p>The GT continues to object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Well Hall	Lincolnshire	E21/1797	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land to the NW and SW of Well</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Well Hall, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Lincolnshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Our understanding of the application is that the majority of works proposed are for thinning of Ash and we confirm we have no concerns with these operations.</p>

					<p>Unfortunately, we have been unable to locate the yellow-shaded cmpts. 14 and 15 on the maps provided. In theory, we have no concerns with the principle of clear-felling of Japanese Larch, Sitka Spruce and other mixed conifers in cmpt. 14 and restocking with Oak and Small-Leaved Lime, thus restoring this PAWS designated cmpt. to native species. Our only slight concern is, depending on the location of this cmpt., any visual impact of the felling operations on the designed landscape.</p> <p>Immediately east of cmpt. 7 (Church Wood) is St. Margaret's Church, dating from the early 18th Century and now Grade I-Listed by Historic England. The little church is located above the lake and is the principal eye-catcher in the Grade II park. Framed by a stately grove of Beech and several likely Victorian trees near the lakeside, this forms the principal view south from the house. Church Wood provides a necessary backdrop to the church building and emphasises its scale, it also creates enclosure on the valley horizon. Old surveys would suggest that the wood has been there since the church was built and had 'wilderness' paths running through.</p> <p>Well Hall is a small very romantic valley park, an unusual early landscape park survivor from the early 18th Century, and the Gardens Trust and Lincolnshire Gardens welcome the management of the landscape through the proposed thinning operations. However, we would be grateful if you could advise on the location of cmpt. 14 so we can look at any potential visual impact from the clear-felling operations.</p> <p>We thank you for your help, Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
North Norfolk Local Plan	Norfolk	E21/1846	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.02.2022</p> <p>The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT), a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting sites listed by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens. In partnership with the GT, NGT works to protect and conserve registered sites and other unlisted heritage parks and gardens which may or may not be included within local lists. In this capacity, the NGT wishes to express support for ENV2 - Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character. In particular, we welcome the requirement (para 3e) that development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and enhance the setting of and views into</p>

					<p>and from the AONB, the Broads, Conservation Areas and Registered Parks & Gardens.</p> <p>We also express support for paragraph 5 of the policy which requires a landscape visual impact assessment for those development proposals with wider visual impact.</p> <p>The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT), a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England's Register of Parks and Gardens (RPGs). The NGT and GT work in partnership to protect and conserve RPGs and also those parks and gardens which are not listed but which are significant heritage assets.</p> <p>In this context, we wish to express our strong support for ENV 7 Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment.</p> <p>With regard to para. 6.7.2 we would note that, as well as the 250 buildings on the Council's Local List, non-designated parks and gardens should be included . In this regard, we welcome the statement in 6.7.3 that the number of non-designated heritage assets on the list is likely to increase over time as new buildings and other assets are identified.</p> <p>In particular, we welcome the statement that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset is a material consideration when deciding planning applications, and that the requirements of the policy apply to any local heritage assets identified in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>These are important protections for designed landscapes which lack the statutory protection of being listed as Registered Parks & Gardens.</p>
Gunton Park	Norfolk	E21/1922	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single storey lodge cottage on the original footprint of ruin of Taylor's Lodge (as part of the ongoing restoration of Gunton Park)</p> <p>Taylor's Lodge , Gunton Park, Hanworth, Norfolk, NR11 7HL</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.02.2022</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. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) 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 Trust supports this application. Restoration of the lodge will replicate an original feature of the park and enhance its character and appearance. Appropriate conditions will ne needed to control materials and detailing.</p>
Lynford Hall	Norfolk	E21/1991	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of Condition No2 on</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>

				<p>3PL/2021/0856/F Glamping Annex within Site Curtilage the position of the annex to be set further away from boundary, and change of design</p> <p>Glebe Cottage West Tofts Road Lynford, Mundford</p> <p>HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) 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 proposed holiday accommodation and cart shed in the grounds of Glebe Cottage is situated on the west boundary of Lynford Park, a Grade II Registered Park & Garden (Listing No. 1000224).</p> <p>As we noted in our response (13 July 2021) to the original planning application, the proposed facility is unlikely to have any detrimental impact on Lynford Hall and its parkland. We have examined the plans for re-siting of the pod and are still of this opinion, and have no objection to the variation of Condition 2.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Susan Grice Planning Officer Norfolk Gardens Trust</p>
Castle Ashby	Northamptonshire	E21/1844	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of barn as eatery associated with cold water swimming together with new access off Parkhill Road and associated car park and paths.</p> <p>Little Park Barn Park Hill Road Castle Ashby</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.02.2022</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 Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Castle Ashby is a landscape much valued by NGT members, and it has been utilised on numerous occasions to further the educational aims of the Trust over many years. Unfortunately, in this instance the NGT has not been able to access Castle Ashby Park to inspect the impact of this proposal. Members of its Council of Management have however carried out a rapid desk-based study based on information relating to this planning application and made available via the West Northamptonshire/South Northamptonshire Council website along with other relevant digital data in the public domain (particularly HE List Entries), and material held by NGT. A member of NGT has also inspected the site of the entrance into the proposed car park from the public highway.</p> <p>Castle Ashby is a Grade I Registered Park and Garden (List Entry Number 100385). It comprises formal gardens, probably by W B Thomas, with lavish</p>

					<p>use of terracotta work of 1862 (Grade II* Listed) adjoining a country house (Grade I Listed). These are set within a wider formal landscape, the park substantially improved by Lancelot Brown in the 1760s. The principal scenic vistas from the garden are eastward, the ground falling fairly gently to a chain of ponds within the valley. A circuit walk/ride with views was established in the mid 18th century, taking in on the east, the Temple Menagerie, which screened a menagerie behind (Grade II* Listed) and presumably the Knucklebone Arbour (Grade II Listed). The main landscape parkland is permanent pasture with a high density of mature parkland trees. Underlying the pasture are extensive areas of earlier ridge and furrow cultivation, notably north of the north terrace and along the ground rising east of Warren and Park ponds.</p> <p>The estate was purchased by the Compton family of Compton Wynyates, Warwickshire in 1512. The presence of a park and fish pool was indicated in 1565 and in 1574 Henry 1st Baron Compton commenced building the mansion house. The work was continued by Henry's son William (who was created 1st Earl of Northampton in 1618), and building was substantially completed by 1635 under the 2nd Earl. James I was a regular visitor between 1605 and 1619 and Charles I visited in 1634. The 4th Earl, George, appears to have married well financially and circa 1686 commenced remodelling of the grounds; diarist and landscape improver John Evelyn visited in 1688. Planting of the avenues commenced in 1695 possibly at the suggestion of royal visitors William III and Queen Mary. New ponds were probably added in the early 18th century. A 1760 survey records the formality of the designed landscape prior to submission of new designs by Robert Adam and Capability Brown, also in 1760. Brown was contracted in 1761 and work began remodelling the park to the east of the house in particular, including softening of the Eastern Avenue with more planting around the refashioned Menagerie and Park Ponds and an eastern tree belt with walk/circuit carriage ride through it. A new entrance into the park was also created between The Menagerie and Park Hill Farm. In the late 1760s the estate started to run into serious financial trouble and in 1774 the house was abandoned and landscape improvements ceased. More than 20 years later in 1796 the 9th Earl Northampton succeeded his father, reclaimed the estate and set about making further improvements to the house and landscape. In 1801 Castle Ashby acquired the estate of Easton Maudit, at which time the manor house there appears to have been pulled down and two (Grade</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>II Listed) early 18th century gate piers from that manor may have been relocated to Castle Ashby at a the new entrance into the park within the Eastern Avenue. This entrance appears to have served a possibly new and direct ride to Easton Maudit which crossed the Grendon to Yardley Hastings road and which survives today as a bridle way. The new park entrance was also accompanied by a lodge, formerly Coachman's Lodge, now known as Nevitt's Lodge (also Grade II Listed).</p> <p>It is principally the remodelling of the parkland during the Georgian period which is of most interest in assessing the impact of the development proposal WNS/2022/0072/FUL.</p> <p>The GT/NGT are pleased to note that the future of Little Park Barn is to be sensitively secured by its conversion to a cold water swimming facility and eatery. We have no objection to this aspect of the application and commend the creative reuse of this attractive building and also the opportunity it presents to appreciate the parkland from a different perspective.</p> <p>However, the GT/NGT do have concerns about the siting of the proposed car park which utilises a linear clearing cut through the eastern parkland belt. There is little or no consideration of the value of this clearing as a heritage asset of the park within this application. Early edition Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping records this feature as existing from at least the 1810s. Examination of OS mapping indicates that if a straight line is drawn from Castle Ashby House to Easton Maudit church the line passes along this clearing. Furthermore, 19th century OS maps suggest that an east-west running linear space was left (or created) between the scattered planting of trees within the parkland to the west of Park Pond. Please refer to attached images at the end of this letter to demonstrate this proposed historic sight line.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that a sight line was probably created between Castle Ashby House and Easton Maudit church. This may have been created as part of Brown's work in the 1760s to create a view beyond the park (effectively using the church steeple as an eye catcher) and/or possibly to be viewed in both directions from Brown's circuit walk/drive, taking in both house and distant church steeple. But it is also possible that the view was created to symbolise the 1801 acquisition of Easton Maudit lands, a visual statement to accompany the removal of the gate piers from Easton Maudit for a new eastern entrance (with lodge) to the park c.120m to the south.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>It is uncertain whether a view from Castle Ashby House to Easton Maudit church is viable now. Tree planting within the park during the 19th and 20th century may have obscured the view (as has happened with views across to Menagerie Temple), and there appears to have been unchecked growth of vegetation within, and certainly at the east end of the clearing cut through the eastern tree belt. However the probable sight line would comprise a significant element of the history of this Grade I Registered landscape and as such retaining the integrity of the clearing through the woodland belt is desirable; it may even be feasible to reinstate the view. To this end GT/NGT recommend that further assessment of the probable “lost” view is carried out as part of the heritage statement to establish its credibility and also the impact that siting a car park here would have on the vista; alternative and less sensitive siting of the proposed car park might be considered.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office</p>
Moreby Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1799	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and change of use of ancillary building including new side extension to form one dwelling Moreby Hall, Moreby, Stillingfleet CHANGE OF USE, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.02.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee with regards to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens – in this case Moreby Hall registered grade II with the house listed 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. YGT has liaised with the GT and is authorised by the GT to respond to this consultation.</p> <p>This single storey garage probably dating from towards the end of the 19th C is constructed of brick with a part hipped roof and is immediately east/south-east of Moreby Hall and its Service Wing. Although unlisted it is within the curtilage of the grade II* listed Moreby Hall and located within the grade II registered historic park and garden and within the Green Belt. It may have had a storage function or been used for livestock or as a fodder store.</p> <p>Moreby Hall was erected on the site of an earlier house for the Preston family, well-known merchants and bankers from Leeds, in 1828-33. It was only the second country house by renowned architect Anthony Salvin (1799-1881), designed shortly after he had gone to live in London where he worked for many years with his brother-in-law the significant landscape gardener William Andrews Nesfield, and the architects John L Pearson and</p>

					<p>R Norman Shaw.</p> <p>The garage is highly visible on the approach to Moreby Hall from the current access point as well as along the public road and from within the parkland.</p> <p>The previous application for the garage/ancillary building is ref: 2020/0427/FUL and on file you will have our responses to the original application documents (our response dated 19th June 2020) and to the amended plans (our response dated 11th September) and again our response of 24th February and 17th May 2021 where we added further comments. We objected to the planning application and in our letter of 17th May wrote:</p> <p>‘We refer you to our comments and concerns in our letter of 24th February. We have noted Selby DC Conservation Officers advice of 24th March 2021 regarding the potential impact of having domestic curtilage round a building that is essentially within the park and was not designed or built to be a habitable dwelling. We defer to the expertise and advice of your Authority’s Conservation Officer regarding this re-consultation. We request that if permission is granted that there is an agreed landscape plan by a historic specialist for the areas surrounding the development to reduce the impact of the domestic curtilage on the registered historic park and garden. We also request that Selby DC removes permitted development rights, so that residents would need planning permission for those changes that usually fall under permitted development rights.’</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust were notified of the refusal of 2020/0427/FUL on 22nd October 2021. The reasons for refusal on 22 Oct 2021 in Planning Officer’s Report are as follows:</p> <p>01. The proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, namely the Grade II* listed Moreby Hall, and harm to the Grade II registered historic park and garden. When the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the scheme, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable, as the public benefits identified would not outweigh the harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP18 and SP19 of the Core Strategy, saved Policies ENV16 and ENV24 of the Selby District Local Plan, S66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 and national policy contained within the NPPF.</p> <p>We fully support these reasons for refusal.</p> <p>We note that the Planning Case Report for 2022/0003/FUL is dated 22nd</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>April 2020 (ie predates all our previous responses for 2020/0427/FUL) and at 4.0 and following it notes ‘... seek the conversion, extension and change of use of the building to 1no dwelling. ...The proposed property is 1no bedroom and openings as part of the proposals have been kept to a minimum to ensure the character of the existing building is retained. The extension will essentially facilitate a kitchen and living room and have also been designed to remain subservient to the existing building. 4.3 The proposals have sought to be undertaken in a sympathetic manner and grant of Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent would ensure the long -term survival of this building. In addition, the proposals will assist in the viability of the Main Hall conversion which will ensure the Grade II* Listed Building extension.’</p> <p>We find it difficult to understand that the conversion of the garage/ancillary building will be important for the viability of Moreby Hall itself.</p> <p>We find that this planning application is similar to the re-consultation for 2020/0427/FUL and having studied the documents, (and the ‘Gardeners Cottage’ proposed layout plan would have benefitted from northing), we remain concerned about the conversion and change of use and its impact on the setting of Moreby Hall and the registered parkland. The plans show the south elevation which overlooks the parkland, with patio doors onto a paved patio, seven windows and three rooflights and very limited planting to the short eastern boundary. We recommended landscaping in our previous responses (see above) but the further outline planting on the longer eastern boundary and south of the vehicle parking is similarly indeterminate and poor. The area of glass on the south elevation will result in the structure being highly visible within the parkland and from the public road, the B1222. There will be light pollution from artificial light from inside the building which would draw attention to the structure. The proposal to create a dwelling will potentially result in additional harm to the setting with the possibility of a garden area, play equipment, bins, and washing lines. We are also concerned that in the future there may be pressure for incremental and inappropriate changes to enlarge the garage/dwelling.</p> <p>We find it difficult to determine any proposed changes post the refusal of the previous application and defer to the expertise of your Authority’s Conservation Officer and request that if permission is granted that Selby DC removes permitted development rights, so that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>future residents would need planning permission for those changes that usually fall under permitted development rights.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Fishpond Wood, Risplith	North Yorkshire	E21/1893	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application to vary condition 2 (to allow for the rearranged siting of the yurts) of planning permission 19/02600/FULMAJ - Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping.</p> <p>Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2022</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. 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. The area of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood is not on the Register.</p> <p>We refer you to our letter of 30th September 2019 responding to the earlier application: 19/02600/FULMAJ Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping. Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire, in which we expressed our concerns.</p> <p>In that letter, we explained in some detail the significance of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood. The application site is situated on land just off the B6265, c.9km to the west of Ripon, within the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The landscape shows signs of historic design with its sinuous lakes which have been dammed, high gritstone cliffs and accompanying careful planting and boathouse. We understand that the lakes may have been medieval fishponds for Fountains Abbey which is located c.5km to the east.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted on the 12th November 2020.</p> <p>In the current application, the Site Plan PL06 'As Proposed', labels 12 yurts or lodges with their additional facilities and communal areas. In the section to the north- west of the site there are also 4 further yurts with a communal area but there is no notation to indicate whether they are already in situ – comparing the drawing with that of 19/02600/FULMAJ, should we assume that these are being removed or have not been sited in this position? We are unclear as to what is proposed and in general find this planning application lacking in precise information, or notation on the plan which is not helpful.</p>

					<p>We still have concerns that the development will disrupt the tranquillity of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood; a precious resource. Although the proposal describes itself as a low impact eco-retreat set within existing woodland there are more permanent features in the site warden accommodation, hard-standing and access.</p> <p>We object to the relocation of the two eco lodges Nos 4&5 to being south of the access drive in the last remaining belt of trees and question any approval for eco lodges as they were only illustrated in the original application as Phase 2 in a very outline way with no central drive or access. Does this not need a separate planning application?</p> <p>We have noted this application does not illustrate where refuse and recycling will be stored, or the passing places on the drive. Will there be strict rules that cars once unloaded are parked in the car park to the south-east? This application no longer shows the dog walking or landscape screening, please ensure that all aspects of the original approval will be implemented. Will there be a monitoring and maintenance plan to ensure that environmental damage does not occur or if it does it is repaired?</p> <p>We will be responding separately to 22/00186/DVCMAJ. Variation of condition 5 (to allow for the permanent siting of the fixed tents but not in operation between 31st December and 1st March) and condition 6 (for the Managers accommodation to not be occupied between 31st December and 1st March) of planning permission 19/02600/FULMAJ.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Fishpond Wood, Risplith	North Yorkshire	E21/1895	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 5 (to allow for the permanent siting of the fixed tents but not in operation between 31st December and 1st March) and condition 6 (for the Managers accommodation to not be occupied between 31st December and 1st March) of planning permission 19/02600/FULMAJ - Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2022</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. 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. The area of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood is not on the Register.</p> <p>We refer you to our letter of 30th September 2019 responding to the earlier application: 19/02600/FULMAJ Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities</p>

				<p>communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping. Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>with parking and soft landscaping. Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire, in which we expressed our concerns. In that letter, we explained in some detail the significance of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood. The application site is situated on land just off the B6265, c.9km to the west of Ripon, within the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The landscape shows signs of historic design with its sinuous lakes which have been dammed, high gritstone cliffs and accompanying careful planting and boathouse. We understand that the lakes may have been medieval fishponds for Fountains Abbey which is located c.5km to the east.</p> <p>Planning permission for this application was granted on the 12th November 2020.</p> <p>However, we note the following in the Decision Notice for 19/02600/FULMAJ:</p> <p>5 The fixed tents, including the spa tent, shall be removed from the site between 31 October to 1 April the following year.</p> <p>6 The managers accommodation hereby permitted shall not be occupied between 31 October to 1 April the following year.</p> <p>The reasons being:</p> <p>5 The provision of year-round residential accommodation would be unacceptable in this location.</p> <p>6 The provision of year-round residential accommodation would be unacceptable in this location.</p> <p>We also note the reason for condition 7: 'To provide adequate mitigation and compensation for the loss of habitat within the SINC and for the indirect impacts on the SINC of increased disturbance'.</p> <p>Condition 6 (Use of site manager's accommodation) requires that the manager's accommodation is not used from November to March and the applicant seeks to remove that restriction to allow its use all year round. The only document with this application is the application form which implies there is a covering letter although it is not on Public Access. A letter would be useful, to know why these alterations are being requested. We are concerned that any extension of the period of operation must result in increased disturbance for the SINC and result in added risk to the beauty and tranquility of the lake and this part of the AONB.</p> <p>We object to the above proposed Variations from the Decision Notice for</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>19/02600/FULMAJ.</p> <p>We will be responding separately to 22/00184/DVCMAJ Application to vary condition 2 (to allow for the rearranged siting of the yurts) of planning permission 19/02600/FULMAJ - Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping. Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
23 Market Place, Bedale	North Yorkshire	E21/1955	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alterations and change of use of former first & second floor office space to provide 3no residential apartments. First & Second Floors 23 Market Place Bedale North Yorkshire. BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.02.2022</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. 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>This listed building is within the Bedale Conservation Area. The Design and Access Statement notes at 6. Access, that the existing public parking to the rear of the building will be utilised and at 5.6 Landscaping, that detailed landscape proposals have not been provided. We advise that the courtyard should be designed to provide some green space for the occupants of the residential apartments, and this could include small shrubs, wall/climbing plants and a small sitting area. This would have various benefits to health, air quality and biodiversity. In view of climate change, we recommend that hard landscaping and the area for vehicles is permeable.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Annesley Hall	Nottinghamshire	E21/1947	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of an office building (use class E (g)(i)) with car parking, landscaping and associated works. Access and drainage infrastructure including new highway from A611 signalised junction.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.02.2022</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 available online documentation and are unable to</p>

				Top Wighay Farm, Land east of A611, near Hucknal OFFICE/COMMERCIAL	find illustrations to back up the LVIA. We tried unsuccessfully to find the earlier outline application which presumably had the relevant photos and locations of receptor points. This vital supporting information should have been included with this detailed proposal which shows a very substantial building isolated in landscape. Although it does appear that the woodland forming the boundary of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Annesley Hall should preclude views out towards the proposed office block it would be helpful if the applicant could demonstrate that. There is also no information regarding future management of the woodland, as should future operations open up the views at some stage, we would have additional concerns. Until the relevant information is provided we would like to submit a holding objection as it is not possible to give an informed response without it. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Wentworth Woodhouse	South Yorkshire	E21/1705	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION 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	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.02.2022 ADDITIONAL RESPONSE Thank you for your e-mail of 28th January notifying The Gardens Trust (GT) that a number of the documents for the above application were not published prior to our response of 10th January 2022. As you know the GT is the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The 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. 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

			<p>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 cafe area and resurfacing of Mews Court courtyard. at Wentowrth Woodhouse Cortworth Lane Wentworth Cortworth Lane, Wentworth Rotherham S62 7TQ CHANGE OF USE, DEMOLITION, PARKING, ACCESS/ROUTES</p>	<p>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. The GT and YGT have reviewed the additional documents and we have the following comments to make in addition to those of our letter of 10th January. Landscape Master Plan There is no Landscape Master Plan, so it is impossible to get any idea of the overall vision. In fact, most of the planting details for the individual elements are sketchy; more landscape details are necessary in order to get a better understanding of what is intended. Camellia House We still cannot find anything about the heating arrangements that we trust are being designed to support the camellias, only a sheet of very technical data. There is definitely a need for a detailed understanding of the future husbandry and management of the camellias as explained in our previous letter. In our view the changing pod is an unworthy and utilitarian building for such a location. This would be somewhat ameliorated by being pulled further back into the trees away from the Camelia House. We are totally of the opinion that the disabled parking should be in the main car park with a transfer system to the Camellia House. Car Parking 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.’ We trust that the method used will not allow the tar to be visible. We appreciate that car parking spaces could be lost but we do strongly advise that there should be some form of planting buffer between the new permanent car park and the stable complex. We have not noted any details about the new overflow parking area other than an indication of the area for protective matting. We cannot see any well-designed and site appropriate screen planting to soften the impact – the area will be rather exposed when it’s full of vehicles; probably not visible from the house but very prominent from the north side of the stable block. In general, we advise that there needs to be a review of and proposals for screening using trees and shrubs to act as a buffer to and within the</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>proposed main car park, and if a car park outside the Camellia House is agreed – despite our misgivings.</p> <p>In conclusion we do not think that any of our concerns have been addressed by the additional documents.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E21/1966	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of hotel at Stratford Road car park; extension to existing restaurant at Knight's Village and new decked areas; elevated walkway; landscaping works including at Leafields; outdoor play area and associated infrastructure works. Warwick Castle, Castle Hill, Warwick, CV34 4QX HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION, BUILDING ALTERATION, PLAY AREA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.02.2022</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 GT/WGT recently objected to application W/21/2192 for the proposed relocation of the car park at Leafields. The hotel application must be considered in tandem with that since the hotel site will remove 65 parking spaces from Bays 10 & 9 in the current car park within Foxes Study. The Design and Access (D&A) part 1, para 2.6.3 states that 'Bay 10 is part of the Warwick Conservation Area (Sub Area 10) and Registered Park and Garden, but falls within an area that today has a commercial back of house character that is of low aesthetic value and does not contribute to the significance of the registered park and garden. Within Stratford car park and Foxes Study there is an existing group of modern timber lodges discreetly located within mature trees and vegetation.' We disagree with this statement. Foxes Study forms a significant and integral element of the late eighteenth century picturesque phase of landscape development, which itself is integral to the overall historic significance of this Grade I designed landscape. The visual impact of the permanent lodges and service building from River Island have had a significantly detrimental impact on the designed setting of Warwick Castle. This downplaying of the significance of Foxes Study is repeated within the Heritage Statement (HS), which continues to assert that Foxes Study is of negligible significance. 7.10 'The physical site proposed for the hotel building makes no contribution to the significance of the Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area as a modern carpark located within a part of the Castle grounds which has been identified as of neutral significance. The remainder of the site, which wraps around the existing Knight's Village Restaurant and facilities building, is of the Lowest significance being located within Foxes Study.</p>

					<p>Foxes Study is of significance as it forms part of the 18th century pleasure grounds within the Castle estate, albeit, it dates from after Brown’s work at the Castle and has been heavily modified through the loss of paths, changes to the tree coverage (both through thickening and then clearance during the late 20th century) and the introduction of modern albeit lightweight and reversible structures.’ The significance (and grading) of this designated landscape does not solely derive from the involvement of Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown, but rather precisely from the palimpsest of phases of development which have created the multi-phased landscape which survives today. The current state of this particular area has only been degraded due to the development put there in recent years by Merlin Attractions Operations Ltd. The HS (8.5) states that ‘Whilst the building and structures are permanent, in their removal at some point in the future, no lasting effects will be made to the landscape.’ Their removal at any stage seems most unlikely and the damage already incurred will be exacerbated by further development within this sensitive area of the RPG. The D&A part 4, which deals with the Landscape Ecology, makes much of the biodiversity net gain. Since the loss of biodiversity already experienced is directly as a result of Merlin’s prior development is seems unlikely that the landscape proposals will rapidly result in a tremendous increase of ‘foraging bats, birds and a range of invertebrate species’ (para 7.2) when the whole point of a new hotel is to increase footfall and visitor numbers in this precise area. D&A 4 7.1 states ‘The cherry laurel has been used extensively in the parking areas and along the boundary adjoining housing. More will be planted to help the new hotel bed into its setting.’ The leaves, seeds and fruits of <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> (cherry laurel) are highly toxic to humans (it contains cyanide) and may be an irritant to skin and eyes. It shades out woodland understory and prevents woodland regeneration therefore resulting in an absence of biodiversity in its vicinity. 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, makes clear that damaging change in the past cannot be taken as a justification for further harmful development. The above application, in our opinion, constitutes further unwelcome expansion within this sensitive and aesthetically significant area of the historic designed landscape (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</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>change).</p> <p>Even if your Authority is persuaded of the applicant's argument that the detrimental impact of the proposed development is less than substantial, we question the assertion that the alleged public benefits of the scheme outweigh the detriment of further incremental permanent development within the Grade I designated landscape which forms the setting of the Grade I Listed Castle and Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p>The GT/WGT strongly object to the further degradation of the RPG and the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E21/1956	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a temporary 49.35MW battery storage facility to include 28 energy storage container units, associated controls, PCS inverters, cooling and fire safety system, 14 Transformer feeder pillars, two substations and compound, each with an open air transformer, dedicated access track, security fencing enclosing the site, 14 low voltage cabins each with an open air transformer and high voltage switchgear. Intended lifespan of 40 years.</p> <p>FIELD ADJACENT THE DUCKERY, CHAPEL LANE, GREAT BARR MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.02.2022</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>The application site lies immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Great Barr. It also is in the centre of the Great Barr Conservation Area (CA) and lies within the Green Belt. The woodland of The Duckery, which is described as '...an area of ancient semi-natural woodland..'¹, lies within the RPAG immediately adjacent to the proposed development site and is clearly visible from it. The Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA, para 2.5) states that 'the site and immediate fieldscape to the north are used for horsiculture which has resulted in a degraded landscaped littered with paraphernalia.' Similar language is utilised within the 'Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (HEDBA, 2021) which describes the Grade II RPG (para.6.2.2) as '...a designated heritage asset of less than the highest significance.' The Great Barr Conservation Area is similarly described (para.6.1.2) as '...a largely agricultural landscape supporting a number of farms...' which contains '...very few historic buildings or heritage assets...' and is in consequence also (para.6.1.3) '...of less than the highest significance'. In fact, the Great Barr Conservation Area immediately surrounding the proposed development area is densely populated with 'historic buildings & heritage assets', as depicted in Figure 15 within the 'Appraisal and Management Plan for the Conservation Area (RPS Group, August 2021), referred to as evidence by the HEDBA. This shows that within a 500m</p>

					<p>radius of the centre of the proposed development site there are no less than 22 designated and undesignated heritage assets on the local Historic Environment Record (HER), including 5 Grade II Listed Buildings, as well as the Grade II Registered Great Barr Park.</p> <p>Surprisingly for a document that should be an objective and dispassionate assessment of heritage and other significances and the likely impacts of the proposed development upon them, the HEDBA takes the opportunity to declare its support for the conclusions of the RPS study, which recommends that</p> <p>‘...the Conservation Area boundary ought to be revised to its pre-1996 extents...’, adding that there ‘... is very little about the landscape outside of Character Area A that contributes to the heritage significance or intelligibility of the Conservation Area’ and that ‘...it is likely that most of this area was incorrectly designated as a landscape of special historic or architectural interest during the 1990’s consultation...’ (para.6.1.3). None of this is relevant to the impact of the currently proposed development, which sits well within ‘Character Area A’. It may however be of significance to what appears to be the wider context of this application.</p> <p>The proposed siting of such a large battery storage facility in open countryside and especially within a Conservation Area seems difficult to understand at first glance. The applicant, Anesco Ltd, describes itself on its website as having ‘...designed and built 105 solar farms in the UK totalling 525MW, including the UK’s first subsidy free solar farm’ as well as being a ‘...market leader in the UK battery storage market’. Its Design and Access Statement (2021) submitted in support of the current application, states that the proposed battery storage facility ‘...benefits from existing infrastructure which can [our emphasis] be utilised to store excess energy from the National Grid...’.</p> <p>Nowhere in the application however is it described precisely how this particular battery storage facility will be connected to the National Grid. Presumably this must be via one of the four electricity pylons nearest to the proposed location, but this is not stated and nor are any ‘cable runs’ to the facility shown on the submitted plans. The ‘District Network Operators Compound’ (DNO) through which this connection will be made is shown towards the southern end of the proposed development site on plan 7291-304275.pdf. This stands some 5.54 metres (minimum) above ground level and will itself be clearly visible from the RPAG. In addition, the nearest pylon to this end of the site is sited some 75 metres to the south, within</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the Duckery Woodland that forms part of the RPAG. The next nearest pylon is some 220 metres away, either again to the south within the RPAG or to the north and east beyond the current proposed development boundary and would be beneath the existing pylon run. No reference is made within the current application to any such further proposed developments or their likely impact upon the RPAG.</p> <p>Nor is the distinct possibility that in fact, the principal driver for the siting of the proposed battery storage facility in this location, is the intention to develop one or more 'solar farms' in the immediate vicinity, as is the case elsewhere with such developments.</p> <p>In the Design and Access Statement referred to above for example, Section 5.2 is titled Constraints and Opportunities. Under Opportunities it is stated, in addition to the section quoted above, that: '...A new access can be provided with sufficient visibility splays to facilitate the construction of the solar farm and for ongoing routine maintenance'.</p> <p>Elsewhere, it is stated (para 6.3.3) that:</p> <p>'Careful consideration has been given to the design of the solar farm to ensure it responds to the existing site context and has been engineered to provide a balance of functional capacity and the preservation of the environment and local amenity. At the scale proposed and with the proposed landscaping to soften the edge of the proposed development, the BESS will sit comfortably within the extents of the site'.</p> <p>In para.7.1.1 it is similarly stated that: 'This Design and Access Statement describes how a scheme has been developed which meets all the technical requirements for a solar farm whilst also addressing the specific issues arising from the Site and its context'.</p> <p>Finally, para.7.1.3 concludes that 'The proposed development can be sensitively accommodated in this location whilst ensuring the preservation of local amenity, ecology and the character of the wider landscape and represents a responsive design in terms of landscape features within the Site. Within the context of the landscape character area in which the solar farm is proposed, the characteristics of the landscape will not be significantly affected'.</p> <p>The part of the Great Barr Conservation Area within which the proposed battery storage development is to be sited lies clearly within the Setting of the Great Barr RPG and will be seen from it, as outlined above.</p> <p>Connections to the adjacent electricity pylons will either run through the RPG itself or be visible from it, again impacting upon its Setting.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We would have expected to see the Historic Environment Assessment looking at alternative, less sensitive sites further from the immediate setting of the RPG, and we have well-founded concerns, outlined above, that should this application be allowed, it will generate additional proposals for solar arrays within the immediate neighbourhood, or on Barr Beacon itself, compounding the impact upon the Conservation Area, RPG and Green Belt.</p> <p>The NPPF Para 151 relates to renewable energy projects within the Green Belt and states that ‘When located within the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers may need to demonstrate very special circumstances if the projects are to proceed..’.</p> <p>We have not seen such special circumstances demonstrated for the existing proposals, and are concerned that it may act as a stimulus and enabler for further proposed developments, as yet undeclared.</p> <p>The GT objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.02.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee over proposed development affecting the setting of Great Barr Park a site included at grade II on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of registered sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations. The Trusts OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>The application site occupies an open grass field abutting Chapel Lane. It lies within the West Midlands Green Belt and is within both the current and proposed revised boundary of Great Barr conservation area. It immediately flanks the northern boundary of the RPG at Great Barr Hall. The present landscaped grounds at Great Barr Park appear to originate from the mid 18th century when the location of the hall was transferred from near Chapel Lane to its current site. In the early 19th century the nationally known landscape designer Humphrey Repton remodelled the pleasure grounds around the hall, and created the lake in the valley to the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>south. Repton was probably also responsible for creating the woodlands and extensive grass pastureland in both north and south parks and laying out the shelter belts around the boundaries. The landscape of the historic park has experienced considerable change and neglect in recent years with the north park suffering extensive unauthorised tipping and recontouring. Nonetheless, enough survives of its historic character and significance for the park to justify continued retention on the HE Register and form the centrepiece of the conservation area. The park is included on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register.</p> <p>The Trusts fully endorse the national drive towards zero carbon energy supply and acknowledge the contribution that Battery Electric Storage can play in meeting that objective. (There is some ambiguity in the supporting documents about the purpose of the development – paragraphs 4.17 of the Planning Statement and 6.3.3. of the DAS describing it as a solar PV farm). Notwithstanding, BESS facilities are not an incontrovertible “good” in their own right and their siting must, inter alia, take into account heritage, ecological, landscape and other planning considerations. The proposed BESS at Chapel Lane with its fenced security compound, containers, switchgear and other apparatus will be of industrial character, readily visible and wholly at variance with the open character of its setting in the conservation area and Green Belt. Although outside the boundary of the RPG there is intervisibility between the two sites through the sparse perimeter planting in the park and, as shown in the photographs in the LVIA, in longer distance views towards the higher ground around Gilbert’s Wood. The proposed BESS will appear as an alien intrusion into the foreground setting of the historic park when viewed from Chapel Lane. The applicants’ description of the development as “temporary” is spurious. A 40 year lifespan hardly qualifies as temporary; it is unclear what enforceable commitment there will be to clearing and restoring the land at the termination of that period. There is mention of reinforced landscape planting but no details are provided to show how this might mitigate the harm to the setting of the RPG over the intervening period.</p> <p>The applicants’ planning statement fails to explain why, geographically, a site close to Walsall is essential for the BESS. While it asserts that other sites including some in less sensitive urban industrial contexts have been explored it provides no evidence for these nor why they were rejected. The Trusts do not consider that the happenstance of this site being close to a road, in proximity to a power line with adequate capacity, well distanced</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>from residential properties, and with the convenience of a willing landowner provide an overriding justification for locating a BESS here. No strategic argument for selecting this specific site has been advanced which might justify overriding the various planning protections afforded to the Green Belt, Great Barr Conservation Area, and the RPG and permitting the resultant harm from this development. The Trusts are very disappointed that the applicants' DAS and Planning Statements barely recognise the existence of the RPG or acknowledge its proximity to the application site. The DAS briefly and mistakenly dismisses its relevance at paragraph 2.3.2. under ecology and omits to mention it at 2.3.4 under heritage.</p> <p>In summary the Trusts consider that this application will cause harm to the significance of Great Barr Conservation Area and to the RPG and its setting and has not demonstrated an overriding need or public benefit which would outweigh that harm (NPPF paras 200-202). The application does not satisfy the test of S72(1) of the</p> <p>P(LB&CA) Act 1990 in that it will neither conserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposals run counter to your Council's planning policies for the protection of the Green Belt and built heritage. The proposal does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances which would warrant the harm from intrusion into the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Trusts recommend that your Council refuse planning permission for the proposal</p> <p>Yours sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGP</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---