



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES MARCH 2022

The GT conservation team received 195 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, 81 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Warmley House RECONSULTATION	Avon	E21/2132	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of for 5 dwellings (Outline) with access, landscaping and layout to be determined, all other matters reserved. Land Behind 114 Tower Road North Warmley South Gloucestershire BS30 8XN RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.03.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting the Mid C18 grounds around a mansion using features of earlier industrial works. Warmley House was built c 1750 for William Champion, a Quaker Industrialist who had moved his brassworks [founded 1742] from Old Market, in the centre of Bristol to Warmley in 1746. The gardens around the house were laid out from 1746 to 1769. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The site affected by this application is within the Warmley conservation area. Warmley's most intricate garden area lies c 50m to the west of the house. An ornamental gateway [Grade II listed] flanks the steps leading to the northern entrance to the interior of the Grottoes [Grade II listed] These underground structures, thought to originate from the industrial workings, are built into the rising ground upon which the House stands and consists

					<p>of passageways built from stone, clinker and slag blocks which link to a central, formerly domed but now open, area to four axial vaulted chambers, some with water basins and waterfalls. The interior is liberally decorated with black slag and clinker, by products of the smelting processes. All of this is relevant to the current application because these by products of the industrial production were creatively used by Champion everywhere that a decorative wall was added, and that included the Chequered Walled Garden as much as the low triangular slab coping block walls that edge the eastern boundary of his estate on the edge of the Conservation area along Tower Road North; as illustrated below.</p> <p>The planned access to the five proposed houses to be built behind Tower Road North is shown below:</p> <p>The 'William Champion's Brassworks' low stone walls of the 1930's houses in Tower Road North form the eastern boundary of the Warmley conservation area. The mound and oak trees in the Registered Park and Garden are visible in the gap between the semi detached houses pictured above.</p> <p>The gardens lie to the west of the house and extend for c 300m to the north and 100m to the south. The house terrace and immediate surrounds are planted with mature evergreen trees such as holm oak and monkey puzzle dating from the C19. A detailed tree survey has been requested by a consultee before comment could be made. The 2007 Conservation management plan ecological assessment of this site recorded evidence of five notable species: badgers; hedgehogs; slow worms; lizards and great crested newts. Also, birds and 10 species of bats were recorded. A light pollution survey would also be necessary to assess potential wildlife habitat harm, by the building of five houses on this enclosed undisturbed piece of land.</p> <p>One reason for the unsuitability of this development on this site is the poor access from Tower Road North, between two semi-detached terrace houses. The application is for five houses to be built behind this access route with parking areas for two cars per house. That would mean paving over the front garden of 114 and 112 with access roads. Which would be contrary to the character of the rest of Tower Road North and the South Gloucestershire Local Plan – Ref: L 12 Conservation Areas 3.17; "Boundary treatments should be designed having regard to their function, character of the setting. Their design should seek to provide a common theme along public frontages in terms of materials,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>planting and elevational treatment.”</p> <p>3.18; “Within residential areas, old and new, it is the sense of place which should have priority. It is not the road layout but the relationship of buildings to each other which should be paramount”.</p> <p>No Highways specialist advice regarding the feasibility or safety of this plan has been offered for consideration as part of this application.</p> <p>The piece of land that is the application site, is 3,369.00 sq. metres. English Heritage in 2002, thought it was probably the Nursery Garden for the William Champion Estate, with access only from within the estate.</p> <p>Have other options been considered? Because of the size and proximity of the site to the Heritage Museum and Visitor Centre a well proven technology of a ground source heat pump would supply the hot water and heating to these, or other buildings. The carbon free technology would be mainly underground, so the application site can be landscaped in a way that suits the parkland setting, not to just screen housing.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust object to the building of five houses and the creation of a roadway between two terraced houses as both will have a negative effect on the conservation area. Also, we consider there are ‘greener’ options for this site that will benefit Warmley House and Gardens.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chair, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Wasing Place	Berkshire	E21/2087	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of an infill extension to link the main dwellinghouse with the stable annexe.</p> <p>Wasing Old Rectory, Shalford Hill, Aldermaston, Reading</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.03.2022</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 Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We are happy that the proposed development will not result in harm to the Wasing Place Grade II Registered Park and Garden and therefore Berkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Bettina Kirkham Planning Advisor to the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>

Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E21/1840	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of a proposed self-supporting timber fence with bar-gates</p> <p>Tyringham Hall Filgrave To Gayhurst Road Tyringham Newport Pagnell MK16 9ES</p> <p>ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.03.2022</p> <p>Please accept my apologies for the delay in replying to your email of 11th March. Unfortunately, we have been tied up in a planning inquiry and my colleague in Buckinghamshire who might have made a site visit has just come down with Covid. We very much appreciate the offer though, but as I live a long way from Tyringham and cover most of the country part time, it is not an option for me.</p> <p>However, we have read the HIA and also the comments from the Senior Heritage Officer and are disappointed that the focus of their assessment is the potential damage done to Tyringham Hall and to the Stables and yet there is very little reference to the Grade II* registered park and garden. We do not consider that our original concerns have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/BGT stand by the content of our original response to the above application and object to the principle of a boundary in this position. We urge the Council to refuse this application. However, if a boundary is permitted, it should continue the line of the driveway hedge and be marked by traditional-style metal railings and gates.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hedsor House	Buckinghamshire	E21/2009	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of two existing buildings creating 1 x 3-bed short term let holiday dwelling with creation of linked walkway and demolition of redundant out buildings</p> <p>Buildings At Woolmans Wood Hedsor Park Farm Heathfield Road Hedsor</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.03.2022</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 their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Hedsor is a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG). The history of the site dates back to 1583 and has a strong connection with the adjacent Cliveden Estate dating back to 1706 when, as the listing states "Lord Orkney planted his northern, axial, 250m long lime avenue approach to Cliveden House (qv), which stretched north from the Cliveden turning circle into the Hedsor estate for 330m, as shown on the Survey of Cliveden House and Gardens, 1749." It is thought that the grounds were remodelled when the 'new house' was built in the late 18th century and formal gardens were added at the start of the 20th century.</p> <p>The application site sits just outside of the RPG in the southern section of</p>

					<p>Woolman's Wood although seemingly within part of the former parkland. This application seeks to convert two existing structures constructed for the purposes of water storage into two holiday lets. Whilst the application site is outside of the RPG, the Gardens Trust is concerned about the impact of converting two functional structures effectively into residential dwellings.</p> <p>The proposals show a substantial increase in the amount of external glazing, the introduction of a glazed link, a new patio area and other alterations consistent with the change to residential use. Whilst we acknowledge that the applicants have attempted to mitigate the extent of light emittance and reflection through the use of timber shutters, the simple fact of introducing residential accommodation to this site, with the noise, substantially increased glazing resulting in light emittance, reflection and general paraphernalia will have a dramatic and detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent registered park and garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust therefore object to the proposals for these reasons unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the impact of these proposals is minimal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stoke Park	Buckinghamshire	E21/2070	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 100 solar panels to be installed on the land adjacent to Manor House. Solar battery storage to be housed within existing pool outbuilding Land On The South-West Side Of Park Road, Stoke Poges, Buckinghamshire, , SOLAR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.03.2022</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 their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The application is submitted on behalf of the current owners of The Manor House at Stoke Poges, a Grade I listed building dating to 1550 and formerly known as Stoke Manor. The proposals are for the installation of 100 solar panels on land adjacent to the Manor to improve the EPC rating of their property.</p> <p>As the website for English Heritage states "EPCs do not provide a complete energy audit of a building but focus on an assessment of the building providing a list of recommended measures to improve energy performance. The type of fuel source for heating the building and providing hot water has a significant impact on the EPC rating. EPCs are also based on</p>

					<p>standard assumptions about occupancy and energy use so they do not take account of actual energy use. As the recommended measures of an EPC are based on the cost of fuel rather than energy efficiency they can be rather misleading and may not always be appropriate for the building." An EPC is only required when constructing, renting or selling the property,</p> <p>The application focusses heavily on the issue of climate change and provides extensive detail as to the proposed solar panels. However, the application is notably unhelpful in its lack of information - in fact, it took considerable time to even find a postcode to identify the application site. The Design and Access Statement does refer to the Grade I listed status of the Manor House. Following their EPC assessment, it appears that the applicant has chosen the route of solar panels as the renewable technology which has the least impact on "on the aesthetic value of the listed building" although this still suggests the solar panels will nonetheless be visible from the house.</p> <p>However, the Gardens Trust is utterly astonished that the D&A statement completely omits the fact that the proposed position for 100 solar panels is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · WITHIN the Grade II Registered Park and Garden for Stoke Park, a landscape park which was one of the first commissions by Lancelot Brown. The park was then subsequently modified by Nathaniel Richmond and Humphry Repton who provided designs for the landscape around the new house then being built. · WITHIN STOKE PARK Conservation Area · ADJACENT to Gray's Field purchased by the local community and gifted to the National Trust for the long-term protection of · Gray's Monument, a Grade II* listed building. Both fall within the RPG. · JUST TO THE NORTH of the Grade 1 RPG of Stoke Poges Gardens of Remembrance <p>It is highly likely that the proposed solar panel array will be visible from Gray's Monument and the footpaths around Gray's Field and possibly from Stoke Park and the Gardens of Remembrance. Furthermore, the light reflecting from the panels will adversely impact on views to and from Gray's Field and Monument.</p> <p>Whilst we note the applicant's desire to seek out renewable sources of energy, solar panel technology is absolutely not appropriate in this setting. It is unsightly and not in keeping with a landscape setting which is subject to so many different levels of protection as detailed above.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The Gardens Trust object in the strongest possible terms to this proposal and we urge the planning authority to refuse consent to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wavendon House landscape	Buckinghamshire	E21/2107	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for the installation of two Electric Vehicle Charging Posts adjacent to existing parking bays. 41 Wavendon House Drive Wavendon Milton Keynes MK17 8AJ MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.03.2022</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 GT regrets that the applicant has installed the electric car charging points in Grade II registered park and garden without prior consent from the local planning authority. Furthermore, we are concerned that this has the potential to set a precedent for similar works.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise the need to address the need for renewables, the installation of such technologies in protected landscapes should only take place with prior consultation with the local planning authority and other relevant parties to ensure that the result is not detrimental to the significance of the setting.</p> <p>On this occasion, as the charging points are limited in number and will mostly be concealed by the vehicles and the surrounding hedging, the GT does not object to them remaining in situ. However, we would encourage the planning authority to stress to the applicant that any further installations or alterations will require prior consultation.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Waddesdon Manor	Buckinghamshire	E21/2124	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of Lafite sculpture at Waddesdon Dairy The Dairy Queen Street Waddesdon Buckinghamshire HP18 0JW SCULPTURE/MONUMENT</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.03.2022</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 their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Waddesdon is an internationally significant Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and the proposed application site sits detached to the north of the main house and formal gardens. The site contains the former dairy building complex which was constructed around 1874 and each building is</p>

					<p>listed separately Grade II. The GT/BGT also note that the complex was altered significantly between 1992-5 by the garden designers Julian and Isabel Bannerman, which involved extensive rebuilding, extension and restoration.</p> <p>Consent was granted to the previous application to relocate two sculptures by Joanna Vasconcelos as well as the relocation and extension of the car park from the east of the building complex to north of Queen Street. Time constraints were attached as conditions to the consent.</p> <p>This revised application proposes to relocate the 'Lafite' sculptures to the south elevation of the Dairy following on from a site visit by the artist and support from the owners who feel that this will improve opportunities for wedding photography.</p> <p>The GT/BGT have considered this application and offer the following comments:</p> <p>Whilst we did not object to the proposed position of the 'Wedding Cake' sculpture, we were concerned about the possibility that it would be visible above the tree line from views around the RPG particularly from the higher ground around the house and would recommend that the planning authority ensure that any visibility is mitigated by additional planting.</p> <p>The revised proposals for the 'Lafite' sculptures relocates them to the south side of the Dairy which is extremely visible in all views to the Dairy from around the Grade I RPG. The proposed position would mean that they would be visible in 180° open views from the west, south and east across the parkland from one of the main drives???? altering the focal point within the landscape. In our opinion, the proposals will therefore change and damage the immediate setting of the Dairy and the wider landscape by introducing a feature in alien form and materials. We feel that contemporary art and sculpture installations, as elsewhere at Waddesdon, should be discreetly positioned close to buildings enclosed within gardens and mitigated by the immediate planting.</p> <p>To locate the 'Lafite' sculpture in this position would set a damaging precedent which may see future applications for further contemporary art works or structures within the wider open landscape.</p> <p>The GT/BGT object to this application and urges the Planning Authority to refuse it.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Peterborough Cathedral Precincts RECONSULTATION	Cambridgeshire	E21/0745	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of Existing Buildings and Erection of 8 Dwellings The Garden House Minster Precincts Peterborough PE1 1XS DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.03.2022 Thank you for reconsulting The Gardens Trust (GT) and the Cambridgeshire Gardens Trust about the amendments to the above application. Whilst the reduced height of the proposed buildings is welcomed, the higher portion of both blocks does appear quite dominant in the proposed elevations whereas the photographic representations from the Wheelyard and over the access gates shows that the proposed materials are suitably recessive. Since the site has been allocated for housing, we have no further comments to make on the proposals except to ask that your tree officers concerns are considered. We withdraw our holding objection. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Burghley House RECONSULTATION	Cambridgeshire	E21/1698	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION The proposed construction of a replacement visitor vehicular parking area; the creation of an overflow parking area; and removal of existing parking area, to be replaced by soft landscaping Land At Burghley House And Park Burghley Park Stamford Road Pilsgate Stamford Stamford PE9 3JY PARKING, LANDSCAPE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.03.2022 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 considered the online documentation relating to the re-siting of the visitor car park, and agree with the conclusions of the 2020 Masterplan for Burghley House and its Grade II * registered park and garden (RPG), that it will be beneficial to move the existing car park away from its current prominent position. We welcome the return of the current parking area to grassland. We appreciate the site for the replacement visitor parking area also lies within the RPG and will still be slightly visible and is relatively close to the Grade II listed Queen Elizabeth's Gate. However, it is further away from the Grade I mansion house and will be partially screened by the existing avenue which is due to be augmented by the introduction of replacement trees where necessary, as well as the introduction of some additional parkland trees to further conceal the parking area. We can see that your tree officer has made recommendations regarding incursion into root zones and we concur with his comments. The overflow carpark is to remain green with the addition of grasscrete or similar and we are happy with that even though on the few occasions when this area will be in use it is more visible than the permanent parking area.

					<p>The GT does not object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sudbury Hall	Derbyshire	E21/2058	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of outdoor musical instrument equipment Sudbury Hall Main Road Sudbury Ashbourne Derbyshire MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.03.2022</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 Derbyshire Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the sparse documentation provided by the National Trust for the above application, which has little more than a very brief heritage statement (HS). We would have expected at the least some photographs of the intended site as the chosen instruments are extremely colourful and it is difficult to understand how these structures complement the garden setting : (HS (p5) 'The instruments chosen will complement the garden setting, comprising of flowers and similar shapes (see illustrative image on the first page of this statement)'. We appreciate the desire to encourage visitors and children to less frequented areas of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG), but we hope that siting of these structures here will not necessitate other amenities in future (refreshment kiosk, toilets etc). It would have been helpful if the applicant had included a Master Plan in order for us to gain a better understanding of future plans. The lake (which lies within the boundaries of the RPG) is just to the south of the proposed play structures and is not in NT ownership. Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). The owner of the rest of the RPG (The Vernon Estate we believe) do not appear to have been consulted about the proposals. Their ability to enjoy their part of the RPG is dependent on the brightly coloured structures being completely screened from the lake and ideally from the rest of the RPG, so the following excerpts from the SHA are relevant : P5 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is... prominent or intrusive. Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset; Visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point; Noise, vibration and other nuisances; Tranquillity, remoteness, 'wildness' ;</p>

					<p>Busyness, bustle, movement and activity; Sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy.'</p> <p>The GT/DGT understands the wish to make this property children focused, but that does not mean that good design should be forgotten, and consideration must be given to the impact these structures will have upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Endsleigh	Devon	E21/2030	I	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Leigh Wood and land north of Hardicott Cottage.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects an area within or immediately adjoining (and lying within the setting of), the historic designed landscape of Endsleigh, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade I. Only approximately 10% of listed historic designed landscapes are considered to be of such outstanding historic and aesthetic significance to merit designation at this highest grade. Such sites may reasonably be considered to be of international significance.</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. Our response is informed by a recent site visit and previous personal knowledge of the landscape; the consultant who wrote the Conservation Management Plan for that part of the designed landscape in the ownership of the then Endsleigh Charitable Trust is a member of our Conservation Committee, and we are grateful for his insights and advice with regard to these proposals.</p> <p>We have examined the documentation for this application, and note that the sites of the proposed felling lie within Leigh Wood which forms an integral part of the internationally significant Picturesque designed landscape which was laid out for the sixth Duke of Bedford by Humphry Repton from 1814; and an area of woodland adjoining the early twentieth century Tavistock drive. The latter lies immediately outside the designated landscape boundary, but clearly forms an integral part of its setting.</p>

					<p>While we recognise the need to manage the existing woodland within the historic designed landscape and its immediate setting, we have serious concerns with regard to the present proposals, and particularly with regard to the species proposed for re-planting, which we would advise appear to be unsympathetic to the aesthetic and historic significance of the designed landscape.</p> <p>As woodland management within the historic designed landscape and its setting is a dynamic, on-going process, we strongly advise that, in our view, best practice requires the compilation of a Conservation Management Plan specifically for the woodland compartments within the Grade I Registered landscape. This should not be a complicated document, and it should not be burdensome to the Estate owner. We advise that such a management plan should consider the historic precedent for planting in each area of woodland, its present condition and the survival within the woodland of any historic features such as paths, drives or structures, and formulate a scheme for future felling and re-planting. We do not have knowledge of the content of the Woodland Management Plan which we assume exists for these areas of planting as it was not produced in respect of this application, but logically that plan, and the Conservation Management Plan we advise should complement each other.</p> <p>Leigh Wood</p> <p>We note historic map evidence, along with Repton’s watercolour views, show that Leigh Wood was predominantly deciduous in character. The late nineteenth century (1882) and early twentieth century (1905) Ordnance Surveys show a scatter of coniferous species within what was still predominantly deciduous woodland.</p> <p>Compartment 9b appears as a somewhat artificial block of coniferous woodland on the lower edge of Leigh Wood. It would appear to have been clear-felled and re-planted with Sitka and Western Hemlock for commercial forestry in the post-War period. This block of woodland appears to be visible from both the Shell House at the end of Repton’s Terrace, and possibly from Endsleigh House itself; unfortunately, our site visit was hampered by adverse weather conditions and recent storm damage, but we feel that what we were able to see confirmed our view that the visual impact of the felling and replanting from key designed view-points within the core of the Grade I listed landscape need to be considered with the utmost care.</p> <p>We would advise that the Duke’s Drive below compartment 9b, the path</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>above it, and those running through it, appear to correspond to the circulation routes forming part of Repton’s design, as recorded in his Red Book views towards the site of the Swiss Cottage and the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey. These paths and drives are therefore of historic significance, and we advise that appropriate measures should be put in place to prevent them being damaged by heavy machinery during forestry operations.</p> <p>With regard to re-planting proposals, we are concerned that it is intended to replicate the existing, un-historic and unsympathetic coniferous monoculture. The necessary felling of the existing coniferous woodland offers an opportunity to improve on the existing situation, rather than perpetuate it. We therefore ask that the species proposed for re-planting in Leigh Wood be urgently reviewed with the objective of securing a more mixed planting pallet.</p> <p>We draw attention to the apparent intention not to replant the ten oaks to be felled in compartment 7b, and ask that these trees should be reinstated in the new planting.</p> <p>Tavistock Drive</p> <p>The Drive forms part of a programme of improvements made to the designed landscape at Endsleigh by the 11th Duke of Bedford (succeeded 1893, died 1940) in the early twentieth century. These changes include the creation of the lake and Pinetum at the head of the Edgcumbe valley, as well as the construction of various drives and lodges and the introduction of a wider range of coniferous species in the woodlands. This was the last significant phase of development within the historic designed landscape, and, as such, contributes to the overall outstanding significance of the site. While the Drive itself and some of the associated landscape features are included within the Grade I landscape, the woodland proposed for felling and replanting lies just outside; arguably this is an error on the part of Historic England. However, notwithstanding this omission, the woodland clearly forms an integral part of the setting of the historic designed landscape, and contributes to its aesthetic and the way in which it is experienced.</p> <p>Historic map evidence (Ordnance Survey, 1905) indicates that at the time of the creation of the new drive, the woodland had a predominantly deciduous character, with a scatter of conifers. We consider that such a mixed woodland is more appropriate to the Picturesque character of the historic designed landscape, which clearly informed the 11th Duke’s</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>improvements and additions. At some point in the mid or late twentieth century, the original woodland was felled and replanted with a commercial coniferous timber crop which is both un-historic, and unsympathetic to its location.</p> <p>We would again advise that simple re-planting on a “like for like” basis, using only coniferous species, is missing a significant opportunity to redress the unwise planting decisions of the past in this part of the historic designed landscape, and to recapture the intended character and appearance of this woodland which forms a key component of this early twentieth century approach. We strongly advise reconsideration of the replanting proposals.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust, with The Gardens Trust as Statutory Consultee, has serious concerns about the impact of the proposed replanting set out in the present Felling License application.</p> <p>We strongly advise that a Conservation Management Plan, or a suitably adapted Woodland Management Plan, is required in this highly sensitive designed landscape, in order that the woodlands may both be appropriately managed for commerce, but also as an integral and essential element of this internationally significant Grade I historic designed landscape.</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust would be very happy to meet with the Forestry Commission to discuss all or any of these issues further, with a view to finding a constructive way forward for Endsleigh.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Barnsley Park	Gloucestershire	E21/2109	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Erection of plant room and toilet block at Barnsley Park House Barnsley Park Barnsley Cirencester Gloucestershire MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.03.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that may have an adverse impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this application on its behalf.</p> <p>Having considered the drawings and the explanatory text accompanying this proposal, GGLT would not wish to raise any adverse comment. The building will have no adverse impact; and the building matches the proposed business-like and practical use, is well detailed, and will fit into its "service" setting.</p>

					Yours sincerely, David Ball,(on behalf of GGLT).
Alderley Grange	Gloucestershire	E21/2122	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of roof light, external chimney and enclosure of pergola, following Permission S.21/1078/FUL. (Retrospective) Alderley Grange, Alderley, Wotton-Under-Edge, Gloucestershire. BUILDING ALTERATIONS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.03.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impinge on the quality of Listed or Registered parks, gardens, and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on their behalf. Having looked at the documentation and the recent planning history of this proposal, it is considered that the works do not have any unfortunate implications for the wider sensitive historic setting of Alderley Grange. The current scheme brings a new life and beneficial use to the then existing run down stable area, and achieves this in a sensitive manner. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Victoria Tower Gardens	Greater London	E21/1455	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Detailed Tree Protection Method Statement and details of arboricultural site supervision and record keeping pursuant to Conditions 8 and 9 of planning permission called in and approved by the Minister of State for Housing dated 29 July 2021 (ref: APP/XF990/V/19/3240661). The Victoria Tower Gardens, Millbank, London, SW1P 3YB TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.03.2022 I write further to the Trust's letter of 26th November 2021; our subsequent meeting about all special conditions in January and the recent news about the WCC's notice to place a Tree Preservation Order on all the trees in the park. The London Gardens Trust (LHPGT) is grateful to WCC for the TPO and wholly endorses this decision. LHPGT also agrees and supports the points made in the Thorney Island Society's submission of 21 st March – these are vital questions that need to be considered. LHPGT wishes to make further observations having taken additional expert advice. It is noticeable that Bartlett Consulting, who carried out the original tree survey, have been replaced by Barrell Tree Consultancy, and the contents of this Arboricultural Method Statement is less conscientious than might be expected given the importance and challenges of this project. The landscape practice involved in the design of the UKHMLC is noticeably absent from this submission – we would urge that the landscape practice should formally be brought in to take responsibility for the future health of the trees as part of any final contractual planning agreement. Inspection of the submitted plans 21127-1 phases A-J suggests that a complete reassessment of the proposed working method is essential: BS 5837:2012 requires a Root Protection Area around existing mature trees as neatly summarised by the Arboricultural Advisory and Information Service Advisory Note

					<p>APN 12 – “Development Near Trees - BS 5837:2005 (updated 2012) Trees in Relation to Construction –Recommendations recommends that on construction sites an area around a tree should be left undisturbed (the Root Protection Area) so that unacceptable damage to the root system is avoided. In the British Standard the Root Protection Area is calculated as the equivalent of a circle about 12x the diameter of the tree’s trunk (measured at 1.5m above ground level).” (In this case some inward adjustment is necessary to take into account that more substantial tree roots are expected towards the park away from the road or embankment wall)”To reiterate there must be NO COMPACTION of the soil.”</p> <p>During the Inquiry it was accepted that this standard would not be achieved for a few of the trees along Millbank; indeed one of the UKHMLC witnesses stated he thought that the loss of these trees would be acceptable. However, all the other trees were assumed to be safeguarded by retention of the Root Protection Areas defined by BS 5837.</p> <p>Plans 21127-1 phases A-J need to be completely reassessed so that no site compounds are located within the Root Protection Areas; the present drawings show both the Main Site Compound and the numerous Satellite Compounds intruding into these areas which must be protected from disturbance.</p> <p>An additional matter of serious concern arises from point 2 of Thorney Island Society’s submission, noting the proposal for “excavation via the use of a 32-tonne vacuum extraction machine.” It is essential that, while working or static on site, such a machine is only located within the area to be excavated or in a small clearly defined adjacent area, centrally placed. As highlighted by the Thorney Island Society the means of its reaching the excavation area needs full explanation too.</p> <p>But this raises a more general and vital point which has not been addressed by the Arboricultural Method Statement. What control of vehicle weight is proposed during construction? In May 2019 New Brunswick Botanical Garden of Canada noted about vehicles that: “2000 kilos (2 tonnes) ... regularly applied to the ground directly above the tree’s root system can cause problems.”</p> <p>Though such a stringent and sensible standard might be considered impracticable, a responsible landscape architect would have negotiated with the contractor and engineer that a defined modest maximum vehicle weight will be used on site during construction and no construction</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>vehicles will enter the Root Protection Areas which will be fenced off from any access by the contractors. LHPGT recommends that a fine be written into the contract for each incursion into the Root Protection Area or a failure to limit vehicle weight to underline the importance of adhering to the guidance and provide the Trees with the best opportunity to survive.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Monger Director</p>
Pylewell Park	Hampshire	E21/2032	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Use of house and land for a period of 15 years for mixed use comprising residential use and the holding of weddings and events with short term accommodation in the house; internal alterations to house; siting of marquee with ancillary generator, oil tank, diesel tank, fencing and storage shed; siting of gazebo; associated parking (Application for Listed building Consent) Pylewell House, Pylewell, East End, Lymington, SO41 5SJ MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have reviewed the online documentation which makes clear the substantial funds required to repair many years of inadequate maintenance within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) as well as the Grade II* mansion house. It is helpful to see the required work prioritised with a clear repair strategy going forwards. It is extremely unfortunate for the applicants that the various Covid lockdowns effectively cancelled most of the pre-booked events in 2020 and 2021 but it is encouraging for everyone to see that there appear to be healthy bookings running into the future.</p> <p>In our previous letter for withdrawn application 21/00137, we referred to the repair of the haha and are glad to see a photograph of this welcome outcome on p40 of the Conservation Statement (Part 1). This photo also shows a clear image of the marquee. We appreciate that the temporary marquee is a key part of the ongoing business plan, but it is extremely unfortunate that something so agricultural and utilitarian in appearance was chosen, which is unsympathetic to its sensitive surroundings. In our opinion it negatively affects the setting of the main house when seen from the southern parkland and other key views. The planting of holm oaks in front of it will not mitigate views for many years.</p> <p>We support the removal of the parking from the southern side of the parkland. We also welcome the absence of hard-surfacing for the car parking, but with 48+ events over the course of a year, do have some concerns that during less favourable weather, there will be damage to the sward. We hope that your officers will ensure that any overspill car parking</p>

					<p>will not affect the root zones of trees, in particular veterans within the parkland.</p> <p>The GT/HGT have no comments with regard to alterations within the house. However, the GT/HGT are unable to support a 15-year extension for the marquee. We have concerns that if it remains in situ for this length of time it may eventually become permanent in its current position, which we would strongly oppose. We would suggest that your officers consider a shorter extension of no more than 5 years. This will give the applicants time to evaluate the success of their wedding venture, and based on this, consider an alternative, less harmful site for a marquee going forward. We would also ask that should the temporary permission cease, the concrete base be removed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Garnons	Hereford and Worcester	E21/2112	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reserved matters following outline approval ref 204024/O for three dwellings.</p> <p>Land at Byford Grain Store, Byford Common, Byford, Herefordshire</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have discussed this application with our colleagues in the Hereford & Worcestershire Gardens Trust who have now responded twice to this application. Rather than repeat their comments, for the sake of brevity, we wish to entirely support their objection to the application, for all the reasons outlined in their letters.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Woodhall Park RECONSULTATION	Hertfords hire	E21/1801	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retention of 1 single storey Portakabin building to be used as an additional classroom for a period of 26 weeks.</p> <p>Heath Mount School Woodhall Park Watton At Stone Hertford Hertfordshire SG14 3NG</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE TO RECONSULTATION 13.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, on this amended application.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement by DLA with the brief impact assessment does not address the concerns we have about the impact of this development on the listed landscape nor on the historic relationship between the listed mansion and these former pleasure grounds.</p> <p>Historic England's GPA3.2 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' also makes it clear that setting is not merely about views but that many other factors, not considered in the DLA report, contribute to setting.</p>

					<p>We also still have concerns about the harm to the heritage assets of listed house and listed landscape from the cumulative effect of addition buildings and extensions to existing buildings in this area of the site.</p> <p>We therefore still object to the current overdevelopment of this part of the site</p>
Woodhall Park	Hertfords hire	E21/2057	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed cabin to be used as classroom</p> <p>Heath Mount School Woodhall Park Watton At Stone</p> <p>EDUCATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, on this reconsultation.</p> <p>We are concerned that the addition of another building to this part of the Registered Landscape will cause harm both to that heritage asset and to the setting of the listed mansion, and due also to the cumulative harm caused by various extra buildings and extensions over the years. The DLA Heritage report does not consider the full implications of setting, as defined in historic England's GPA3.2 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' concentrating merely on views to the mansion.</p> <p>We have concerns over the damage to the listed landscape and the setting off the listed building due to overdevelopment of this part of the former pleasure grounds and therefor object to this proposal.</p>
9 Osborn House Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E21/2096	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 1 x externally illuminated projecting hanging sign and 2 x internally illuminated fascia signs</p> <p>9 Osborn House Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AT</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.</p> <p>The design and proposed illumination of this sign do not respect the original Welwyn Garden City design style as developed by Reginald Glossop and others, which should be a consideration in this key position on one of the Unwin-type 'gates' leading down Howardsgate.</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E21/2134	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey rear extension with rooflights and alterations to openings. Replacement windows and doors</p> <p>6 Lovett Road London Colney Hertfordshire AL2 1Ue</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, on this application</p> <p>We note that the Design and Access Statement considers the impact on the Green Belt at some length but fails to mention that this property is situated in a landscape Listed by Historic England, nor assess any impact these proposals would have.</p> <p>On the basis of the information supplied, we have no comment to make on the impact on the historic landscape although the large amount of glass proposed on the southern elevation could have an adverse effect on the more modern landscape of the housing development.</p>

103-109 Newgate Street Village	Hertfords hire	E21/2152	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline permission for construction of up to 6 new dwellings, formation of access, car parking and turning space, and landscaping with all matters reserved Land to the west of 103-109 Newgate Street Village</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The site of the proposed development lies within the Green Belt, and this part of the Green Belt has not been assessed for removal from the Green Belt during the current Local Plan preparation and examination proceedings and has been assessed as making a significant contribution to safeguarding the countryside. It also does not fall within WHBC Policy SADM34 which limits infill development to 4 houses maximum. Sufficient justification for building in the Green Belt in an area not allocated for development in the emerging Local Plan has not been provided.</p> <p>The site also lies with the Locally Listed Ponsbourne Park which is the setting for Ponsbourne Manor, first built on that site to a design by Joseph Bonomi. Development would be contrary to WHBC Policy SADM15 which seeks to avoid harm to the significance of the historic environment, and Ch 16 of the NPPF, which this development would do.</p>
Bayfordbury	Hertfords hire	E21/2188	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of agricultural land to create, archery range with creation of 42 parking spaces, erection of wooden clad storage structure/shelter and toilets. Installation of photovoltaic solar panels</p> <p>Bayford Hall Farm Bayford Lane Bayford Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8PR</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Bayfordbury is a Grade II 18th century designed landscape, and the area of these proposed developments lies just north of the former South Lodge and was crossed by the former south drive. Both Lodge and drive are no longer extant though archaeological remains may exist. We note that the proposed storage facility would be situated just north of the former lodge. As the car parking will be on re-inforced grass and the storage facility clad in wooden panels, there should be minimal disruption to this part the landscape. The important views to and from the mansion are screened by Hooks Grove although there might be some slight harm to views from Bayford Lane to Hooks Grove, we consider that the storage facility is of a suitable character for this location. We welcome the fact that no external lighting is proposed.</p> <p>We have no objection to this change of use and the developments outlined but suggest that conditions as to parking surfaces and lighting should apply if permission is granted</p>
Norris Castle	Isle of Wight	E21/2060	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Hybrid Application to include: Full Application: Restoration & conversion of: Grade I Norris Castle to luxury hotel (C1); Grade I Norris Castle Farm, bailiffs</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.03.2022</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</p>

			<p>house, cottage & walled kitchen garden to spa & wellness centre providing spa residences, treatment rooms, associated retail, restaurant & cafe facilities (sui generis); Grade II Pump House to clubhouse (E(f)); Grade II Cattle Shelters to a resort residence (sui generis), gatehouse & security building (E(g)(i)). Restoration of Grade I Registered Park & Garden including preservation of the grotto & ponds; 4 Grade II stone watering ponds. Construction of: spa residences within walled garden (sui generis); two linked buildings to accommodate hotel services, amenities, swimming pool & additional hotel suites (sui generis); 4 seawall sentinel buildings containing resort residencies (sui generis); resort residences (sui generis), boathouse & slipway at harbourside; resort residences within Norris Castle Estate walls (sui generis); dwellings in South West Field (C3); parking areas, ancillary services, utilities, drainage works, SUDS & substations for resort. Repair and restoration of Seawall including Grade II elements to stabilise the Norris Castle Estate. Consolidation of Grade II Bathing House ruin & construction of associated restaurant</p>	<p>protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. As the registered park and garden at Norris Castle is Grade I, we understand that that the Gardens Trust will also be submitting independent comment. The Conservation Committee of the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust is in the process of reviewing the Norris Castle planning application. Our review will include the Norris Castle Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and Springhill Locally Listed Park and Garden. Based on our initial review of the documentation submitted as part of the application, we believe there are a number of areas where we need further information before we can finalise our comments although it is possible that the relevant details may be contained in documents that we have not yet identified. Our initial concerns are listed below:</p> <p>1) Landscape details. Currently there is insufficient information to make an informed view on what is proposed, particularly in regard to the Grade I listed RPG at Norris. There is no information about species selection, the sizes at which trees and other vegetation is planted or any indication of surface materials. Furthermore, we have noticed that the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and supporting drawings use imprecise language, such as 'concept', 'illustrative', 'to be developed further' and 'indicative' – is this appropriate for an application of this nature? We assume that, should permission be granted, landscape matters would be dealt with via a planning condition but given the importance of the RPG, we feel that it is important that this information is available before determination so that the application as a whole can be properly considered. Can detail landscape drawings be provided to cover Norris, or at the very least, provide more information in the form of planting schedules and supporting design statement?</p> <p>2) External lighting proposals We feel that external lighting proposals should be a material consideration as part of this planning application given that there is currently no external lighting within either Norris or Springhill and any unconsidered or inappropriate change could lead to substantial harm. One would imagine the development might require new lighting to all pathways and roads, as well as lighting to building entrances. Whilst reference to Dark Skies and the intended lighting design approach is made in various supporting documents, no specific proposals are included. We note that the list of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>(E(b)). Demolition of Modern Barn & change of use of existing barn for resort storage. Creation of resort access road from the Esplanade across Springhill Estate & demolition of section of Norris Castle Estate boundary wall to provide new entrance to resort. Hard & soft landscaping & all enabling & associated works. Outline Application: Construction on Springhill Estate of: senior living units with associated communal facilities (C2); dwellings (C3) including retention & conversion of existing buildings; associated drainage, services, utilities & SUDS; restoration of landscape; resort overflow car park & all enabling & associated works (all matters save for access reserved). Norris Castle With Springfield Estate, New Barn Road, East Cowes, Isle Of Wight PO32 6AZ MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>submitted document includes a 'Lighting Strategy Briefing Note, June 2021' but this does not appear to be included within the submitted documents. Can The Lighting Strategy Briefing Note be shared? If this does not include specific proposals, can a lighting strategy report be produced to provide an indication of the design approach for external areas. See also Note 4, and consideration of night-time views within the LVIA.</p> <p>3) Topographical changes. The proposals include many fully or partly subterranean buildings and structures. These will create a significant amount of spoil that will need to be disposed of. The LVIA mentions a 'Sequencing Plan' and that spoil will be used to reclaim the coast behind the restored seawall – is this correct? We cannot find this Sequencing Plan. Has a cut and fill analysis been undertaken? We are concerned that the natural and designed landscape undulations within the RPG will be altered through the spreading of spoil. Furthermore, we believe there is insufficient information provided in relation to finished levels, particularly in relation to how the subterranean buildings will tie into the natural/designed landscape levels. This is particularly relevant for the Terrace, Crescent and Lodges. The DAS shows some visualisations of a bund sitting in front of the Terrace and Crescent but this is not shown anywhere on any plans – clearly this is fundamentally important for protecting views towards the Castle and RPG from the sea. Also, we do not fully understand how the proposed Lodges and its access road will tie into the slope of West Field (W3 and F9) – we are concerned that in reality this landscape will change dramatically with the addition of retaining walls or steep slopes to accommodate the new built elements. Linked to 1) above, detail landscape drawings are required to show finished levels and contours. Can the Sequencing Plan be provided? We also require some form of statement with calculations as to how the spoil generated on the site will be managed.</p> <p>4) Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment We welcome the addition of 'private' views from within the Norris and Springhill, which is not the normal practice for LVIA's, but given the lack of public receptors these are certainly useful to better understand how the development changes will affect the landscape. However, we are disappointed that there are not more private viewpoints from within Norris. Five private views have been included within Springhill showing a good coverage across the landscape, whilst Norris, of far greater importance, shows only three, all clustered around the entrance at South</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Lodge.</p> <p>We had asked to be involved in viewpoint selection at the consultation stage but nevertheless, if practical, are the consultants able to include the following additional private views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the vicinity of Fort Norris, (or the new access road?) looking north towards the coast and Lodges. - Beneath Norris Castle, on the terrace, looking north towards the coast. - On lower ground, below Norris Castle, looking south towards the Castle. <p>We appreciate that going back to site to take these may not be practical but we would assume the assessor (or other consultant) has plenty of site photographs which could be used for this purpose.</p> <p>Furthermore, we note that the LVIA does not include any photomontages (and visualisations generally are lacking within the supporting drawings and documents). We believe that a planning application of this stature requires several photomontages within the LVIA so that any effects on the landscape and visual amenity can be properly assessed. At the very least, we believe the LVIA should include a photomontage as the coastal view towards Norris Castle from viewpoint L5, showing the Sentinels, Terrace and Crescent in the context of the Castle. It is worth noting that the LVIA states that photography is taken in accordance with 'Landscape Institute Advice Note 01-11' which was withdrawn in 2019 and replaced by the current guidance document 'TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of development proposals'. Table 1 at 3.5.6 suggests the appropriate visualisation types for different planning application complexities. It suggests that applications which form part of an EIA would require photography types 2 – 4 (type 2 requires a 2D wireline /model, type 3 requires photomontages, and type 4 requires verified photomontages). Currently, it is debatable as to whether the viewpoint photography conforms to the most basic 'type 1'.</p> <p>Finally, we believe that the LVIA does not appear to consider the development impact on night-time views. This is particularly relevant for both Springhill and Norris as the application introduces development into a landscape which is currently not illuminated (dark), where windows will be focused towards the coast and roadways / paths will be visible (notable from viewpoints L3, L4, L5, L6, L7). We are aware that boat users at night will be limited, with a therefore lower sensitivity to the proposed changes but we feel this is matter which requires consideration and assessment.</p> <p>Can an addendum to the LVIA be produced which:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>- Includes the additional private views and assessment within Norris as listed above.</p> <p>- Includes proposed photomontages from at least viewpoint L5.</p> <p>- Include an assessment of night- time views.</p> <p>5) Springhill Outline application</p> <p>We are disappointed that proposals for Springhill are only submitted in Outline, leaving potential opportunities for future development, spread and/or change. The Planning Statement at 4.71 and elsewhere, refers to the provision of an area of public open space. Where will this be located? There are no plans or other information about this. The Parameters Plan shows locations for the new development parcels but makes no suggestions as to what is happening in the other areas of the locally listed landscape at Springhill. We need to make sure these areas are protected. Rather than showing as 'void' spaces within the parameters plan, can the parameters plan be updated to include information from the Landscape Restoration Plan? Specifically, in relation to landscape, the parameters plan should show existing woodland/trees, proposed structural tree planting, natural grassland, areas of public open space, areas of private open space/parkland landscape, and SUDS.</p> <p>In view of the above requests for more information and given the sheer amount of material that we need to digest, we are requesting an extension of time so that we can give this application the time it deserves. We would also like sufficient time to properly consult with our trustees before we finalise our comment submission to you.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Vicky Basford</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.03.2022</p> <p>The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust is currently considering the above planning application for Norris Castle. We are contacting you today as a member of an organisation which attended the workshop held in October 2018 at Barton Manor to discuss the proposed development at Norris Castle. We wish to update you on our initial approach and to ask if there might be merit in having a discussion to align any points which we may make in our mutual submissions.</p> <p>We have sent in a holding comment on the application to the Isle of Wight Council as planning authority. We believe there are deficiencies in some of the documentation which create an element of ambiguity, evidenced by</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the use of terms such as ‘design concept’, ‘indicative’, and ‘to be developed further’. In our opinion this is not appropriate when considering the future of this highly important heritage asset.</p> <p>Our main focus when considering the application will be the impact of proposals on the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Norris, including the model farm complex, and on the setting of the RPG and the main Grade I listed Castle building when viewed from land and sea. To that end, we will ask that matters relating to landscaping at Norris are not dealt with via a planning condition (if the application is approved) but should be included in full in this planning application to be part of its determination. We will also be looking at impacts on the locally listed landscape at Springhill, and are disappointed that this element is seeking outline permission only and not providing more detail at this stage.</p> <p>We will be asking for an extension to the time given to provide comment on this highly complex application which has triggered an Environmental Impact Assessment, as we believe the current April 8th deadline is insufficient to allow a detailed analysis and considered opinion to be given. We hope that the local planning authority will support our requests and that this will see more information provided.</p> <p>With all the above stated, in its current form, the application continues to cause us concern in terms of irreversible impacts on the heritage assets, and what we still believe to be over-development to meet a falsely inflated conservation deficit (due to the level of investment planned and the need to recover and create a return on this for the developer). There are some aspects which we welcome and some changes that have been made, based on conversations we have had with the developer’s consultants but it is likely that we will find these changes do not sufficiently mitigate the overall harm which the proposals will cause to the site.</p> <p>Should the local planning authority not provide an extension to the consultation period, we will be finalising our comments as best we can towards the end of this month and would like to ask if we could perhaps mutually share views with you at that time prior to submission. Perhaps you would contact me to let me know if you would be happy to do so and we can arrange a telephone or Microsoft Teams call to discuss.</p> <p>Vicky Basford</p>
Aynho Park	Northamptonshire	E21/2137	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Extensions to Aynhoe Lodge with demolition of existing	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.03.2022 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>single-storey extension of modern construction erection of detached garage. Park Lodge Croughton Road Aynho OX17 3AX DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATIONS</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 Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the online documentation accompanying this application and it is regrettable that this inexplicably unlisted property should be subject to such significant development. We consider that the house (and the adjacent parkland boundary wall) should at least qualify for local listing (Assessment Criteria for non-designated heritage assets is attached, as downloaded from the South Northamptonshire Council website). However, the impact of the proposals from outside the park will be no greater than the current assortment of add-ons, and the property is fairly well screened from the rest of the parkland. We would ask that should this application be allowed, as a condition of planning permission, that historic building recording be made of the remaining 19th/early 20th century historic structure once the modern extensions have been demolished and prior to commencement of the new extensions, the report to be deposited with the local Historic Environment Record. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Rowntree Park RECONSULTATION	North Yorkshire	E21/1977	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Dormer to front, access ramp to side and front, and container storage to rear in Rowntree Park a Designated Park/Garden Pavilion Rowntree Park Terry Avenue York BUILDING ALTERATIONS, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.03.2022 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. Rowntree Park was York's first municipal park. Laid out in 1919-21, it is a memorial to the Cocoa Works staff who fell and suffered during the First World War and was designed following proposals by Frederick Rowntree. Plants were provided by James Backhouse Nursery. It was presented to the City by Messrs Rowntree and Co and is Registered at grade II. The park is a rectangular shaped site of c 8.5ha and consists of a formal garden on an east/west axis, with hump- back bridge and dovecote. Other features include a rockery and defunct cascade, and a building with a tea-</p>

					<p>room. The gateway to Terry Avenue has relocated wrought iron gates of 1715 by Jean Tijou. The whole of the park is subject to flooding which takes a long time to drain away.</p> <p>The Pavilion is near the boundary fence, facing the tennis courts and is adjacent to a large skate board structure which dominates this section of the park. The building floods so the proposal is to use the upper portions which involves new windows and roof line to the west, facing into the park. We do not consider that this will materially affect the listed park. The proposed container will be positioned on the east side of the pavilion where it will be visible from Terry Avenue, and we recommend additional evergreen shrub planting along this section of the boundary.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E21/2036	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission for Two Canopies within the Courtyards of The Coach House (Retrospective) Stable Block Of Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, North Yorkshire MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Middleton Lodge at grade II, (list entry number: 1001699). 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>Middleton Lodge, (listed grade II*, list entry number 1317085), was designed by John Carr of York and built between 1777 and 1780 for the barrister George Hartley with the grounds being laid out at a similar time. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and walled kitchen garden. This planning application relates to the stable block (listed grade II, list entry number: 1180037) situated north-west of the house designed by John Carr or John Foss c. 1780. It comprises stables, coach house and hay loft of sandstone with ashlar dressings and is arranged around three sides of a courtyard with a central two-storey block and single storey outer ranges. The development comprises two canopies that cover the outdoor seating areas of two courtyards within the outdoor area of the Grade II Listed Building. The canopies are affixed to the outside of the listed building by small fixings. We note that the canopies can be easily erected and brought down for cleaning and maintenance. The canopies have already been</p>

					<p>erected and used to give additional outdoor areas for seating and dining. We can appreciate that the canopies would have been valuable to assist with the economics of the hospitality operation at Middleton Lodge during the restrictions of the pandemic.</p> <p>However we do have some reservations about this retrospective planning application and do not agree with Planning Design and Access Statement at 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 that the development does not result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets as although there is limited intrusion with the fixings, the canopies are large and interrupt the views of the listed building from within the courtyard and are visible from the pleasure grounds beyond to the north-west and visible above the wall to the south-west opposite the walled garden. They do adversely affect the character of the stable block and its setting. We have concerns that the canopies may become a permanent feature which would continue the harm to the heritage assets for a long period.</p> <p>We advise that if (retrospective) planning permission is granted it is temporary and is reviewed regularly.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ripley Castle	North Yorkshire	E21/2064	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Repairs to the lean to bothies on the north wall of the Walled Garden. Repairs include repointing using hydraulic lime mortar, renewing the slate roof and associated timber repairs, replacing the corrugated asbestos roof with corrugated cement fibre sheeting to match existing, installing cast iron gutters and 4 No. cast iron downpipes and inserting 10 No. glazed panels in the roof.</p> <p>Orangery Ripley Castle Hollybank Lane Ripley North Yorkshire</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, in this case Ripley Castle at Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Bothies and associated structures are Grade II* Listed (List Entry No: 1315394) and are currently on HE's Heritage at Risk register. The east end of the Bothies is not in use due to the risk of collapse with the section under the asbestos roof being used for storage and staff facilities. The Bothies are important as part of the historic working and garden pleasure area that includes the Orangery, garden wall and pavilions. They may have been designed by William Belwood c.1785 with further work being done for Sir William Amcotts Ingilby in the early 19th Century.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust welcome and very much support this restoration scheme which will give additional recognition to</p>

					<p>the heritage assets and to the experience for visitors to Ripley Castle and gardens.</p> <p>We support the Westmorland slate roof being renewed as existing but strongly suggest that the asbestos corrugated roof be replaced by slate coloured sheeting OR ideally traditional slates rather than corrugated cement fibre. We think that in the long-term traditional slates will be financially beneficial as well as aesthetically and historically more appropriate.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Ripley Castle	North Yorkshire	E21/2097	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Display of no.4 non-illuminated advertisement signs.</p> <p>Ripley Castle Hollybank Lane Ripley HG3 3AY MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, in this case Ripley Castle at Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The proposed signage is for the car park from Hollybank Lane that is located within the registered site, against part of the eastern boundary within the buildings area and south- west of the walled garden. We appreciate the need for visitor parking and improved signage, however, the documents do not indicate the actual locations of the proposed signage, carpark cash points etc apart from a photograph of the entrance from Hollybank Lane. There is no mention of the possible impact of the proposals on the many designated heritage assets; no Heritage or Design and Access Statement. This is a poor quality submission/proposal for Ripley Castle – such a very fine part of Yorkshire's built heritage within a registered park and garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust is also concerned that the car park cashpoints, cameras etc are being installed into the outer courtyard section of the Historic Park and Garden whilst the application is still under consultation. The Castle is losing its Castle Courtyard character with the numerous other café/shop signs, and we consider that the additional signage etc needs very careful consideration; little seems to be being paid to the excellent Ripley Village Design Guide in particular the section on 'Highways, Parking and Traffic' and especially GUIDELINE HPT4.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Ripley Castle	North Yorkshire	E21/2106	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Display of no.7 non-illuminated advertisement signs. Ripley Castle Main Car Park Main Street Ripley North Yorkshire MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, in this case Ripley Castle at Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We have little comment as due to the location there is no impact on the registered park and garden. However, we are disappointed and concerned that little appreciation has been shown for the Ripley Village Design Guide and that work is in progress whilst the application is out for consultation. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Norton Conyers	North Yorkshire	E21/2126	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of new toilet facilities, alterations to improve visitor circulation through the south end of the east range and into the main house, and public display of the clock. Norton Conyers Hall, Old Stables With Clock Tower Norton Conyers Ripon North Yorkshire HG4 5EQ MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.03.2022 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 park, pleasure grounds and garden at Norton Conyers is registered grade II. This application relates to the late 17th century grade II listed east range, on the north-east side of the Hall (listed grade II*). This is a single-storey range of former stables and an adjoining wall. The clock tower rises from the gabled south end of the range and is shown in a painting by Nicholas Dall of 1774 when the attached buildings were two-storeys in height. The Clock Tower with its cupola makes a statement in views of the house both close by and more distant. There is an early 20th century lean-to Summer House against the south elevation. The proposals seek to provide enhanced visitor, community and wedding facilities including toilets and in so doing help provide a significant source of income to sustain the future viability of Norton Conyers, increase public

					<p>access and preserve historic fabric.</p> <p>This is a detailed and carefully considered planning application. The repaired Clock Tower will be accessible to the public and the small lean-to extension on the east elevation of the Clock Tower to provide toilets, will be carefully designed. Harm to the significance of the heritage assets, including the registered park and garden, should not be incurred by this proposal.</p> <p>We have no objection to this planning application and support the endeavours to generate revenue for the future of Norton Conyers.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Wentworth Woodhouse	South Yorkshire	E21/1705	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of the estate from a private residence to use class Sui Generis, opening to the public for house guided & non-guided tours, garden visits, weddings, events, education workshops, ancillary café within the mansion house & location filming. Change of use of Camellia House to a café and event space (use class E) & associated facilities & services including changing place pod, bin store, 4 No. disabled car parking spaces & new landscape setting to Camellia House. Demolition of teaching accommodation and provision of a new car park to the North West of the stable block to serve the estate together with temporary coach parking on former tennis court to the East of the main house. New pedestrian and cycle route between stables and the main house and Change</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail of 25th February and attachments: Landscape Design Statement; Strategy for Caring for the Camellias MP1 Camellia House.</p> <p>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. We have discussed the documents.</p> <p>We refer you to our letters of 10th January and our additional response and comments of 2nd February.</p> <p>Landscape Master Plan, Landscape Design Statement, Access</p> <p>We have not seen a Landscape Master Plan. Also, we would expect that for a site of the importance of Wentworth Woodhouse, planning applications for the development of a new car park and introduction of new paths, would include an assessment of potential impacts, in order to consider any mitigation. We have not seen an Access Strategy so do not have a good understanding of what is intended.</p> <p>We appreciate much of the assessment in the Landscape Design Statement. However, Fig 2 does not show the route of the cycle track and pedestrian route to the main house which we presume is parallel to the main drive. We have not been privy to any discussions on this matter and would have concerns about an additional track. We query whether this is necessary.</p>

				<p>of use of part of Stables building to a production kitchen and café area and resurfacing of Mews Court courtyard. at Wentworth Woodhouse Cortworth Lane Wentworth Cortworth Lane, Wentworth Rotherham S62 7TQ CHANGE OF USE, DEMOLITION, PARKING, ACCESS/ROUTES</p>	<p>The 'Events Delivery Access' is unclear to us. We presume that it is the proposed access to the south of the car park (point 6 of Landscape Design Statement). This access would interrupt the path that links with the pond and grade II listed Duckhouse. In which case we have reservations about this proposal.</p> <p>In terms of the car parking, we do not object to the surface treatment but would prefer a softer buffer of planting between the car park and the riding school. Please see our comments in our letter of 2nd February. 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.</p> <p>Camellia House Thank you for the Strategy for Caring for the Camellias. We support the details in the Strategy compiled by Scott Jamison, the Head Gardener at Wentworth Woodhouse and we understand that additional advice has been given by a Camellia expert. However, the Strategy does not give information about the heating regime, and we query who in practice will be making the day-to-day decisions about the winter temperature inside the Camellia House and monitoring it. This is a job for the knowledgeable garden staff rather than the managers of the cafe and the events that are to take place within it.</p> <p>We remain of the view the changing pod is an unworthy and utilitarian building for such a location. 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.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Boston Park, Rotherham	South Yorkshire	E21/1994	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) imposed by RB2019/1642 at Boston Park Boston Castle Grove Moorgate MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.03.2022 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</p>

					<p>of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This planning application affects an area within the north- eastern boundary of grade II registered Boston Park and immediately outside the park's boundary to the south- east. To the north and north- west of Boston Park is the grade II registered Victorian Moorgate Cemetery which is partially located within Moorgate Conservation Area.</p> <p>On 19th November 2019 we responded to the earlier application: RB2019/1642 and planning permission was granted conditionally on 7th February 2020.</p> <p>We have consulted with the Friends of Boston Castle and Parklands (including Moorgate Cemetery) and understand that the current application does not encroach on the parkland. It is unfortunate that the works will be occupying the park for a further length of time, but we trust that the work and reinstatement will be carefully executed.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Wentworth Castle	South Yorkshire	E21/2037	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of Home Farm buildings from C2 'Residential Institution' to short term residential letting units (24no bedrooms)</p> <p>Wentworth Castle, Northern College, Lowe Lane, Stainborough, Barnsley, S75 3ET</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Wentworth Castle at grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Wentworth Castle and Stainborough Park is the only Grade I Registered Park and Garden in South Yorkshire and one of only nine in the whole of the County. This is the highest grade reflecting its exceptional heritage significance as a historic designed landscape. The landscape comprises remnants of schemes of successive generations of Wentworths and demonstrates their tastes and ambitions and the ways that they came to terms with the dramatic hillside setting beginning in the early 18th Century. Its structure is largely intact. Nationally, Wentworth Castle is arguably on a par with Stowe due to its dating and plethora of 18th Century garden buildings, but unlike Studley Royal and Wentworth</p>

					<p>Woodhouse, Wentworth Castle was determinedly Tory which adds a further dimension to its national and international importance.</p> <p>The Home Farm complex lies immediately south of the kitchen gardens on the east side of the main drive. This approach is shown as an avenue on the Knyff and Kip engraving of 1714 and as a wider avenue on the Badeslade view of 1739. This area is a part of the Wentworth Castle registered historic designed landscape. In addition Dairy House at Home Farm is listed grade II (List Entry No 1191812), the Barn and attached wall on the east, listed grade II (List Entry No 1315052), and the former Stable Block and Attached Archway are also listed grade II (List Entry No 1191779).</p> <p>Northern College would like to change the use of 24 bedrooms (student accommodation) to make 20 guest accommodation for Airbnb at the Home Farm complex.</p> <p>We have looked at the submitted documents and have not found any information about any material changes proposed, any statement about the heritage assets or the vehicle parking which we presume will be necessary for Airbnb guests. Will this be within the Home Farm complex which is a constrained location?</p> <p>We are therefore unable to comment on this application but will be happy to do so when we have more information.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Wentworth Woodhouse	South Yorkshire	E21/2049	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Formation of Vehicle Circulation Area to include laying of crushed stone and aggregate and associated planting at Wentworth Garden Centre Hague Lane Wentworth</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – in this case Wentworth Woodhouse, at Grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Wentworth Woodhouse Fitzwilliam estate is a remarkable heritage asset. The Grade I listed C18 main house is but the centrepiece of over twenty supporting buildings and features with individual listings ranging over Grade I, Grade II* and Grade II. Land ownership of the estate became fragmented across the middle of the C20, resulting in a more challenging environment for the mutual preservation of these assets.</p> <p>Wentworth Garden Centre has been created from land including the C18</p>

					<p>walled Kitchen Gardens, an Italianate Garden and a Japanese Garden. The Garden Centre is more than 500m from the main house and the two are mutually invisible as they are divided by the crest of a hill and substantial quantities of mature trees. However, some of the secondary listed assets are nearby – e.g. the Kitchen Garden walls themselves and other associated walls, Doric Lodge, Doric Temple, Camellia House, Bastion Wall. Remarkably, the overflow car park has been located on an island of land which appears to have had no formal designation in the history of the estate apart from being within the registered boundary – its role has become simply the setting for so many gems, perhaps in particular the setting of the gatehouse, Doric Lodge. We note that the car park already enjoys tree planting around its outer boundaries, and we regret that additional boundary planting is not included in this application – indeed the “red line” has been located inboard from the boundary walls. However, with the limited tree planting proposed between parking bays, it is our opinion that the introduction of new hardcore surfacing to the alleyways will not further jeopardise the settings of the various listed assets noted. Therefore, we do not object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Biddulph Grange RECONSULTATION	Staffordshire	E21/1675	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION And Listed Building consent. Proposed installation of wrought iron balustrade around the internal perimeter of the existing Bandstand to prevent falling. Biddulph Grange National Trust Grange Road Biddulph BOUNDARY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee over the revised design for a handrail around the Bandstand at Biddulph Grange a site included at grade I 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. We are sending a single letter to cover both consultations.</p> <p>The Trusts remain concerned that this third design iteration for a new railing still remains visually intrusive and insensitive to the grade I RPG. While the remodelling of the stanchions is welcome the overall design with close spaced uprights still has more in common with a highway pedestrian barrier than is appropriate in the context of an historic park. We consider this design would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset without any demonstrable overriding benefit.</p> <p>The Trusts appreciate there may be a health and safety requirement for a</p>

					<p>handrail here (though we are mystified why none is proposed alongside the adjacent lawn where the balustrade is some 400mm lower) but strongly advise it should be as unobtrusive as possible in appearance and reflect something of the historic character of the garden. We suggest that a railing similar to that found along the north boundary of the car park or adjacent to the church gate at the end of the lime avenue (see attached photographs) be adopted as a more sympathetic alternative.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SPGT</p>
Patshull Hall	Staffordshire	E21/2101	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of modern hotel extensions and removal of hard standing car parking, retention of the listed Temple, siting of 100 holiday lodges and construction of new Boathouse Central Facilities Building, including associated access, parking and servicing Patshull Park Hotel Golf And Country Club Patshull Park Burnhill Green WV6 7HR DEMOLITION, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee over proposed development affecting Patshull 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.</p> <p>The Trusts object strongly to application 22/00083/FUL</p> <p>Patshull Park is listed grade II on the Historic England register of Historic Parks and Gardens and lies within the South Staffordshire Green Belt. It extends over 500 hectares and encompasses the grade II* listed Patshull Hall and St Mary's Church and a designed landscape around the Y shaped lakes comprising Great Pool and Church Pool. The historic landscape appears to have originated in the 17th century in the Pleasure Grounds around the Hall and to have been extended southwards from the 1760s when the two pools were either extended or remodelled. Although no plans are known to survive the mid 18th century work is thought to be influenced by Lancelot "Capability" Brown who is known to have provided a "general plan for the place". The design of the lakes is very characteristic of Brown's work.</p> <p>The application site lies in the southern part of the park to the west of Great Pool in the area associated with the Brownian remodelling. An 18th century boathouse and small garden temple, both listed buildings, survive in this area together with a number of ancient trees possibly part of the 18th century planting scheme. The character of this part of the park was substantially altered in the latter part of the 20th century by the intrusion of a golf course, the attachment of a sprawling hotel extension to the rear</p>

					<p>of the grade II* Temple, and construction of large associated car parking areas. Notwithstanding these harmful changes the underlying historic significance of the 18th century designed landscape remains intact, legible and capable of reinstatement..</p> <p>The harm and incongruity of the modern golf course in this historic setting is fully acknowledged. In principle its removal is to be welcomed. However the erection of 100 chalets (in reality Park Homes or enlarged static caravans) of uninspired design will have a seriously harmful impact on the appearance and significance of the historic designed landscape. Their axial north-south distribution along a metalled roadway running through centre of the former wood pasture at the heart of the one-time golf course has all the appearance of an uninspired housing estate. This is not compatible with its location within the Green Belt. The Trusts have expressed support in principle for related application 22/00084/LBC for demolition of the unsightly modern hotel extensions which will enhance the openness and appearance of the historic park. Any benefit gained thereby would be vitiated by construction of chalets offering an equivalent floor area but dispersed across the landscape. No information is provided about the design of the proposed new housekeeping building shown in footprint only on the Masterplan. This appears to be a sizeable structure, prominently and harmfully located without any mitigating screen planting.</p> <p>Although the area allocated to collective car parking will be reduced in this scheme (compared to the present arrangement) the overall provision for circa 150 spaces will remain constant but now the intrusive presence of parked vehicles will be distributed throughout the landscape. No screen planting is shown around the car park for the proposed new facilities building: the mass of parked vehicles will stand out in the landscape.</p> <p>No clarification is provided within the submitted documents but It is inferred that the lodges are to be within a fenced compound. Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 of the Design and Access Statement refer to a security gate across the drive (also shown on the Masterplan) to prevent public access around the chalets. No details are provided of the lodge or fence. Its erection would be quite at variance with the open nature of the grade II registered historic landscape and is opposed.</p> <p>The proposed new restaurant and facilities building will have a smaller footprint than the present hotel but its location and dominant massing on the banks of the lake will have a more deleterious and urbanising impact on the rural tranquility of the Great Pool. It will be an unattractive and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>unwelcome encroachment into the designed historic landscape.</p> <p>The Trusts have read the supporting statements submitted with the application and take issue with the claimed benefits for the scheme. We are disappointed by the very general and superficial analysis of the historic parkland in the Historic Environment DBA and astonished by its conclusions at paragraph 5.2.4. that the development would be an “overall positive benefit” and paragraph 6.0. that there would be no harm to the RPG. The ARC Market Review does not mention the RPG. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal scarcely mentions this designation; does not seek to assess the age structure of the existing planting and its significance; to identify any sightlines or views which might need protection; or to advise how any harmful visual impact from the development might be mitigated. Its findings at 4.16 and 4.18 that the development reinstates a naturalistic parkland configuration and allows a better interpretation of the park is contradicted by the very intrusive proposals it seeks to support. The Landscape Appraisal, Design and Access, and Planning Statements all make great play that with the closure of the hotel and golf course the proposed development is the only means of preventing dereliction of the site. The Trusts strongly dispute this assertion and suggest that there are many appropriate low key, conservation and heritage friendly management regimes which could be explored, for example reversion to grazing pasture. Even were all management to cease and the park became “rewilded” historic wood pasture landscapes are very resilient and capable of reclamation over time. It is troubling that no mention is made of a future management regime for the upkeep and curation and enhancement of the historic landscape and only a tangential reference at para 4.17 of the Landscape Report to the risk of differing standards of upkeep of the chalets if they are sold to multifarious individual owners. The proffered benefits to the heritage asset arising from removal of the modern hotel extensions and car parks, and cessation of use as a golf course are fully endorsed but the Trusts believe these could be achieved satisfactorily without recourse to extensive new development across the parkland. Mention is made passim in the documentation of improved public access to the historic landscape but it is not specified how this would be achieved.</p> <p>In summary the Trusts find that this application is inadequately prepared, poorly justified and lacking in detail. Notwithstanding, at root the proposed development will cause substantial harm to the Green Belt and the grade II RPG for which there is no overriding public benefit. The Trusts recommend</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>that the application be refused planning permission. Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.03.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee over proposed development affecting Patshull 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 consider that the application description for 22/00084/LBC is invalid and much of the supporting information is irrelevant. The proposals relating to erection of new chalets, boathouse facility, car parking etc are outwith the scope of listed building legislation and should be deleted from this application which should relate solely to the works of demolition. The application description should be reworded and only information relevant to consideration of the demolition works included in the revised submission. To save delay we are submitting our comments as if the application papers had been amended. Patshull Park is listed grade II on the Historic England register of Historic Parks and Gardens and lies within the South Staffordshire Green Belt. It extends over 500 hectares and encompasses the grade II* listed Patshull Hall and St Mary’s Church and a designed landscape around the Y shaped lakes comprising Great Pool and Church Pool. The historic landscape appears to have originated in the 17th century in the Pleasure Grounds around the Hall and to have been extended southwards from the 1760s when the two pools were either extended or remodelled. Although no plans are known to survive the mid 18th century work is thought to been influenced by Lancelot “Capability” Brown who is known to have provided a “general plan for the place”. The design of the lakes is very characteristic of Brown’s work. The Temple appears to be contemporary with the mid 18th century remodelling of the park and is possibly to the design of James Gibbs, a leading architect of the period and with whom Brown worked at Chillington and Weston parks. Originally a small garden ornament</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>overlooking the Great Pool the building was enlarged at the rear in the mid 19th century to form a staff cottage. It was again extended in the latter part of the 20th century by the attachment of a sprawling hotel range to which it became a diminutive classical style “porch”. What remains of its setting has been diminished by construction of a large tarmacadam car park alongside. The hotel extension is of no intrinsic architectural merit is out of scale with and overwhelms the 18th century structure causing serious harm to the significance of the grade II* heritage asset and its setting in the RPG.</p> <p>The Trusts have no objection in principle to the proposed demolition of the modern hotel extensions to the rear of the grade II* listed temple. The careful demolition of these additions will better reveal the significance of the original building and its place in the parkland and is fully supported. It is unfortunate, however, that the application does not contain any proposals for removal of modern interventions to the temple (for example the fully glazed frontage), any conservative repair to its historic fabric, provision for remediation of scarred fabric after demolition of the extensions nor for its future use and upkeep. Further information on these matters should be obtained before determination of the application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Hilton Hall	Staffordshire	E21/2153	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of marquee to be used for hosting of events Hilton Hall Hilton Lane Hilton Staffordshire WV11 2BQ MARQUEE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (TGT) about the proposed development affecting the setting of Hilton Hall, a grade I listed building. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications. As the marquee is not physically attached to or involves any works to a listed structure the Trusts consider that application 22/00088/LBC is unnecessary and invalid.</p> <p>Hilton Hall is an imposing early 18th century house, possibly incorporating earlier fabric. It sits within a remnant of a medieval moat at the centre of what was, until the latter part of the 20th century a moderately sized designed landscape. The history of the park has not been investigated but clear elements of its layout remain apparent – for example in the shrubberies and pleasure grounds which immediately adjoin the Hall, the</p>

					<p>surviving shelter belts and park wall around the perimeter, and various ornamental garden buildings such as the grade II listed Portobello Tower and the grade I Forcing House. . Unfortunately the construction of two motorways, a service area, and gravel working have seriously compromised the integrity of the landscape. Nonetheless the core area around the grade I listed hall remains visually intact and is of historic significance.</p> <p>The Trusts do not object in principle to the retention of the unauthorised marquee if the income it generates is hypothecated to the upkeep of the historic buildings and landscape. Its location on a site previously used as a base for an earlier marquee is just outside the core historic part of the park, is not readily intervisible with the hall and primarily overlooks degraded paddocks to the east. The Trusts do not consider that retention of the marquee will cause harm to the significance of the heritage assets or their setting.</p> <p>The Trust do suggest that, if your Council is minded to grant planning permission to retain the marquee, the consent should be time limited to a period of say five years. By emphasising the temporary nature of the facility it would help avert the risk of a future proposal to substitute a permanent building on the site. The Trusts also suggest that your Council considers imposing a condition requiring the income from the marquee to be allocated to the upkeep of the listed buildings, the historic parkland and other related heritage assets and a mechanism whereby it has enforceable oversight of this process.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Biddulph Grange	Staffordshire	E21/2177	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed installation of wrought iron balustrade around the internal perimeter of the existing Bandstand to prevent falling Biddulph Grange National Trust Grange Road Biddulph MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2022 As per E21/1675 above</p>
Biddulph Grange	Staffordshire	E21/2192	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The proposal is to create a new section of steps to connect the parterre area of the garden to</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee over the proposed new flight of steps in Mrs Bateman's Garden, Biddulph Grange a site included at grade I on the Historic England Register</p>

				<p>Mrs Bateman's garden to match steps elsewhere in the garden. Biddulph Grange National Trust Grange Road Biddulph MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>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. Biddulph Grange is a grade I registered historic landscape of mid 19th century date, within a designated conservation area. It is a site of international significance. The Grange itself is a grade II* listed building. The significance of the gardens derives in part from the survival of the carefully contrived landscape laid out between 1840 and 1865 by its owner James Bateman with assistance from the artist Edward Cooke, and in part from the eclectic selection of plants many being first time introductions to Great Britain The gardens have been carefully restored or recreated in recent times by the National Trust and are now an important public attraction.</p> <p>Ms Bateman's Garden is an integral part of the historic landscape and forms the frontispiece to the mansion house. It has been sympathetically reinstated by the National Trust over the last 30 years and comprises a sequence of small garden spaces enclosed by dense, tall hedges. The vista from the house terrace across the uniformly trimmed hedges is of an almost unbroken network of yew and appears as a deliberate design intention. There is currently little interconnection between the spaces and the impression within is comparable to being in a maze.</p> <p>A key characteristic of Bateman's original layout is that most of the garden compartments are entered indirectly invoking a sense of fun, mystery and discovery as well as keeping their identities and micro-climates separate. For example entry to China is through a tunnel from the Fernery; the Pinetum is entered through the Pyramid ; the Cheshire Cottage leads into Egypt.</p> <p>The current application to cut form a new opening through the yew hedge will interrupt the visual continuity of the design and will also open a straight and obvious sightline down the perimeter of Mrs Bateman's Garden directly contradicting the design intention and philosophy of the original creators of the park. The design of the proposed steps with individual treads and risers is out of keeping with historic flights elsewhere in the park which have a single stone step. No information is provided about the proposed handrail.</p> <p>The Trusts therefore object to both the principle and detail of this application which we consider will cause harm to the appearance and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>significance of this important historic landscape.</p> <p>The applicants' Design and Access Statement explains that the desire for forming a new access is to make it easier for visitors to move around the site without retracing their steps. This is not a compelling reason for change. The DAS does not suggest there is a need to alleviate queuing or congestion. Should there be an overriding imperative to create a link between the two garden compartments the Trusts suggest an alternative and more discrete location be explored, for example behind the tall pyramidal yew abutting Mrs Bateman's Boudoir a rather unkempt area with exposed plumbing and unfinished masonry in need of tidying up.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E21/1696	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed relocation of car park at Leafields, comprising reinforced grass, with landscaping and associated works.</p> <p>Land at Leafields, Warwick PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to amendments to the above application. We have again liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint second response.</p> <p>The GT/WGT agree that moving the car parking spaces to the western side of Leafields is an improvement in heritage terms, as is the increasing of the buffer zones to the northern and western sides of the application site. We are also pleased to see the removal of some of the gravel access tracks and the maintaining of the openness of the site by taking out the proposed hedgerow, and the delineation of the former carriage drive by mowing. However, despite that we cannot agree that a car park for 1,200 cars can ever constitute a heritage gain, no matter what mitigation is proposed. We consider that Merlin Attractions Operations Ltd should have been carrying out these heritage improvements anyhow, whether or not intended as mitigation for their current proposals for this Grade I registered park and garden.</p> <p>Warwick was among the first sites that Brown tackled whilst still in the employ of Lord Cobham at Stowe, and as far as the influential commentator Walpole was concerned, this is the area where Brown first showed his personal 'taste' in planting : <i>'It is well laid out by one Brown who has set up on a few ideas of Kent and Mr Southcote. One sees what the prevalence of taste does.'</i> Horace Walpole 1751.</p> <p>Whilst moving the car park further west is a positive move, lighting, which we mentioned in our first response, will become more of an issue as the</p>

					<p>car park usage increases. It is therefore extremely important to plant <i>considerably more than</i> six parkland trees as so few will have a minimal impact in improving the setting of the car park. I am attaching at the end of this letter, copies of three sheets of the 25" OS map for Leafields dating from between 1903/04/05 (National Library of Scotland) which shows all the trees and clumps within the parkland. The trees with a 'double' canopy are those which have been individually plotted, and as you can see there are an awful lot of them. We have consulted Steffie Shields, the acknowledged Capability Brown expert, with regard to the planting of parkland trees amongst the revised car parking area. Mrs Shields has provided the following recommendations from a sample of trees known to have been planted at Warwick in the Brown era. She suggests a scattering of at the very least 12 significant individual specimens such as Oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>), Cedar of Lebanon (<i>Cedrus libani</i>), Plane (either <i>Platanus orientalis</i> or <i>Acer Pseudoplatanus</i>) and Spanish chestnut (<i>Castanea sativa</i>) plus the odd medium-sized flowering thorn planted singly: Glastonbury thorn/common hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>) and evergreen thorn (<i>Crataegus oxyacantha</i>) as at Burghley for instance. In addition she recommends at least a couple of small groves offering shade or shelter while also enhancing and diversifying views in an 18C 'natural landscape' manner, perhaps in place of two oaks, left at 10 and right at 4, kept well-manicured/managed with their trunks trimmed, each perhaps with : 3 larch (<i>Larix decidua</i>), 1 Scots pine (<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>), 1 Spruce fir (<i>Picea abies</i>), 1 sugar maple (<i>Acer saccharum</i>), plus 3 smaller flowering trees : 1 wild cherry (<i>Prunus avium</i>) and 2 lilacs (<i>Syringa vulgaris</i>). We would strongly urge that Wellingtonia is not included amongst the parkland trees. Even if these were planted elsewhere within the park during the Victorian era, this tree more than any other, would have a detrimental impact on what remains essentially a Brown design and would be wholly inappropriate. To provide more heritage and biodiversity gain these new parkland tree specimens should be employed on not just the western car park side but also on the eastern side of the former drive.</p> <p>The applicants have provided a partial LVIA with a few photographs of views, but in order for these to be of any real use they should have included images of cars. Figure 1 in the Lichfields' <i>Response to consultee comments/LVIA</i> (p2/8) shows an aerial view of the current overflow parking on the eastern side ¾ full. We would like to see this replicated within the LVIA on the new site to give a truer impression of the impact of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>such a substantial quantity of cars on this area of as yet untouched parkland.</p> <p>The GT/WGT maintain our former objections to this scheme.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Honington Hall	Warwicks hire	E21/2141	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a garden office along with the removal and replacement of an asbestos shed. Park View , Honington, Shipston On Stour, CV36 5AA . MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.03.2022</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. We have looked at the sparse documentation accompanying this proposal and can see that the application site's northern and eastern boundaries lie immediately adjacent to the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Honington Hall. Whilst the new garden office and shed are in themselves inoffensive, and the windows of the garden office face away from the RPG which will minimize light spillage towards the RPG, we would have expected some sort of Heritage Statement and assessment of the impact that these new structures will have upon the RPG. For example, Drawing No 0055 (Proposed Plans and Elevations) appears to show a hedge surrounding the garden to the north and eastern sides, but there is no indication of its height or indeed the height of the new wooden structures within the garden.</p> <p>None of the submitted documents mention that Park View is adjacent to the RPG, although the name of the property is indicative. This omission means that the application fails Paras 194 and 195 of the NPPF. On this basis, we do not wish to comment further on the proposals at this stage but would like to point out the important omissions in the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Friarwood Valley Gardens	West Yorkshire	E21/2103	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of decorative gates to the main Southgate entrance Valley Gardens, Friarwood Lane, Pontefract MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Friarwood Valley Gardens, a public park which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and</p>

					<p>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>Friarwood Valley Gardens in the centre of Pontefract, is a very favourable horticultural site and has a long and interesting history encompassing the vicinity of the Dominican friary, founded by Edmund de Lacy in 1256. After the Dissolution in 1539 it became a cemetery and then orchards and gardens in the 18th Century. Pontefract is noted for liquorice manufacture and the liquorice plant was cultivated in what is now the Rose Garden and Bowling Green from the mid-19th Century until the late 1940's when the land was acquired by Pontefract Borough Council. The design and development work undertaken by Parks and Cemeteries Superintendent, Mr R W Grubb in 1950 transformed the area into Friarwood Valley Gardens, one of the very few public parks on the HE Register from the mid - 20th Century.</p> <p>The north-north-east side of Friarwood Valley Gardens is bounded by the A645 Southgate, a road which runs c.4m above the park. The boundary here is a stone retaining wall created in the 1930's when Southgate was widened. There are railings inset at intervals into the parapet wall giving views over the park. Unfortunately, the boundary is not in a good state of repair.</p> <p>The Friends of Friarwood Valley Gardens have helped care for this lovely park over a considerable number of years and in fact several years ago the Yorkshire Gardens Trust gave a small grant for the reinstatement of a long herbaceous border.</p> <p>The Friends plan to repair and renovate the Southgate wall and railings along with this proposal for an Entrance Archway at the top of the main steps down into the gardens. The installation of the metal decorative arch at this main Southgate entrance will be a very pleasing enhancement, a fitting statement for the park. The design will match the style of the railings and we understand that the installation work will not have any archaeological or other heritage implications.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objections to this planning application and support the efforts of the Friends in caring for Friarwood Valley Gardens.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust continues to run a small grant scheme and details can be found on the website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E21/2040	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Provision of new recreational facilities to include cycling and walking routes, a 'learn-to-ride' facility, a play area and improvements to wildlife habitats to site of former golf course</p> <p>Temple Newsam Park Temple Newsam Road Halton SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.03.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Temple Newsam registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The wide extent of the registered landscape at Temple Newsam is significant as the setting to the grade I listed Temple Newsam House and a considerable number of other listed buildings. Britain's most famous landscape designer, Lancelot 'Capability' Brown made a plan for Temple Newsam in 1762, which was the first for West Yorkshire. This has survived and, in spite of his design not having been fully implemented, it sheds light on the design approach of this foremost landscape designer.</p> <p>The former Temple Newsam golf course covers a large area within the north- western and western boundary and north of the southern boundary of the Registered Park and Garden. The planning application area is in the north and east parts of the golf course and includes the area of the golf clubhouse. Much of the eastern area of the golf course site was used for open cast mining in the 20th century but notably the area immediately west of the House was left along with a section to the south- west.</p> <p>You will be aware that Temple Newsam estate is currently the subject of work by consultants to prepare a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) that is expected to be completed by April 2022. Our Vice-President Peter Goodchild attended a stakeholder presentation on 7th February, and we have sent comments to Ms Maya Harrison, Principal Keeper, Leeds Museums and Art Galleries. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust is very pleased that a CMP is being produced and we hope this will be an integrated tool for the management of Temple Newsam for years to come and allow future developments to be thoughtfully incorporated into this important heritage asset.</p> <p>We apologise for the slight lateness of our response, but my colleague Jane Furse and I have had difficulty seeing the details of the plans on your planning website. The keys in particular are blurred, and we have found it</p>

					<p>impossible to make out the details of the cycle path widths and finishes for the different areas – all important for their impact on Temple Newsam’s historic park. This was not helpful for our response as statutory consultees. We understand and appreciate the provision of new recreational facilities at Temple Newsam, but particularly have reservations about the new cycling and walking routes by Temple Newsam House. Our concerns are threefold.</p> <p>a) As far as we can see there is no screen planting or no fencing of the new tracks around the club house from the entrance drive. This is not just an aesthetic but also a safety barrier between cars, delivery vans and coaches from young children and teenagers.</p> <p>b) The plan to reinstate the missing vista westwards from the house is no longer shown in the documents. Although we understand that this is an objection from Leeds Landscape section, the Leeds CC planting is a mere 50 years old or so after the open cast finished. But this area is VERY clearly part of the Capability Brown plan - included with this application- and lasted for most of the intervening 200 years but we would hazard was much older, an Elizabethan or Jacobean feature Brown respected, ie. a 300-400 years old vista. We strongly regret that the plan to reinstate this vista has been lost, a vista which has been a key part of Temple Newsam’s setting from the City of Leeds for hundreds of years. The length of the vista should be cleared to balance the intrusion into the quiet green spaces all these new paths will make. It would be a positive contribution linking the importance of the house and the past, with the future of Temple Newsam.</p> <p>c) Finally, and we think most importantly we are really shocked that there is nothing in this archaeological report about the mound/Mount area, which is within this planning application, next to the south -west corner of the formal garden (see concentric contours on Fig 8 in Appendix D the Heritage Statement) but OUT of both the golf course area and MOST IMPORTANTLY out of the open cast area. In other words, it’s much bigger trees and steep profile really were there before any open cast took place. As a result, we cannot agree with the report that says everything had been messed up by open casting and nothing remains.....this is not accurate. Evidence for the mound/Mount: On the early maps the marked track to a temple (now lost) is always shown skirting the mound/Mount rather than going directly from the house. The track is on the 1st Edition OS map 6":1mile, i.e. 1840’s and every subsequent one. The mound/Mount’s oval shape is also marked.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Your council's own planning application, Fig. 8 p.31 in Appendix D the Heritage Statement, shows the mound/Mount. We think it is an important feature and should have been investigated already with a view to listing if found to be what we think it is. It is at huge risk with these proposals. We have not found reference to any surveys or archaeological investigation of the mound/Mount. We note that the plan of the proposals shows an existing path immediately west being upgraded but also LINKED to brand new cycle ones.</p> <p>We strongly propose that the mound/Mount should be urgently assessed by Historic England. Without this assessment we consider the new paths as harm, justified by the consultant's own criteria (see Heritage Statement) and therefore, in view of the Mount's long -standing association with the setting of Temple Newsam House, should be refused permission to within say 30 metres at least until a proper archaeological survey report has been commissioned and reported.</p> <p>The Mount should NOT have cycle paths made really close to it. You will appreciate that this will be an invitation to bikers, many of whom will have thick "mountain" tyres, to ride right next to it on a brand- new track so close to the house gardens. Cyclists will rapidly colonise it and erode the mount's slopes and destroy all the tree roots in addition to a potentially important historic landscape feature. You will be aware that in any wood where mountain bikes go these days, the damage to the most exciting steepest slopes that they create, is all too visible. We are also concerned that a path so close to the formal gardens could potentially invite unwanted incursions and possible damage to the gardens.</p> <p>If the new limestone path was kept away, zig zagging down the slope further away from the gardens than currently planned, it could still be a cycle circuit BUT the existing pedestrian paths would not have to link up and thereby imperil the mound/Mount.</p> <p>Apart from reinstating the missing vista we welcome the new woodland areas and habitat enhancements.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Longleat	Wiltshire	E21/2158	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of the existing lemur walk-through enclosure and associated fencing, existing toilet	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.03.2022 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>block and associated hard surfacing, existing small animal (tortoise) exhibition building and associated hard surfacing. Provision of 18no. safari-tent style sleeping lodges on land at the northern end of the Safari Park including associated gravelled access tracks and parking areas. Re-alignment of existing animal enclosure fencing to increase the area of the giraffe enclosure. Succession planting in various locations across the northern end of the Safari Park in accordance with Longleat Estate's tree management plan. New soft landscaping to improve the setting of the lodges.</p> <p>Longleat Safari Park, Horningsham, Warminster, Wilts DEMOLITION, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Wiltshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We sympathise with the plight of owners struggling to recoup financial losses due to Covid and it is apparent that much thought has been given to the placement of the safari tents within the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Longleat. We welcome the reduction in quantity of lodges from the original pre-app proposals. The removal of the lemur enclosure and utilitarian toilet block removes much of the clutter to the west of the Gamekeeper's Cottage and is a positive benefit. The LVIA's have been helpful in assessing the impact of these proposed structures within this sensitive landscape. The considerable quantity of new tree planting and shrub understorey, both within the tent woodlands and elsewhere within the wider parkland setting is also beneficial.</p> <p>The lodges to the west of Gamekeepers are fortunately recessive in colour, but will be especially visible as they lie mostly to the south of the existing tree cover. Despite a reduction in the number of safari tents, we consider that 18 pretty substantial structures will undoubtedly have an impact upon the setting and views within the RPG, particularly for the first 10-15 years whilst the mitigation planting understorey of hazel, holly and field maple matures. We are unable to ascertain what the life expectancy of these canvas lodges is likely to be and we would hope that if renewal is required, it is only the canvas covering which will not require much in the way of heavy intervention within the landscape.</p> <p>The external lighting has been designed to be dark sky compliant, but there does not appear to be much detail about interior lighting of the structures at night. Their reception areas lie to the front of the buildings as do the elevated balcony terraces. Visitors will no doubt be outside on summer evenings and we have concerns that this will result in a line of lights along the woodland edge, in an area which had previously been entirely dark. We would ask that your officers request further clarification as to how this may be mitigated. There is also the issue of visitors possibly driving somewhere at night to have dinner outside the estate as the kitchen facilities within the lodges appear small and basic, and car lights will be another change to the current darkness.</p> <p>We consider that this scheme will cause some harm to the setting at the lower end of less than substantial harm of the RPG and we would be glad if your officers could address the issues raised with regard to lighting.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
--	--	--	--	--	---