



CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES APRIL 2022

The GT conservation team received 151 new cases and re-consultations for England and two for Wales in April. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 51 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Tyntesfield	Avon	E21/2246	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Increase use of field for overflow car parking (incl. grass reinforcement mesh in upper part of field) Land To South Of Existing Car Park, Tyntesfield Estate,Wraxall PARKING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Tyntesfield, and the wider association of the site within the North Somerset Green Belt. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust note that the extension of the existing car park would not have a permanent physical impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The application site is an open field without trees and lies adjacent to the existing car park and therefore close to the Home Farm visitor facilities. The field is already used for overflow parking for up to 28 days a year. The National Trust would like an extension of overflow parking of up to 120 days per calendar year, between 10am and 5.30pm. The site is located on the southern gentle slopes of Failand ridge, falling in a south-easterly direction. This means that it is likely to be able to see cars parked in the field from the other side of the valley, near to Flax Bourton. This may cause

					<p>light pollution in the winter months.</p> <p>Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust have no objection to this application if it restricts the use of the over flow car park to 120 days in the summer months.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chair, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Hamstead Marshall Park	Berkshire	E21/2239	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of a 3/4 span greenhouse</p> <p>Craven House, Hamstead Marshall, Newbury, RG20 0JG</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT). The Berkshire Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust (GT) and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>We have had an opportunity to review the applicant's revised proposals. I see that the height has been reduced from 3715mm to 3051mm and the filials revised so no part will rise above the top of the adjacent walls. We would be happy to support this revision but would ask that a condition be imposed requiring that the whole structure, including filials, is not higher than 200mm below the top of the walls (to avoid 'accidental' raising above the wall).</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham BGT Chair</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E19/1853	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 130 dwellings, associated access and parking, landscaping and amenity space and the change of land from agriculture to use as sports pitches/recreational open space and informal open space. Land West Of Moreton Road And Castlemilk, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2020</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 would be grateful if you could take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>It has not been possible to visit the development site and assess the likely effect of the proposed development or test the assertions in the Heritage Statement, but detailed local knowledge of the Grade I Stowe RPG of members of the Bucks Gardens Trust has informed this response.</p> <p>The heritage statement ('built heritage' statement) by RPS Heritage states : 'It is important to note that the study site shares no physical or visual relationship with Stowe Conservation Area, Grade I Stowe Mansion and associated Registered Park and Garden, located to the north west.</p>

					<p>Therefore the setting and significance of these assets would remain unaltered.'</p> <p>and :-</p> <p>'The study site is located to the south east of the central point of Stowe Conservation Area and to the east of Stowe Avenue. Due to the distance, topography and mature greenery, there is no inter-visibility between the study site and Stowe Conservation Area. It is considered that the study site makes no contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area, and the designated heritage assets that lie within.'</p> <p>We are not convinced that either statement is accurate. The LVIA Addendum provided does not provide accurate or full coverage of key aspects of views from Stowe, and significant visual harm is likely from more than one key viewpoint with the Grade I RPG, particularly in winter. The site is on the north edge of the town of Buckingham and east of the Buckingham Avenue and therefore south-east of the core of Stowe landscape. It falls within the boundary of the historic setting of Stowe identified in 2009 by Land Use Consultants in their Setting Study for the National Trust and shared with AVDC (see Fig 1 attached). This study identified that the Buckingham Avenue is especially vulnerable due to its narrow linearity. The photograph from Viewpoint 10 in the LVIA Addendum, January 2020, taken on the Buckingham Avenue does not face the development site directly to the east at 90 degrees from the road at a point north of the Castle Fields settlement but faces nearly north, and from a point further south it seems. This conveys no image of the direct view, nor provides any understanding of how much more the new buildings on the site would be visible, particularly in winter.</p> <p>In addition long views south from the elevated environs of the Bourbon Tower/ Keeper's Lodge, a Grade II listed mid-C18 building that is a key part of the design in this part of the park, include the north edge of Buckingham, apparently including the development site (see Fig 2 attached). This view is vulnerable to inadvertent damage from large scale development such as this. It is important to note that the area is beyond the Stowe Conservation Area but within the RPG. In the LVIA Addendum it is also noted that Stowe Castle is potentially affected due to its elevated position south of the Tower.</p> <p>It is also possible that the development would be visible from the field south of the New Inn drive, on a ridge and an important view for historic visitors to the visitor inn as well as current visitors.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We ask for detailed analysis and montages of the visual impact of the development in likely views from the Buckingham Avenue, the environs of the Bourbon Tower and the field south of the New Inn drive before a decision is made.</p> <p>If it is demonstrated that the impact is not harmful, we suggest making a condition that buffer zones are planted as the conservation area cannot just be Stowe Avenue itself and the setting and wider landscape needs to be preserved.</p> <p>In our opinion, your officers should not approve this application until they can confirm there is no significant damage to the setting of Stowe. The GT/BGT therefore object unless it can be demonstrated adequately that these key vistas are not significantly harmed by the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cliveden	Buckinghamshire	E21/1601	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for new glazed roof structure over conservatory, comprising use of timber and aluminium framed glazing, hip and ridge bars Cliveden Estate Conservatory, Cliveden Road, Taplow, Buckinghamshire, SL6 0JF, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to an amendment on the above development. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the amendments with the additional louvres, and as long as your officers are satisfied that the appearance from the exterior ground level is not significantly altered, we do not object.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wotton House	Buckinghamshire	E21/1833	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of agricultural barn Little Yeat Farm Bicester Road Woodham Buckinghamshire HP18 0QH AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (GT) about the withdrawal of the above application. I have liaised with my colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) with regard to the resiting of the proposed barn.</p> <p>There have been a number of applications on this site for assorted development potentially affecting the RPG. We very strongly urge that the applicant commission a rigorous Landscape Character Assessment and Masterplan by an expert consultant in order to identify where this and future development could be positioned acceptably to the registered park and garden (RPG), and to inform the potential scale of such change. It would save the applicant money in the long run as these multiple</p>

					<p>applications risk refusal or withdrawal. It will help all parties (the applicant, the planning authority, as well as any consultees such as the GT) assess the potential impact of significant proposed changes on the site.</p> <p>In the absence of such Assessment and Masterplan, it is difficult to assess the acceptability of new proposals as details would be required, in this case including size, scale, materials and exact proposed position of the agricultural building to be able to assess the effect on the RPG.</p> <p>We therefore still request the submission of a Landscape Character Assessment and Masterplan as part of any future application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E21/1920	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building consent for the proposed loft conversion with roof lights and internal alterations</p> <p>16 Gayhurst House Gayhurst Court Newport Road Gayhurst Newport Pagnell MK16 8LG</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Gayhurst Court (formerly Gayhurst House), a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) is an 18th century landscape park with mid c19 formal gardens around an earlier house. The gardens are attributed to Lancelot Brown c1750-60 with modifications by Repton c. 1793. The house and service building were converted to apartments in the 1970s.</p> <p>We previously responded to the original proposals stating that whilst "we have no objection in principle to the proposed internal alterations, the Gardens Trust are greatly concerned about the proposed introduction of rooflights to allow for these internal works."</p> <p>The GT/BGT strongly objected to the application.</p> <p>In our response, we noted a number of inaccuracies within the application form and requested that these were clarified to allow for a proper assessment of the proposals. We also stated that it was difficult to identify the actual application site, and we requested;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · photographs of the actual application site · accurate clarification of which part of the structure the application concerns · an assessment of the impact of the proposals on the heritage asset which we felt must be provided

					<p>We have been notified by the planning authority that the applicant has submitted revised proposals following the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer and the Gardens Trust. We have now reviewed the proposals and it appears that our concerns and requests for additional information detailed above have still not been addressed. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any explanation accompanying the revisions, and as the original submissions have been withdrawn, we cannot compare the revised proposals to those we previously reviewed.</p> <p>Therefore, we can only comment on the basis of the information that has been submitted with this application which remains limited and inaccurate and still does not address the concerns that we raised.</p> <p>We previously objected to the introduction of 5 rooflights across a relatively small roof pitch which we considered had the potential to result in detrimental impact to the RPG through light emittance and/or reflection. We advised that rooflights should not be used unless they were not visible from the wider setting and we were concerned that this would set a precedent across the site.</p> <p>It appears that for this application, the 5 rooflights have been revised to 1 window in a gable, 1 new dormer window and 1 rooflight on the inward facing roof pitch. If this is so, (assuming this is everything and correctly interpreted), the Gardens Trust does not object.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E21/2139	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of part single / part two storey front /side extension, refurbishment of existing dwelling and restoration and relocation of existing gate piers with new gates.</p> <p>Oak Lodge, Dropmore Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NQ</p> <p>DEMOLITION, BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We very much appreciate being given a little leeway to respond due to Covid absences.</p> <p>We welcome the restoration of Oak Lodge and feel that the proposed works are sensitive to the historic design of the structure. A simpler approach might equally be employed to distinguish between the historic fabric and the contemporary addition but on a structure with such intricate detailing, we would support the current proposal.</p> <p>We would also support the introduction of works to mitigate the impact of</p>

				ALTERATIONS, ACCESS/GATES	<p>flooding on the site and to the property and note that a bund is being discussed with Highways England. We would ask for further details relating to this as and when they are prepared and would ask that any such bund is carefully considered with the priority being the context of the building and the setting of the Registered Park and Garden. We would much prefer to see a well-designed earth bund rather than a concrete sandbag bund.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed works to the gate piers, the OS maps for 1890s and 1920s do not show the position of this particular set of gate piers but photographs entitled Figure 5 and 7 (as shown in the document 20220216 North East Gate Piers Report) appear to show these gate piers may have previously been positioned at the north-west end of the terrace in the Italian Garden leading into the Pinetum. It would also appear that, if these were the original gate piers from this position in the formal gardens, they were not only moved to their current position by Oak Lodge but were also replaced by later gate piers which the aforementioned document now shows to be in a poor state of repair.</p> <p>We welcome the repair of the gate piers to restore them to the former glory but would strongly encourage their retention in their current position at the entrance to the north-east drive and we would also encourage the restoration of the drive itself.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E21/2180	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION New railings to edge of existing stone path within the cafe courtyard New Inn Farm Stowe Avenue Buckingham Buckinghamshire MK18 5EQ MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and it is regrettable that the GT/BGT were not involved in any pre-app consultation.</p> <p>We appreciate that the applicant has chosen iron railings because they are already used alongside an open stairway above the area in question. Historically such heavyweight and ornate railings would never have been used to surround a working area of the farmstead to prevent damage to a peripheral area of grass and are in our opinion, therefore an incongruous choice. We believe there is no precedent for this fencing elsewhere at New</p>

					<p>Inn and oak palings of the sort used elsewhere around similar spaces at the New Inn Farm would be more appropriate to evoke the character of its former use. The GT/BGT do not object in principle if the type of fencing fits with the working farmstead character although the GT/BGT object to the choice of material for the railings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Denham Place	Buckinghamshire	E21/2224	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a starters hut, halfway house and two access gates. Buckinghamshire Golf Club, Denham Court Drive, Denham, Buckinghamshire, UB9 5PG,</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE, ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.04.2022</p> <p>This application affects an ornamental landscape of considerable local significance which is a strong candidate site for the Local List of heritage assets. Bucks Gardens Trust offers comments on the effect of application on this designed landscape. We attach a copy of the Bucks Gardens Trust Report on Denham Court, completed in 2021 which has informed our comments below, and which we hope the planning authority will find helpful to its considerations.</p> <p>Denham Court is an 18th century Grade II listed property set in park and pleasure grounds for a mid-C17 on the west bank of the River Colne in South Bucks. The grounds survive largely intact. While the pleasure grounds north of the C17 house have been grassed over and replaced by a large turning circle for the Mansion's current golf clubhouse role, those on the south side retain the ornamental planting established in the late C19 and its wealth of mature trees. The island setting of the Mansion survives created by an ornamental watercourse which is crossed by a C18 classical bridge and two C19 bridges. An iron suspension bridge of c.1890 gives access across the River Colne to a further extension to the late C19 park. The main park is crossed by two C18 drives with entrances marked by ornamental gateways, and it contains mature typical mid-C19 planting, including a lime avenue framing the principal drive amongst much planting and ground remodelling for golf course use. Late C20 changes include considerable extensions to the Mansion, the addition of a number of pools in the park, and the removal of traffic from the original principal approach. The proposals are for the construction of a starter hut, halfway hut and two new gates. Overall, these will have a considerable cumulative effect on the designed landscape. The construction of the golf course has added minimal built structures and the construction of new built structures, notably set apart from the existing built structures, will damage the ornamental parkland character of the historic grounds which had few</p>

					<p>structures in it.</p> <p>The starter hut north of the house will be visible from the Grade II listed C19 iron bridge over the River Colne which is a key part of the landscape design. The halfway hut will be visible from both the former main entrance to the park and the former secondary entrance, both forming key elements of the landscape design. The proposed new west gate at the former main entrance and the proposed new south gate may be visible from the south lawn and the principal bridge to the mansion, again key elements of the landscape design.</p> <p>The degree of damage which these interventions may cause the historic parkland is unclear. In the absence of an informative visual assessment and impact appraisal for the historic landscape we object to the proposed application. We suggest that the council requires this information to be submitted to allow an appropriate assessment of the effects of the proposed works.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Joanne Mirzoeff On behalf of the Bucks Gardens Trust</p>
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E22/0006	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of house and outbuildings, temporary road for construction, proposed new dwelling, garaging, enhancement of adjoining parkland setting including altered driveway, 1.2 metre deep ha-ha and estate railings</p> <p>Burwood House , Taplow Common Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NR</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.04.2022</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 Grade II listing for Dropmore Registered Park and Garden (RPG) states that it is “a late C18/early C19 landscape park with ornamental woodland and a formal garden surrounding a late C18 country house. Lord Grenville, Prime Minister to George III, began work on the Dropmore estate in 1792, having bought 15ha of land complete with a small labourer's cottage, which he demolished, then employing Samuel Wyatt to build the south range of the present house..” Of particular note to this application is the reference to the “ornamental woodland with rides and drives through it.”</p> <p>The Gardens Trust was originally consulted in 2019 on planning application PL/19/4100/FA which sought permission to demolish the existing Burwood House and to construct a replacement dwelling in the woodland within the RPG. The Gardens Trust urged the LPA to refuse consent for the application</p>

					<p>and two key comments we made in response to that application are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whilst the existing dwelling is not of any architectural merit, we would prefer to see an Arts and Craft style structure. We acknowledge that the applicant may prefer the proposed neo-Classical design. In which case, we would recommend that this be positioned on the site of the existing residence by the road. - Finally, we would again like to support the Conservation and Listed Building Officer's comments as follows; "Retaining the present 1980s ranch-style residence would be less harmful than the building proposed by the applicant, in terms of the impact upon the designated assets on the estate." <p>After the LPA issued their refusal to that application, the GT were approached by the applicant's representatives seeking a site visit to discuss revised proposals. Representatives from the BGT, acting on behalf of the GT, attended the site visit and were shown proposals to position the replacement property closer to the existing Burwood House and near to the footprint of the walled garden and existing semi-redundant stable structures.</p> <p>Following the site meeting, the following comments were emailed to the applicant's representatives which it is necessary to include in full here as these comments have been quoted in the Design and Access Statement for this new application :</p> <p>"(We) have had a chance to consider further what we saw on Friday and we feel that we must express our considerable reservations about the proposed site on, what is currently, relatively undeveloped land in such a beautiful and significant valley setting. Whilst we acknowledge that there are existing structures and the manège in situ, their impact on this setting is quite small and their functional nature helps to minimise their impact. Whereas we feel that a substantial new house, albeit with single storey wings, and its accompanying ancillary structures and hard and soft landscaping, will have a much more dramatic impact.</p> <p>We would like to add that, whilst we are still keen to see draft revisions for pushing the proposed new house further into the hillside by the walled garden, our reservations regarding this entire part of the park have increased on reflection since we left.</p> <p>As we discussed on the day, it would be very helpful if you could develop an objective historic impact assessment of the effect of a new house of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>proposed scale on the 4 sites we discussed? The four sites being :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the existing site of Burwood House · the site currently being proposed (from the helicopter pad to the greenhouse · the site we discussed i.e being pushed as far as possible towards the existing walled garden · the site from the previous application set in the woodland <p>It would also be tremendously useful if you could forward the proposals that you presented on Friday for us to have a closer look at.”</p> <p>We note from the Design and Access Statement page 2, point 1.7 that the application states the following “BGT expressed some reservations about the design and its impact on the landscape and sought revised proposals ‘pushing the proposed new house further into the hillside by the walled garden’- which they felt would be more appropriate and which now forms the basis of this application.” We would like to refer you back to our statement underlined above which states that “our reservations regarding this entire part of the park have increased on reflection since we left.” We are therefore extremely concerned that our comments have been edited to give the impression that we support this application.</p> <p>Furthermore, we have not seen any revised proposals since our email was sent. We have not seen the Historic Impact Assessment that we recommended so we have had no opportunity to review and feedback directly to the applicant since our emailed comments above. It would appear that all other sites, including the existing site of Burwood House, have been rejected in favour of this site.</p> <p>With regard to this specific application, whilst we acknowledge that the applicant has revised the proposals to present a smaller dwelling on the footprint of existing buildings, we stand by our previous considerable reservations about the proposed site, on what is currently relatively undeveloped land in such a beautiful and significant valley setting, with regards to the impact on the Grade II RPG.</p> <p>Our preference remains for a new dwelling on the site of the existing Burwood House which, most importantly, sits outside the RPG.</p> <p>We must stress that the Gardens Trust has not offered any support to the applicant with regard to this application. We would, however, be willing to make a further site visit to assess the revised proposals in situ if the applicant agrees. In the meantime, we object to this application and recommend that the planning authority refuses consent until further</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					assessment can be carried out. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Berry Hill	Buckinghamshire	E22/0099	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of a parcel of land associated with horticulture to a use providing the provision of a community shop (selling local products and goods grown at the site) as well as an area to place a portable trailer for selling refreshments, and the provision of parking on the existing hardstanding</p> <p>The Walled Garden, Berry Hill, Taplow, Buckinghamshire, SL6 ODA</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.04.2022</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>Berry Hill is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden and the listing states that the site is a "Mid C19 pleasure grounds and a small park laid out by Robert Marnock between 1856 and 1860 around a modest country house (now gone), with extensive artificial rockwork by James Pulham..., which William Robinson was to praise as a fine example of the English or natural style (The Garden 1872)."</p> <p>The Gardens Trust note the planning application is for change of use of horticultural land and to 'create a community shop in an existing structure selling local produce, as well as that grown at the site, to provide an area for a portable trailer to sell refreshments and the provision of parking on the existing hardstanding.'</p> <p>Whilst we do not know the site, it is apparent that the existing walled garden looks to be in poor condition from the photos provided in the well-written Design and Access Statement. The extent of the proposed parking is quite minimal, 6 spaces with a further 6 spaces as overflow all against the wall of the original lean-to greenhouses and we also note the proposed use of portable trailers which can be removed when not in use or no longer required.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst in principle we have no objection to the proposed change of use and the opportunity to bring this site back in production, we do have substantial concerns as to the future evolution of these proposals and the longer-term impact on the site if the community shop proves successful (which we hope it will be). We are concerned that the proposed provision of parking would not be adequate and that other ventures/shops may also seek to be positioned here.</p> <p>It would, therefore, be extremely helpful to have a masterplan for the site and for the LPA to assess, if they are minded to approve the proposals,</p>

					whether any restrictions or limitations on future expansion might be required. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Peterborough Cathedral Precincts	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 11.04.2022 The GT/CGT responded to the above application on 25th March 2022, and subsequently we have been sent additional information which alerted us to the possibility that the photomontages which we relied on for our response, were misleading : ('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'.) It is regrettable that due to capacity issues, we have been unable to make a site visit to verify this discrepancy. However, we do now have significant concerns that the heights of the existing building shown in the photomontage from the Wheelyard (ie. The Garage at the Old Deanery – height to ridge of 5.7m) clearly appears lower than the new buildings (height to ridge of 7.7m) in the annotated photograph supplied with the documentation (see next page). We are very disappointed that a document which we relied on to make our comments is misrepresentative of the relative building heights. The combination of the confusing Visual Impact Assessment and the concerns raised by your tree officer regarding the imprecise information as to which trees were to be removed and which were to be retained, relate back to our original response dated 10th August 2021. It would now appear that there is an almost complete clearance of the site. This increased visibility of the new buildings from the various adjacent heritage assets will have a considerable impact upon their setting as well as a net biodiversity loss. We therefore wish to OBJECT to the heights of the proposed new buildings which we will be overly dominant within the Registered Park and Garden. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Dallam Tower	Cumbria	E22/0005	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 101 houses, 7	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.04.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory

				<p>bungalows and 44 apartments, of which 28 are for people aged over 55, with associated roads, car parking, landscaping, infrastructure and access from Beetham Road Land off Beetham Road, MILNTHORPE RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>Consultee on the above application which affects Dallam Tower, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Cumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and note that this 6.3 hectare site was allocated for housing under Policy LA2.11 of the South Lakeland Local Plan – Land Allocations, adopted in December 2013. The development is located on rising ground immediately east of the of the Dallam Tower RPG, separated by the A6 Beetham Road. Whilst we concur in general with the findings of the Heritage Statement that the development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the RPG, as defined in NPPF Paragraph 202, we cannot agree with the assessment that the new development have no greater impact than the housing (etc) that already occupies adjacent land to the north of the site. The new development will indeed bring the southern periphery of Milnthorpe closer to the north-eastern boundary of the Dallam Tower estate, but given that Beetham Road largely follows the River Bela i.e. along the lowest line of the local topography, is unlikely to act as a substantial visual barrier in the landscape. Therefore, we cannot agree that the visual impact of the proposed development on the Dallam Tower RPG will be benign. As demonstrated in the Landscape and Visual Assessment (Viewpoint 13. View northeast towards the Application Site from the public footpath in Dallam Deer Park), it is inevitable that the southward extension of the housing will be visible from the RPG.</p> <p>Owing to the topography of the local countryside, and proximity of Dallam Tower and the development site, effective mitigation through landscape and planting is virtually impossible. However, we would advise that further consideration should be given to the treatment of the site boundary along Beetham Road to soften the impact of this urbanised edge and reflect the rural setting of this site. We note that the majority of the hedgerow trees to be retained are Ash. We have been advised that Ash die-back is prevalent in the local area and the Dallam Estate has a very large clearing policy on Ash at present. We would advise that the proposed hedgerow tree planting be strengthened in advance of any potential loss of Ash by inter planting an alternative species such as Oak. While this will offer little in the way of direct screening it will help to soften the urban nature of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>development in views from the Dallam Tower landscape.</p> <p>To summarise, while we do not object to the proposal, we do consider that there will be less than substantial harm caused to the Grade II Dallam Tower landscape, due to the visual impact of the housing development. Whilst mitigation of this impact is difficult, some semblance of the rural nature of the Beetham Road boundary can be retained through the strengthening of tree planting in advance of any losses of the established hedgerow trees through Ash die-back.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Elvaston Castle	Derbyshire	E21/2222	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion and extension of existing buildings to commercial use, and construction of access drive and car park.</p> <p>Elvaston Castle Country Park, Borrowwash Road, Elvaston, DE72 3EP</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.04.2022</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 Historic Gardens Trust (DHGT) and their local knowledge informs these joint comments upon the above proposals. It is disappointing that Derbyshire County Council did not consider engaging with the Gardens Trust when developing the Master Plan, as our very specialized statutory remit, whose requirements have been in place since 1995, is entirely focused on the impact of 'development likely to affect' historic designed landscapes in relation to Grades I, II* and II registered sites.</p> <p>There is a considerable amount of information relating to this application and as our remit relates to the impact of the developments on the setting and significance of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Elvaston Castle we will focus principally on this rather than commenting on the laudable aims for restoration of buildings within the core area surrounding Elvaston Castle itself.</p> <p>We fully support the restoration plans for the various buildings and their proposed new uses, and whilst the new café is not an entirely sympathetic entity within the paddock behind the North Range east carriage archway, we can understand the necessity of such a facility. We have to accept the findings that there is no existing building of sufficient size within the core buildings to support this venture.</p> <p>At the beginning of the Heritage Statement (HS) (Introduction para iii) it states : ' The park requires only a brief appraisal here, because its broad history is well-known and appreciated, and the current application is of</p>

					<p>little direct relevance to it.’ (our emphasis). We are perturbed to read such a statement, as the siting of a major proposed new drive and car park directly adjacent to and occasionally passing through the RPG, has very direct relevance to this nationally important registered landscape. The HS fails to describe the significance of the RPG and although it is mentioned in the Planning Statement (Paras 5.29 and 5.30), both documents are dismissive of the crucial importance of the setting to the significance of the RPG. In the absence of a conservation management plan, we would have at the very least have expected the HS to identify historic views towards and from within the RPG, not just those within the Landscape Visual Appraisal (LVA), as well as identifying sensitive areas least able to accommodate change. We consider therefore that the heritage statement fails to adequately identify the significance of the RPG and its component areas. It is also very surprising that nowhere amongst the suite of documents is there an up-to-date Master Plan of the proposals (both Phase 1 and Phase 2) or any kind of plan which superimposes the proposed changes, and in particular the new drive and car park, over a map of the RPG.</p> <p>Without such information, it is not possible to adequately identify impact upon the RPG and as the new drive is such a major imposition upon the landscape, it is not always easy to see where it crosses over into the RPG as opposed to running alongside the western edge. It would appear to enter the RPG in two areas : firstly where the drive begins at the new roundabout with the B5010, and secondly where the new drive meets the south-west corner of the cricket ground, where woodland areas W8 and W9 are to be found, before bending up again to the north. (‘Cricket Pitch knuckle’)</p> <p>The HS (1a.4) suggests that ‘there appears to be a general consensus that the roundabout and the short length of drive through the wood form the most contentious part of the current proposals.’ We disagree and are more concerned about the area of the RPG around ‘Cricket Pitch Knuckle’ and the route for the new drive which is readily visible from here and from the permissive footpath across Oak Flat. Photo A at the end of this letter shows the obviously visible view WSW from near the SE corner of the cricket ground where the new access route follows the fence line towards the parked car. This particular area of drive is precisely where a good view out to the surrounding countryside from within the RPG, and vice versa has always been possible. The drive passes through an area known as Oak Flat</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>beyond the boundary of the RPG. The HS (Paras 4.2 & 4.3) refers to the 1822 OS Survey Drawing and highlights the importance of this area to the setting of the RPG as the ‘most park-like’ of the landscape outside the RPG and ‘stippled to show that it was then considered as part of the ornamental grounds of the Hall.’ Although not illustrated in the HS, this detail below clearly indicates that Oak Flat is at least equal in size, if not slightly larger than the rest of the parkland to the N and NE of the Castle (within the RPG), and we do not feel that its importance has been adequately assessed when considering the impact of these major impositions on setting and significance as well as views of the new drive to and from the RPG.</p> <p>Elvaston was originally listed in 1984, and at that time the OS Survey drawings were not digitised (not till 2010), so unless the EH inspector had been able to visit the British Library in person, the significance of Oak Flat was quite possibly unknown. Had they been easily available, we consider it very likely that the Oak Flat area may have been included within the RPG. The Heritage Statement states (3.32) that the new drive will be completely screened from the RPG. This is incorrect. Photo B shows a view E from the bridleway to Alvaston where the new access will pass R to L in front of the hedge/trees along the far side of the fields. Photo C taken from the bridleway across the existing access to the castle shows that the proposed car park area is also clearly visible through the trees, which are not that dense. A similar view is available for some distance along this stretch of bridleway. Woodland areas W8 and W9 which lie within the ‘Cricket Pitch knuckle’, are described as ‘young mature to mature’ and ‘young mature’ respectively in the pre-development Arboricultural Report (ie mostly non historic woodlands) and both these areas are to be largely removed to accommodate the new road. We appreciate they will be replanted. The LVA has an indicative viewpoint (VP6) from in front of the Golden Gates towards this area. VP6 shows the view here as completely wooded and we would query whether this is a realistic representation, particularly as the images are with the trees in full leaf and given the felling required, and the time it will take for new trees to grow. We would have expected the LVA to include a closer view-point from just below the cricket pitch out to Oak Flatt as the new drive is clearly visible from here as demonstrated by photo A.</p> <p>Since the early 19th century the estate at Elvaston has been enclosed and inward looking, with occasional deliberate breaks in tree cover where the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>rural sweep of encircling farmland can be glimpsed. This sets it apart from many other more open designed landscapes where extensive views draw in surrounding land, making it appear as a seamless extension of the designed landscape.</p> <p>From the outside, trees mostly hid the segregated, private world of Elvaston. The new driveway and car park with their regular flow of traffic and people completely changes this static, secluded environment to a far more dynamic one. It alters this very important aspect of significance and the character of the landscape, diminishing the privacy of Elvaston's setting, both from inside and outside the RPG. It is also apparent that views from the west of the existing bridleway and permissive path approaching the RPG from Alvaston or Oak Flat will be much altered. The new access road will present a deleterious visual intrusion and the addition of new planting between the new access road and the parallel bridleway will obstruct the views to the west across Oak Flat from the bridleway changing the landscape character.</p> <p>The LVA also fails to show any views from the Castle itself and elsewhere within the RPG from the west and north-west. For example, the former orchid house on the roof of the Castle, which is of particular heritage interest, would almost certainly have had a very clear view of not just the drive but also the new car parking area. Whilst the landscape around Elvaston is undeniably flat, views out from the RPG are far more common than the online documentation suggests.</p> <p>The re-siting of the car park is the lynch pin of the proposals and we do not unquestioningly accept that visitors are unwilling to walk slightly further to get to the core buildings at Elvaston. Indeed, even now the central area is quite clearly the honey pot destination, and this will not change when the buildings are restored. We appreciate the problems with compaction around trees as visitors enter the site from the current car park, but this is arguably more a matter of long-term inaction rather than an insurmountable problem. The route to the existing car park through Thulston, Elvaston and Borrowwash, is already a rat run for motorists during rush hours and this will not change, even if traffic to Elvaston Country Park is mostly removed from the equation. We can see the attraction of the clock tower being a focal point as visitors enter the site from the new car park, and the use of Springthorpe Cottage as an information space and gathering point.</p> <p>We will comment in due course on the proposals earmarked for Phase 2 of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the project (mentioned within the Environmental Statement Vol 1) with reference to the conversion of the Dog Kennels into holiday accommodation with the addition of eleven chalets in the surrounding woodland.</p> <p>Having highlighted the above concerns, we are also aware that there are no definite plans as yet for the current car park. We would not support development on this site which lies entirely within the RPG.</p> <p>The Elvaston Castle and Gardens Trust website https://www.futureelvaston.co.uk/current-projects/ (undated) states 'We are now developing a business plan which will support and explain the way in which the Masterplan will be delivered and managed to ensure that Elvaston is truly self-sustaining and able to achieve the economic, social and environmental impacts which underpin our work.' We would have hoped that this business plan came before the Master Plan.</p> <p>We would have liked to see some reference within the application documentation to the interim plans for the management of the historic gardens and landscape.</p> <p>The application does not include a clear description of the significance of the RPG and the contribution made by its setting, and has therefore failed to assess the true impact of ht proposals on the RPG.</p> <p>The GT/DHGT suggest that until the omissions highlighted above are addressed, it will not be possible to determine the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E22/0048	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed dog day care centre including new buildings, solar panels and parking - this is a departure to the adopted local plan. Land Off Flagshaw Lane Flagshaw Lane Kirk Langley Ashbourne Derbyshire MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The application site lies within the designated setting of the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Kedleston, as well as being on a greenfield site immediately adjacent to the western approach to Kedleston from Kirk Langley. The application documents do not contain a Heritage Impact Assessment which we would have expected in order to help us understand how the proposals affect the setting of the Grade I RPG. Whilst the Design and Access Statement (D&A) stresses the wish to be</p>

					<p>'sensitive to ecology' (Para 3.6), sowing wildflower strips, putting up bird/bat boxes and planting new hedging, does not mitigate removing sections of mature hedgerow, erecting polytunnels, new buildings and considerable extra fencing within the setting of a Grade I designed landscape. There is also the impact of considerable extra traffic within a rural area with a poorly sited access onto a fast stretch of road. The D&A mentions briefly that the site lies within the setting of Kedleston, but thereafter the documentation makes no further mention as to what impact these alien structures and the associated dog care paraphernalia may have on a key approach to one of England's most important and significant historic designed landscapes.</p> <p>Some objectors have already mentioned policies within the Adopted Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 which this application fails to comply with. We concur with their comments and do not intend to repeat them. In addition, we consider that the applicant has not met the criteria set out within the NPPF Para 194 as there has been no attempt to 'describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.' We consider that the proposed dog day care centre on this particularly sensitive piece of land is not the optimum use of the site, and hence contravenes NPPF Para 202. Your officers will also 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. Page 11 relates to the experience of the heritage asset, and lists several ways in which this can be harmed, including : 'Noise, vibration and other nuisances'... and 'Busyness, bustle, movement and activity'. These are all applicable here.</p> <p>The GT objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stanmer Park	East Sussex	E21/2230	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Temporary provision for seven accessible car parking bays including the construction of a reinforced grass surface treatment.</p> <p>Stanmer House Stanmer Village Stanmer Park Brighton Brighton</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.04.2022</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 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p>

				<p>& Hove BN1 9QA PARKING</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>Representatives of SGT know the site well and have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted. The Trust considers the proposed car park would cause substantial harm to the Significance of the Fountain Garden and the setting of the Grade I listed Stanmer House.</p> <p>Moreover, given the application provides no indication of when or how a permanent solution to provision of disabled parking could be provided, this harm needs to be considered irreversible.</p> <p>SGT therefore objects to the application and, before the application is determined, requests the LPA to ask the applicant what alternative permanent solutions might be possible.</p> <p>Material Considerations in the Planning Process</p> <p>The site sits within Stanmer Park which is included in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest with a Grade II designation. The inclusion in the Register means the Park is subject to a statutory designation, and has the same weight in policy terms under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as scheduled monuments and listed buildings.</p> <p>Moreover, the site is located in part of the formal Fountain Garden very close and directly in front of the south wing of Stanmer House, which is a Grade I listed building.</p> <p>A detailed Historic Landscape Survey and Restoration Management Plan for Stanmer Park was adopted by BHCC in 2003 (see here) and this should be treated as a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Significance of Stanmer Park, the Fountain Garden and Stanmer House</p> <p>Paragraph 128 of the NPPF places an obligation on the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage asset and to produce an assessment of the impact of the proposals on that significance.</p> <p>Stanmer Park is of principal importance to the significance of Stanmer House. From the house the park creates a tranquil outlook over the park with the views to the east and south largely unchanged (see Fig 1).</p> <p>Fig 1 Stanmer House in late C18 and early C21</p> <p>To the south, the reception rooms on the ground floor and the rooms on the upper floors look out over the Fountain Garden with distant views across the park to Brighton beyond (see Fig 2).</p> <p>Fig 2 Aerial view 2009</p> <p>Assessment of Significance</p> <p>The Heritage Statement submitted with the application includes a detailed</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	---

				<p>description of the site and its history. However, Sussex Gardens Trust considers the Heritage Statement fails to properly identify the significance of the Fountain Garden SGT considers the Significance of the Fountain Garden lies in: (i) its illustrative historical value as an example of how an informal 18th century parkland garden evolved in the 19th century into a more formal garden; and (ii) its aesthetic value as a harmonious formal garden in front of a fine example of a formal Georgian house (see Fig 3 below). The structure and main features of this garden remain to this day (see Figs 2 above and 4 below), albeit there has been some degradation to the paths that surround the garden.</p> <p>Fig 3</p> <p>Fig 4 – Proposal included in present planning application</p> <p>Impact on Significance</p> <p>The garden area to the south of the house was originally laid out in the 18th century as informal parkland but later in the 19th century this area was remodelled as a more formal Fountain Garden.</p> <p>Fig 3 above shows how the garden looked in the early 20th century</p> <p>The Heritage Statement includes a cursory assessment of the impact merely stating: “Though it is considered the creation of a car park has had some impact on the setting of the house, this is temporary and is reversible”</p> <p>The significance of the Fountain Garden described earlier would be substantially harmed by the proposed car park due to visual harm – parked cars would be in full view from the Fountain Garden.</p> <p>Views of the Grade I listed house from the park will also be adversely affected as will views from the house to the parkland to the SE. Given no permanent alternative has been identified, this harm should be assessed as permanent.</p> <p>Restoration Management Plan</p> <p>The Restoration Management Plan referred to above includes a number of objectives and actions affecting the Fountain Garden and the garden/carpark beyond. Approval of the present application would conflict with several of the objectives included in that Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Objective 5: To mitigate the adverse impact of the existing C20th developments, where this has been shown to exist. In some instances this may only be achieved through removal. o Objective 6: To ensure that any mitigation measures that are found to be necessary are in accordance with the character of the C18th design.
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>o Objective 12: To resist any new development... unless it is demonstrably beneficial to the aesthetic quality of the landscape.</p> <p>o C9: removal of the shrubbery and cherry orchard... to the south of the house / garden to reestablish the open aspect towards the parkland and reveal views towards Stanmer House.</p> <p>o C10: the clearance of the conifer screen from the garden boundary ... to reveal visibility between parkland and house.</p> <p>o SH1: Restore levelled garden to the south of the house.</p> <p>o SH2: Repair the garden fountain.</p> <p>o SH4: Remove the C20th garden extension.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jim Stockwell</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E21/2247	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extension and alterations to existing building and driveway and for change of use from parkland to garden Dairy House Shortgrove Newport BUILDING ALTERATION, CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The application pertains to the Dairy House located within the Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Shortgrove Park. Shortgrove Park contains the remains of an eighteenth-century landscape park covering approximately 176 hectares. A landscape park was laid out at Shortgrove by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown between the 1750s and 1770s overlying an early eighteenth-century formal landscape surrounding the site of the former Hall. The Dairy House was built c.1900, first appearing on historic maps in the Ordnance Survey Map of 1920. It was originally the dairy for the Shortgrove Estate but was converted to residential use in the 1960s. The land within the park was divided in the mid- and later twentieth century, and many of the outbuildings were converted to residential use. The Dairy is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The GT/EGT do not object to the application, however, would like to note a few important considerations.</p> <p>We note that the proposal retains the appearance of the principal façade, however, the design of the windows and doors of the extension should be revised so that they are more in line with the character of the house. We also note that conditions are required, removing permitted development rights and requiring approval of materials which should be of good quality and to match the existing building.</p>

					<p>Furthermore, we would like to note that it would be beneficial to include any historic trees in the area within the scheme.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Harlow Town Park	Essex	E22/0034	II	<p>LOCAL PLAN North Harlow Sustainable Transport Corridor</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and are able to confirm that this will not affect the Harlow Town Park. We therefore have no objections to the proposed transport corridor.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community	Essex	E22/0079	N/A	<p>LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation https://tcbgardencommunity.co.uk/</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2022</p> <p>The Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) seeks to protect Essex's precious green spaces - past and present, which includes providing informed comment on relevant plans for development.</p> <p>In broad terms, EGT supports planning along Garden Community principles as one of the best ways to achieve a holistic view of sustainable development through attention to both retention of existing landscape features and creation of new open spaces and gardens. The current draft proposals are considered to provide the essential next phases of detailed guidance required to advance the process of building a Garden Community, which were established in broad outline by policies SP8 and SP9 in the shared Tendring and Colchester Section 1 Local Plan.</p> <p>EGT notes that masterplanning work has been informed by a Heritage Impact Assessment which identified avoidance and mitigation measures required to safeguard and enhance heritage assets. EGT supports the requirement that 'densities must also reflect the sensitive landscape and heritage value of Wivenhoe Park Registered Park and Garden and its setting that forms part of the University estate and abuts the southern boundary of the Garden Community' (page 64) EGT also supports the requirement that planning applications include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment:</p> <p>To ensure proposals minimise impact on the existing landscape character and sensitive receptors, both on the site itself and in the surrounding settlements or countryside, a comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of detailed proposals is required. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) must demonstrate how the layout and design of</p>

					<p>proposals has evolved to avoid or minimise harmful impacts. (Part J1, pg. 62)</p> <p>EGT welcomes the commitment to a wide range of green infrastructure running throughout the proposals, including commitments to the new Salary Brook park, smaller green areas and play spaces, connections to the wider green network including the Colchester Orbital, food production spaces, private gardens and achievement of biodiversity net gain. Long term stewardship will be critical to the success of green infrastructure proposals and EGT would support the early creation of management and funding bodies to ensure effective maintenance of green resources over time. This will require involvement of a wide range of community interests, including the custodians of the Registered Park and Gardens in the area, Wivenhoe House at the University of Essex and Beth Chatto Gardens.</p>
Lypiatt Park	Gloucestershire	E21/2206	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed extension to existing agricultural workshop /store Land And Building At, Bisley Road, Stroud, Gloucestershire. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have an adverse impact on listed or registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>The extension to this essentially standard agricultural building will have little impact on its immediate surroundings, and even less on the more sensitive parkland landscape associated with Lypiatt Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Woodchester Park	Gloucestershire	E21/2217	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of rear extension and garage building. Erection of 1.5 storey rear extension. Internal alterations to main house. Erection of detached 1.5 storey garage. Landscaping. Erection of stone piers to support a new gate. The Lodge House, Woodchester Park, Nympsfield, Stonehouse. DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for development proposals that might adversely impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>The proposed renovation and modification of Lodge House and the addition of a reasonably substantial extension; although increasing the massing of this building group, does not create an unacceptable impact on its surroundings. The character of Lodge House itself is enhanced by the works, and although some aspects the scale of the extension detailing may be debated; the net effect again is not creating an unacceptable impact.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>

Sudeley Castle	Gloucestershire	E21/2244	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment and conversion of Almsbury Farm Barns to provide a mixed residential and commercial development, comprising of circa. 900 sqm of Class E commercial floor space and 19 new residential units. Including demolition of non-historic portal framed barns and the provision of new car parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure</p> <p>Almsbury Farm, Vineyard Street, Winchcombe</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for development proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal on its behalf.</p> <p>The Almsbury Farm group, much of which is derelict, lies between the southern development edge of Winchcombe and the northern boundary of the parkland associated with the Sudeley estate. The recent site plan of March 2022 shows the relationship with the Listed park boundary and the proposed development. The slight overlap on the development's southern boundary is considered inconsequential.</p> <p>The proposed reconstruction of this farm group to give it a beneficial future mix of residential and commercial use is considered to be a logical step. The architectural quality of the traditional buildings has been maintained and this has been continued in the additional construction. The future use of this farm group in this manner has little impact on the Listed park. However, but I would suggest that the Estate might be persuaded to reinforce the parkland planting to the South, and particularly to the eastern boundary, where the impact of the domestic "clutter" associated with garden structures would be visible- although not towards the Castle.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball,(on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Trent Park	Greater London	E21/0772	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 2 of 16/04324/FUL (as varied under reference 20/03992/VAR) to allow 1) amendments to the Walled Garden comprising reduction in the number of homes from 32 to 22, revised housing mix, increase in build footprint, alterations to the design of the buildings, increase in the size of private gardens, removal of private terraces at first floor level, decrease in the size of the communal garden with</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.04.2022</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 applications. We must apologise for the lateness of this response but as it is clear the above have not yet been finally decided, we wish to add our comments to those of our colleagues in the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT).</p> <p>The earlier application of the two applications shown above (21/02813/VAR) has been fully responded to on our behalf by our colleagues in the LPGT, and we wish to state that we concur entirely with their comments. We share their objections to the increased footprint of the housing proposed within the walled garden and the corresponding reduction of communal garden space remaining. The application, if approved will compromise the understanding and legibility of this historic</p>

				<p>changes in layout ; 2) amendments to the Gardeners Cottage comprising a new private garden and alterations to window and door openings ; 3) amendments to the Energy Statement and; 4) amendments to the Landscape Masterplan. Former Middlesex University Trent Park Bramley Road N14 4YZ RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>asset to the detriment of public benefit. We also include 22/00396/LBC in this response as it relates to the remnant historic elements of the garden wall and is therefore inextricably bound with the former application. As you will already have a lot of paperwork for these applications, in the interests of brevity we will not repeat LPGT's comments here, and for the reasons outlined in this letter and more fully in LPGT's response, we object to both applications and urge your officers to reject the Developer's proposals. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Trent Park	Greater London	E21/2071	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Partial dismantling and reinstatement of the walled garden at Trent Park. Trent Park Cockfosters Road Barnet EN4 OPS REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.04.2022 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 applications. We must apologise for the lateness of this response but as it is clear the above have not yet been finally decided, we wish to add our comments to those of our colleagues in the London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (LPGT). The earlier application of the two applications shown above (21/02813/VAR) has been fully responded to on our behalf by our colleagues in the LPGT, and we wish to state that we concur entirely with their comments. We share their objections to the increased footprint of the housing proposed within the walled garden and the corresponding reduction of communal garden space remaining. The application, if approved will compromise the understanding and legibility of this historic asset to the detriment of public benefit. We also include 22/00396/LBC in this response as it relates to the remnant historic elements of the garden wall and is therefore inextricably bound with the former application. As you will already have a lot of paperwork for these applications, in the interests of brevity we will not repeat LPGT's comments here, and for the reasons outlined in this letter and more fully in LPGT's response, we object to both applications and urge your officers to reject the Developer's proposals. Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
The Roof Garden, 99 High Street, Kensington	Greater London	E21/2171	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Renovation and redevelopment works to sun pavilion at 6th /7th floor and renovation of historic gardens at 6th floor level. 99-121 Kensington High Street, LONDON, W8 5SA MISCELLANEOUS, LANDSCAPE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application. I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Gardens Trust (LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Kensington Roof Garden is included in the London Gardens Trust Inventory. This is an important roof garden, as one of the earliest roof gardens in England that was planned to surpass all previous examples. It remains the largest roof garden in Europe. We welcome the re-opening and renovation of Kensington Roof Garden. The layout of the garden as originally designed remains largely intact and it appears that the proposals for the renovations set out in this application respect this. However, we are concerned about the proposed forward extension to the Sun pavilion, with paving onto what is now the grassed area of the woodland garden. Clearly, a roof garden is of finite size and we object to this area of grass being lost to paving. The garden was originally open to the public for a small charge to charity. We request that should planning consent be forthcoming that there should be a planning condition that the garden will once again be open to the public, at least for the London Gardens Trust's Open Gardens Weekend. · The disproportionate increase in hard landscape. Yours Sincerely Hazel Morris For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group

Battersea Park	Greater London	E22/0071	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Temporary removal of Grade II* Listed Dame Barbara Hepworth Sculpture</p> <p>Battersea Park, SW11 4NJ</p> <p>MONUMENT/SCULPTURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2022</p> <p>We have no objection to the Temporary removal of the Sculpture for display in the Museum, on the understanding that it will be returned to the garden in good condition within the timeframe agreed in the planning request ie. no more than 7 months, with no extension.</p> <p>We trust the Council will be paid for this inconvenience and that all monies received can be ringfenced for use in exclusively to benefit Battersea Park.</p> <p>Kind regards, Helen Monger Director</p>
Embley Park	Hampshire	E21/2220	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Vary conditions 8 and 10 of TVS.08810/2 (Appeal Ref: APP/C/1760/A/031114244) (Continued use of land as travelling showpeople's site) to allow revised boundary treatment and more of the space on site to be used for showmen's purposes</p> <p>Forest Edge Park, Gardeners Lane, East Wellow</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.04.2022</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 looked at the sparse documentation accompanying this application. As with previous applications concerning this site, which lies entirely within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Embley, absolutely no consideration appears to have been taken with regard to the effect the changes might have upon this designated heritage asset. There is nothing to inform us how visible the existing site is from the RPG. Our remit is to consider whether the change will further negatively impinge on the historic landscape.</p> <p>In our opinion, the bund should be retained and planted as originally proposed by the Planning Inspector. Its removal and replacement with a 2m tall close boarded fence with concrete kick boards, can only add to the unwelcome urbanisation of this historic site. The native hedge proposed will need continual maintenance over its lifetime and as only 7.5% of the suggested planting mix is evergreen, will not do much to screen the intrusive, alien fencing during approximately 5 months of the year.</p> <p>We have received several applications now for this area of the RPG and we strongly suggest that a Masterplan be commissioned, so that everyone is clear what is and is not acceptable as far as future development is concerned, so that what remains of the historic landscape in this part of the RPG is protected. We feel that such a framework would be extremely beneficial.</p> <p>The GT/HGT object to the removal of the bund.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Bramshill Park	Hampshire	E22/0047	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to provide a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) area and associated works Bramshill House Bramshill Park Bramshill Hook RG27 0JW CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.04.2022</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.</p> <p>We have been aware of the changing development options at Bramshill for many years now but are not familiar with the imminent applications which will relate directly to the above SANG proposals. Whilst protection for important nature sites is to be welcomed, before we comment further on the documentation accompanying this application, we need to understand the full details of the proposed developments within this Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) at Bramshill.</p> <p>We do have some concerns however, regarding the statement in the Planning Statement, (p.15) Impact on Heritage Assets, Para 5.13 which states that ‘ecological enhancements and benefits of the proposal were considered to outweigh the heritage issues. Bramshill is an extremely important and unique Jacobean landscape and the only example in the UK where the house and its associated landscape remain intact. There is a survey of the house and park dated 1699, which shows that its remarkable features and dramatic landscape, approach, house and walled gardens, the avenues, maze, lake and island – were created before this date and confirms that the landscape is contemporary with the building of the house. There are also significant 18th century additions and alterations to the landscape.</p> <p>Looking at the plans, the boundary of the proposed SANG runs along the west, north & north-east banks of the lake. However, the lake - actually an early 17th century water garden and seen in its surviving form on the 1699 plan, is the most significant landscape survival from that period. Loss to any of this significance by inappropriate development would be a tragedy. We will need to be convinced that the SANG will not adversely impact it. We note that the proposal includes the removal of Rhodendron ponticum and willow scrub, both of which are welcomed.</p> <p>The GT/HGT reserve the right to amend our comments further once we</p>

					have full details of the other proposed developments at Bramshill. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Sandy Lane Quarry, Wildmoor	Hereford and Worcester	E21/0846	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed importation of inert restoration material and extraction of sand to enable engineering operations for stability purposes and completion of site restoration (Western portion of the former) Sandy Lane Quarry, Wildmoor, Worcestershire MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.04.2022 Thank you for consulting Hereford & Worcester Gardens Trust with regard to the above Application. We have no objection to the proposals and note that there will be no adverse impact on any historic park or garden or designed landscape. We have no comment regarding the additional information relating to ecology and biodiversity.
Briggens	Hertfordshire	E21/1691	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application for development including demolition of existing structures, refurbishment and change of use of existing Grade II Listed Brickhouse Farm Barn and structures and erection of a residential led mixed use development comprising: up to 1,500 residential market and affordable homes; a mixed use local village centre; retail, business, commercial and community uses; primary school, early years and nursery facilities; leisure and sports facilities including a football hub; provision for 8 no. pitches for Gypsies & Travellers; open spaces, ecological areas, woodlands and public realm; pedestrian, cycle and vehicular accesses and	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2022 The Gardens Trust are concerned about the impact on a number of Listed sites: Stansteadbury park, Briggens park, Hunsdon House and the recently scheduled monument Henry VIII pond system along Hunsdon Brook. The area of Village 7 was largely within the royal park surrounding Hunsdon House and is still visible from the historic viewpoint on top of the house. We are concerned that light pollution from the development, especially if high-level lights are installed for sports pitches, would affect not only the ponds and Hunsdon House which is on a high point next to the eyecatcher of listed St Dunstons church, but also the parklands of Briggens and Stansteadbury on the other side of the A414. Nothing we have seen in the original plans nor in this dismissive response from Savills has indicated that this needs to be addressed. The HE guidance (GPA3.) on Setting of Historic Assets does address this. We would consider that the impact on these listed heritage assets and on Olive's Farm could be somewhat mitigated if the Village 7 development was concentrated to the east of Church Lane. We are aware that some archaeology has been done in the Church Lane area but the possible site of the royal hunting lodge as depicted in the painting of Edward VI and the possibilities for more earthworks in the royal park has not been addressed. Savills claim that there are no undesignated heritage assets in the area - we would argue that no-one has looked for any. Given the ponds in this royal park are on a par with those of the French king and the Medicis in Italy, perhaps this site should not be

				network within the site; associated drainage, utilities, energy and waste facilities and infrastructure; works to and realignment of the existing highway; other supporting works, facilities and infrastructure; together with associated temporary enabling works or structures. With all matters reserved apart from detailed works to the A414 Church Lane junction (phased development). Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Gilston Village 7 Land Off Church Lane A414 Hunsdon And Eastwick Hertfordshire MAJOR HYBRID	dismissed so lightly. Regards Kate Harwood Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.
5 Reddings, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0052	N	PLANNING APPLICATION T1 - Oak: To reduce height & width by 2.5 to 3 meters 5 Reddings Welwyn Garden City AL8 7LA TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. The oak (T1) is part of the ancient woodland of Sherrards Park and abuts the old railway line from Harpenden, now a footpath. There is no detail of the condition or age of the tree which may provide reasons for the pruning for health and safety reasons. Unless substantial justification for pruning this oak tree is submitted, on safety grounds for either people or the tree, then we consider that the tree in a wood which predates the adjacent house by several centuries, should not be pruned as proposed.
5 Oakwell Drive, Northaw	Hertfords hire	E22/0062	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Formation of single subterranean dwelling 5 Oakwell Drive Northaw Potters Bar Hertfordshire EN6 4EZ RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We commented on application 6/2018/1808/HOUSE that we were concerned about the trees from the Victorian landscape. We have seen nothing in this current application to alleviate our concerns and no convincing justification for the subterranean dwelling which may affect drainage and thus the health of the trees.
35-37 Howardsgate,	Hertfords hire	E22/0080	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of new shopfront to Howardsgate Elevation with roof	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application we do not wish to

Welwyn Garden City				alterations to accommodate new ventilation equipment. Alterations to the rear Northeastern Elevation fenestration. 35-37 Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AP BUILDING ALTERATION	comment on the proposed new shopfronts etc. However, we are concerned that heaters appear to be mounted over the windows which would be contrary to the spirit of the aims of the government and local HCCSP, of which WHBC is a member.
35-37 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0082	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 1 x illuminated fascia sign, 1 x unilluminated fascia sign, 1x rojecting sign and 1x internally illuminated menu board and 1x Chalkboard 35-37 Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AP MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application we do not wish to comment on the proposed new shopfronts etc. However, we are concerned that heaters appear to be mounted over the windows which would be contrary to the spirit of the aims of the government and local HCCSP, of which WHBC is a member.
Cote Brasserie 1-3 Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0085	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 2 sets of halo illuminated fascia text and 2 externally illuminated projection signs Cote Brasserie 1-3 Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AL MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application we have no objection to the new-style of signage but are concerned about the bright blue as shown in the photographs. If this is the true colour proposed we consider that something more muted would fit better with the overall design of this important town centre junction.
Emmanuels Farm Great North Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0091	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application for a residential development of up to 20 affordable units. Access, layout and scale are for approval; landscaping and appearance are reserved matters. Emmanuels Farm Great North Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 7TA RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. We note that the area of the proposed development is part of the current Green Belt, although the 2019 LUC Stage 3 Study of The Green Belt did not consider it to make a significant contribution to any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt. It is also adjacent to Hat1, also in the Green Belt, which has been allocated for development in the emerging Local Plan. We would consider that the landscaping, and specifically provision of a dense belt of trees and shrubs of the the west side of the site, adjacent to the motorway is crucial to mitigate the effect of noise and light pollution on the proposed dwellings. We have no concerns over this site on historic designed landscape grounds.

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 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 residences (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.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.04.2022</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 Isle of Wight Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs our response.</p> <p>This major application contains a very large quantity of documentation and the relatively short consultation period gives us less time than we would like to assess fully the details of every part of the proposals. As our statutory responsibility lies with the impact upon the designed landscape the GT will primarily focus on this.</p> <p>The Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Norris Castle lies within the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is flanked to the west by The Springhill Estate (which lies outside the AONB) and to the south by the Grade II* RPG of Osborne Castle estate. This broad tranche of land, in particular Springhill and Norris Castle, represents a substantial area of virtually untouched landscape recognised for its picturesque views, especially to and from the Solent and Spithead, for at least the past 200 years. The significance of Norris Castle is heightened by its group value of castle, model farm and designed landscape, which together create an extremely fine example of Picturesque landscape style, crucially remarkably virtually unchanged since its creation c1799. Norris Castle's Grade I RPG ornamental pleasure grounds and park were most likely laid out by Humphry Repton, as a landscaped setting for a marine villa built in the form of a Gothic castle designed by James Wyatt, and a castellated model farm following the traditions of a ferme ornée. The GT has corresponded with Stephen Daniels, the Repton expert, about recent research undertaken by John Phibbs https://www.iowgardenstrust.co.uk/V2%20Repton%20on%20the%20IoW%20final%20for%20website.pdf and Mr Daniels endorses Mr Phibbs' conclusion that although no drawings by Humphry Repton relating to Norris Castle have come to light, Phibbs concludes he did work there: 'Besides the illustration in Peacock's Polite Repository, so much of what happened at Norris was recommended by Repton at Plas Newydd (1799) and Hooton (1802), where he was working at more or less the same time. It is as if he was trying to see how the same suite of ideas would play out with different buildings in quite different</p>
---------------	---------------	----------	---	--	--

			<p>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 (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>parts of the country' (Phibbs 2017e)¹ Springhill shares the elevated views of Norris Castle and the former parkland surrounding the current house is now pasture with some remaining veteran trees. It is locally listed and its significance is enhanced due to its position and proximity to Norris Castle. The cost of restoration of the landscape and numerous listed structures at Norris Castle will exceed the value of the property once restored, which is why the applicant has put forward an ambitious scheme for a large quantity of new buildings within the application site. Whilst the GT welcomes the restoration proposals, which include work on the listed buildings, walled garden, parkland, opening of vistas as well as woodland/understorey management etc, we have very serious concerns about the scale of development proposed to achieve this. For the reasons outlined below we feel that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of this extremely precious site which will irrevocably alter the character and spirit of place of both Norris Castle and Springhill. The application documents state that the Sentinel buildings form part of the structural support system to the sea wall. The restoration of the sea wall, one of the most expensive parts of the restoration proposals, is in direct conflict with the IOWC's Shoreline Management Plan. If the seawall is not restored, then the Sentinels and the restaurant complex at the Bathing House will be unviable. The sea walls are eroding not due to landslippage as suggested in the application documents, but instead we would argue, by the power of the sea. The monolithic Sentinel buildings would permanently alter what is widely considered the most famous and historic view towards the castle from the north, and we strongly oppose the construction of these and the other developments along the seashore. Appendix A, Schedule of Accommodation Development Proposals (Structural Report) by Gurney Consulting Engineers, included within the online documentation, makes it clear that (p27) 'there is little evidence of foundation movement causing damage to the load bearing external walls' (of the Castle). In order to clarify the crucial status of land stability Historic England (HE) commissioned their own report : Environmental Statement Volume 3, pp 57-62, Annex B, Historic England, Structural Engineering Team, Internal Report, 13th January 2021. HE's report recommends : 'The applicant's geotechnical engineer should consider the beneficial effect of the Bembridge Limestone formation on the stability of the castle, this appears to have been overlooked in the original report (Structural Report).</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Additional boreholes should be considered at the location which the applicant believes is vulnerable to slip as this would provide greater certainty as to the geology and the risk of the slope to instability.’ However, this is contradicted by another letter to the applicant from Wilson Bailey, Geotechnical and Environmental, dated 25th January 2020 (Environmental Statement Volume 3, Annex C, pp 63-65) in response to HE’s structural report. This contradiction appears to be centred around the nature of what Bembridge limestone is, apparently the platform upon which the Castle sits, and which gives it considerable stability. Whilst unravelling these contradictions is beyond our technical expertise, the suggestions for further boreholes would appear sensible to clarify exactly how stable the site of the Castle is. If the Castle is stable, as per HE’s conclusion ‘I do not believe that this instability extends as far as the castle due to the presence of the Bembridge Limestone Formation, which has not been considered by the applicant’s geotechnical engineer’, it follows that the applicant’s statement D&A (Section 4, p 69) ‘Apart from providing much needed accommodation, the Terrace rooms in particular allow structural stability for the Castle and the slope below the Castle’ is misleading. We would also therefore query the assertion (D&A, Sect 5, p88) that ‘The Terrace (ie. subterranean Suites) also has a structural function in resisting landslip in front of the castle which would ultimately endanger it.’ What the reports do agree on is that vegetation on the hillside is extremely beneficial for slope retention. The GT also considers that the Terrace and Crescent developments are harmful to the setting of the castle and the RPG, regardless of any stability concerns.</p> <p>For an application of such complexity and sensitivity, we would have expected to have seen examples of wire frame photo-montages taken from several crucial viewpoints, especially within the Norris Castle Estate. Without these, it is difficult to envision exactly how visible the numerous newly built structures will be within the landscape. Of paramount importance would be a wire frame photo-montage taken from the sea, as this has historically always been the set-piece view of the Castle and its surrounding parkland. With vegetation clearance (which we are told could jeopardise the stability of the slope) opening up historic views and also necessary for the construction of the Terrace, Castle Crescent, Restaurant by the Bathing House, Coastal Cottages, and their associated access roads, the newly built elements will become considerably more prominent within the landscape, negatively impacting its setting and significance. The many</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>new roads throughout both estates plus the extensive new housing within Springhill will add to this negative, permanent impact upon the application site. Other introduced buildings which will be visible upon the approach to Norris Castle along the main drive : housing in the South West Field, the modern barn residences, car parking, and housing within the Walled Garden (which will be visible over the walls), will irrevocably adversely impact upon the way the various heritage assets are experienced within their setting.</p> <p>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). This advice states (p2) that ‘buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each’. Also pertinent in this unaltered Grade I RPG : (p2) ‘A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it’ and lastly (p2) ‘When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.’ All are relevant at Norris Castle.</p> <p>When the estate at Springhill is included in the application SHA (p5) states that ‘While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site’s visual boundary.’</p> <p>Taking into account all the above excerpts from SHA it is clear that the proposed development in both Norris Castle and Springhill estates will be extremely harmful to the setting of the designated and non-designated heritage assets. This is amplified on p11, which deals with the Experience of the Asset, which will be hugely altered by the proposals set out in the application : Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset; Noise, vibration and other nuisances; Tranquility, remoteness, ‘wildness’; Busyness, bustle, movement and activity; Sense of enclosure, seclusion,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>intimacy or privacy. During the long construction period the current tranquility will be lost and subsequently, the additional qualities of remoteness, seclusion and privacy will also vanish forever.</p> <p>We also have great concerns about the lighting which will be introduced into the hitherto dark landscape at night. Even if the structures comply with Dark Sky lighting requirements, the numerous new residential dwellings and 'resort' buildings, most subdivided into units/suites, cannot help but drastically increase night-time light emittance. The housing proposed in the outline Springhill proposals as well as lights from residents' cars will add to this light pollution and should the scheme for whatever reason prove financially unviable, the inevitable request for additional development elsewhere within the application site, will add to the loss of darkness over this large area.</p> <p>We also have concerns with regard to public access. The Norris Castle developments are in essence a private gated community which will be inaccessible to the general public. Within Springhill a few hectares have been allocated as publicly accessible, but this a very small proportion of the entire application site. We therefore feel that the scheme provides insufficient public benefit.</p> <p>The applicant is at pains to stress that the extensive new build is not enabling development. We struggle to accept this argument. The NPPF, para 208 states : 'Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.' It would be extremely unlikely that the land at Springhill would ever be given planning consent if it were not as enabling development for the proposals at Norris Castle.</p> <p>In our opinion, the proposals fail to comply with the NPPF para 189 as the development within Norris Castle estate will so change the character of the RPG that future generations will no longer be able to appreciate its contribution to the quality of life as originally designed. We consider that the development fails 190c & 190d of the NPPF as it does not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and changes that environment and the character of place forever. Paras 199 and 200 are also applicable in this case.</p> <p>Cumulative harm is of particular influence within this application. The weight given to the harm is particularly high given the significance of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>historic assets affected as an ensemble. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance as a whole rather than the scale of the individual areas of development that we feel should be considered. The sum total of all these individual works add up to cause substantial harm to the assets and their setting.</p> <p>In conclusion, the proposed development will be transformative, with the numerous new buildings damaging the setting and significance of a large and varied group of highly important designated and undesignated heritage assets, particularly their landscape frame. The Gardens Trust objects very strongly to this application and whilst the restoration aims of the applicant are laudable, the quantity of new building required to finance this represents an overdevelopment of the unaltered historic application site as a whole, and as such is not the Optimum Viable Use for the application site. A solution for the problems at Norris Castle is something we all desire, but unfortunately, in our opinion, the current proposals are not the answer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust (IWGT) with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens and a locally listed site as set out in the above application.</p> <p>Summary of Our Submission</p> <p>This application will lead to 'major interventions taking place across the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) which we believe will cause long-term, irreversible substantial harm. Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Para. 200 such a level of harm to a Grade 1 RPG 'should be wholly exceptional'. Furthermore, the development does not fulfil the 4 requirements of NPPF 201 meaning that 'local planning authorities should refuse consent'.</p> <p>This proposal does not demonstrate why it fulfils the 'exceptional' requirement for development within an AONB due to the likely substantial harm it will cause, severely outweighing the benefits to the heritage assets and/or landscape.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed conservation and management of landscape</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>and other features within the site but are concerned that the current proposals for Springhill are outline only, leading to the possibility of an application for additional development.</p> <p>The Role of the Isle of Wight Gardens Trust</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The IWGT is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>As the registered park and garden at Norris Castle is of exceptional importance, being Grade I, the Gardens Trust have submitted their own independent comment on this occasion.</p> <p>Whilst the primary focus of IWGT is the RPG and the locally listed site, we will also comment on the important assemblage of heritage assets which contribute to the character and significance of these sites.</p> <p>We have arranged our response under the following headings: 'Relevant Planning Policy; 'Significance'; 'Impacts'; 'Conclusions and IWGT Position'.</p> <p>Relevant Planning Policy</p> <p>National and local planning policies have informed our assessment of the proposed development and are fully referenced in Appendix 1. NPPF 80,177, 189, 199, 200-204 and 209 are particularly applicable to the application.</p> <p>The Island Plan 2012 provides the local planning framework for the Isle of Wight. Policies SP5, DM11 and DM12 are relevant to our consideration of this application.</p> <p>The Isle of Wight AONB Management Plan is also relevant to this application</p> <p>Significance</p> <p>This planning application encompasses the Grade I RPG of Norris Castle and the locally listed Springhill estate.</p> <p>The RPG at Norris Castle is within the Isle of Wight AONB and its Osborne Coast Landscape Character Area. As such, it is a major contributor to the special characteristics of this nationally important landscape along with the neighbouring sites of Osborne House (Grade II* RPG) and Barton Manor (locally listed parkland).</p> <p>We would like to emphasise the significance of the landscapes at both Norris and Springhill.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>These are outlined in turn.</p> <p>Norris Castle</p> <p>The description in the National Heritage List for England states that Norris Castle, a landscaped park and pleasure grounds laid out from c1799, is registered at Grade I for the following principal reasons (underlining has been added for additional emphasis):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Rarity: as an exemplar of a Regency marine villa estate; · Architecture: as the contemporary landscaped setting for an architectural ensemble of outstanding significance, including a Gothic Revival castle, castellated model farm and lodge by one of England’s most notable architects, James Wyatt; · Authenticity: as a well-preserved, essentially single-phase, designed landscape; · Degree of survival: the overall layout remains largely in its entirety and there have been few changes or alterations; · Designer: Humphry Repton, one of England’s greatest late C18 and early C19 landscape designers, is likely to have been involved in the design of the landscaped park; · Walled garden: as one of the grandest examples of a late C18 castellated walled garden in England; · Vistas and external views: for the manner in which the landscape appropriates the natural topography, and for the controlled views along the approaches, as well as the commanding view of the Castle, in its setting, from the sea; · Historic interest: as a landscape laid out according to picturesque principles, which also encapsulates late C18 agricultural improvements during the Napoleonic Wars; · Historic association: as an estate closely linked to the C19 royal family in which The Prince Regent, Queen Victoria, Kaiser Wilhelm and the King of the Netherlands visited; · Group value: with the Grade I-listed house and model farm, Grade II-listed lodge, Pump House, Bathing House, sea wall (a 50m length), two cattle shelters and four stone-lined ponds, as well as the adjacent Grade II* registered park and Grade I-listed house at Osborne. <p>There are around 1,600 Registered Parks and Gardens in England, with only 9% considered to be of exceptional interest and classified as Grade I. Norris is the only Grade I listed RPG on the Isle of Wight. It is one of just a few examples of well-preserved designed landscapes associated with Regency</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>era marine villas. The Isle of Wight formerly possessed a number of important marine villa landscapes but all except Norris have been lost or subject to change as documented by IWGT in the 'Isle of Wight Designed Landscape HEAP' Projects (iowgardenstrust.co.uk). The survival of Norris Castle and its designed landscape is all the more remarkable and significant in view of the loss of John Nash's East Cowes Castle in 1963, described by Lloyd and Pevsner as 'the most serious architectural loss suffered on the Island in the last hundred years'.¹</p> <p>Particularly significant components of the marine villa landscape at Norris Castle are the dramatic views of the house and landscape from the sea. The strong possibility that the noted landscape designer Humphry Repton was associated with the development of the Norris Estate has been explored by IWGT in our publication 'Humphry Repton on the Isle of Wight' https://www.iowgardenstrust.co.uk/V2%20Repton%20on%20the%20IoW%20final%20for%20website.pdf. One highly unusual feature of Norris Castle is the way in which a picturesque designed landscape is combined with a model farm, reflecting the interests of the original owner, Lord Henry Seymour. Although many landowners of this period were interested in agriculture it was more usual for functional features of the estate such as the farm buildings or the walled kitchen garden to be built out of sight of the ornamental parkland and pleasure grounds. At Norris, the castellated model farm and attached walled kitchen garden were a feature of the ornamental grounds with a design mirroring that of the main house. The complex is listed Grade I. Historic England's List Entry (2016) states that it is probably the grandest example of the open court layout generally adopted for model farms by the 1790s and that the incorporation of a walled garden within the design of the model farm is highly unusual.</p> <p>Springhill (locally listed)</p> <p>The IWGT has identified key areas of significance at Springhill as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Situated in elevated position. Norris Castle to East. Views over Cowes Harbour and Solent beyond. Significant views into the Springhill estate from West Cowes, particularly from The Parade and from the Royal Yacht Squadron but also from other more elevated positions. · Estate developed from 1794 with an area of parkland marked on early 20th century Ordnance Survey maps. · The former parkland and surrounding fields are now pasture with some mature oaks. Woodland adjoining Solent shore was part of Springhill estate. Lawns to West and North of house are terraced above surrounding
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>parkland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Individual trees in open ground. Clumps. Wooded area surrounding house. · Site of long, narrow kitchen garden and orchard abutting Norris Castle, the east boundary of the kitchen garden being formed by the 2.5 high boundary wall of the Norris Castle estate. <p>IWGT researched the Springhill Estate in 2018 and prepared a detailed description for our inventory of Isle of Wight designed landscapes before submitting an application to HE for its inclusion to the National Register of Parks and Gardens. Although HE declined to add Springhill to the Register, its inclusion on the Local Heritage List identifies it as a locally significant site which contributes to the historic environment of East Cowes and also to that of West Cowes (through views into Springhill). The aesthetic interest of the Springhill landscape is of group value because of its juxtaposition to Norris Castle which in turn lies to the east of Osborne (Grade II* RPG) and Barton Manor (locally listed parkland). The four estates make up a block of undeveloped parkland close to the Solent coast, all except Springhill being within the Isle of Wight AONB. The Norris Castle and Springhill estates were both carved out from pre-existing agricultural holdings in the 1790s. The landscape at Springhill may have been similar to that of Norris Castle in combining ornamental qualities with an emphasis on cattle farming.²</p> <p>The Assessment of Significance (RPS Heritage) states that ‘there is little evidence on historic mapping of any deliberate design interventions or planned changes’ at Springhill’ and ‘that the landscape worked within the existing field boundaries and planting to create a modest seaside estate and farm’. It is certainly true that the landscape worked within the existing field boundaries, as did many modest parklands on the Island but the 2018 IWGT report comments that ‘although the trees and hedgerows are probably not part of a conscious design they provide the house with a parkland setting in a very English tradition’. The RPS Assessment of Significance acknowledges that ‘existing mature oaks were ... incorporated into the landscape, with many of them still surviving today’. We cannot agree with the RPS statement that Springhill ‘presents a poor contrast to the carefully considered Norris Castle Estate to the east and the more formal grounds of Osborne further east’. We would argue that the three estates complement each other whilst fully accepting that Springhill is of much lesser heritage significance than Norris Castle and Osborne.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>However, we do not accept that the Springhill parkland is of 'Low Significance' as indicated in the Heritage Impact Assessment (Figure 50). There are a few points of historical detail in the various assessment documents which we would dispute although these do not affect the objectives of the planning application.³</p> <p>Impacts</p> <p>This major application will cause wholesale changes to both the RPG at Norris and the locally listed park at Springhill as illustrated within the numerous drawings and supporting documentation. Some of these changes contribute positively but others, we believe, will adversely affect specific parts of the respective estates as well as their collective value. These changes are explored further below.</p> <p>We applaud the level of research that has been undertaken by the various consultants as presented within the application documents which recognise the historical significance of the parkland at Norris. The 'Assessment of Significance' report rightly identifies the majority of the Norris RPG as either of Very High Significance or High Significance. We very much welcome the aspiration to restore the parkland at Norris and at Springhill, in keeping with their separate, intrinsic characters, by managing existing landscape features, removing naturally colonised vegetation, carrying out extensive replanting, and introducing long-term management regimes. The 'Heritage Landscape and Ecology Management Plan' (HLEMP) recognises the importance of the unique landscape at Norris Castle and provides details on the management, restoration and enhancement of existing and proposed hedgerows, woodland and trees, grassland areas, ponds, carriage ways and stone walls. The Heritage Impact Assessment (4.6) provides for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of the historic farm buildings and kitchen garden within Springhill and the ongoing management of the landscape features, including the mature oak trees and hedgerows within the site as shown on the Springhill Landscape Restoration Plan and the DAS.</p> <p>We welcome the removal of vegetation, where illustrated on the Landscape Restoration Plans (RE1654-Z1-P-L107 and RE1654-Z2-P-L107), to open up and re-establish important vistas throughout the Norris Castle parkland. Whilst one never likes to see trees and vegetation being cleared, grand gestures such as these are important to ensure the Repton-designed parkland does not lose its integrity and become too naturalised (similar tree clearance work was carried out successfully at Osborne House to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>reopen views to the sea).</p> <p>We welcome the plans to restore the Norris Castle walled garden with productive fruit, herbs, vegetables and fruit trees laid out on a formal grid, with axial views to the gates. The aspiration of restoring the pleasure gardens is also supported (albeit we are unconvinced by the overly ornamental nature of the design which is not period-appropriate or in keeping with what is known of 19th century planting in this area, as previously raised by us with the design team).</p> <p>As noted within our holding response letter to IWC dated 14 March 2022 requesting additional information, we believe the planning application is missing key information, and the material provided in respect of the landscape proposals is often vague and non-committal. Given the exceptional value and importance of the landscape, particularly at Norris, we are surprised that the application was validated. The application uses imprecise language, such as ‘concept’, ‘illustrative’, ‘to be developed further’ and ‘indicative’ which we do not feel is appropriate for proposals involving a nationally important landscape. Drawings and reports relevant to the landscape changes, referenced elsewhere within the submitted application documents, are missing (e.g. the Lighting Strategy Briefing Note and the Sequencing Plan). There is no information about proposed planting species or the sizes at which trees and other vegetation is planted. There are no external lighting proposals, nor do any of the submitted plans include external levels or an indication of how proposed buildings integrate into the existing topography (particularly relevant when many of the buildings are sunk into it – a point which is explored further below). Also as noted within our letter, we are disappointed that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) does not include any photomontages and the presented viewpoint locations within Norris offer poor coverage (there are no views in the vicinity of Model Farm and Walled Garden, the Castle itself, or within West Field). The LVIA does not use the current guidance published by the Landscape Institute (TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Table 1 at 3.5.6) which states that applications which form part of an EIA should provide photography which conforms to 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’. Furthermore, the LVIA gives no consideration to night-time views and the effect of lighting changes upon any of the identified</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>landscape or visual receptors.</p> <p>We believe that the proposals are contrary to NPPF 80 and we are unconvinced about what is being presented as the only 'Optimum Viable Use' (OVU) and the subsequent burden this then places on the parkland at Norris and Springhill. By pursuing the desire to create a high-end resort complex, staggering sums of money (£107.29m if we understand correctly, according to the Viability Assessment) are required to achieve the quality and level that would be expected of a 5* resort. Extravagant facilities such as a sub-terranean swimming pool and an underground spa come at a price. The Terrace, Crescent and Lodges also pursue expensive construction approaches of all being built into the ground, in their attempt to reduce the impact on the RPG and setting of the listed buildings. However, this extravagant desire to provide 'luxury' generates an even greater financial deficit, which can only be overcome by building more and more lodges, hotel suites, and private dwellings within the RPG at Norris and locally listed landscape at Springhill. Furthermore, there is also a significant risk that inflationary trends lead to a project that ends up costing more and/or loan repayments are unsustainable, generating an even larger financial deficit, resulting in more and more development being required within the parkland at either Norris or Springhill to compensate. Additional development is likely to end up at Springhill, given it has no statutory protection. At Springhill proposals have only been submitted in Outline, areas of the estate have been excluded from the application boundary, and the submitted Parameters Plan does not appear to protect the areas of remaining parkland (these are shown as void spaces).</p> <p>Contrary to what has been put forward, we do not believe this is the only viable use for Norris and Springhill and we would prefer to see a proposal which carries less financial burden and risk. We are aware that there were 15 other prospective buyers for Norris Castle, who undoubtedly had a different vision from what is being presented here, and a vision which one would hope would be less harmful. It should also be noted that there are also examples of acceptable sensitive enabling development projects within RPG's (such as at Tottenham Park).</p> <p>The application's evaluation of OVU contributes to the judgement in the Heritage Impact Assessment (4.5) that 'The Proposal, when taken cumulatively, will represent a moderate-high degree of less than substantial harm to the significance of the Norris Castle registered park and garden'. We challenge this statement and maintain that the development</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>in its current form will result in an overall loss of significance to the RPG and constitute substantial harm.</p> <p>We are concerned about the impact of topographical changes and how the proposed buildings, roads, SUDS water bodies (swales and balancing ponds), and other structures integrate into the landscape. This is particularly relevant when many of the proposed buildings, particularly at Norris (The Terrace, Crescent, Lodges) are sunk into the hillside and roads will be needed to access them. We believe little consideration has been given in this regard. For example, a bund is shown on the cross sections and illustrations located in front of the Terrace, but this is not shown elsewhere (in reality, we cannot see a bund being desirable as it would obscure the all-important views to the coast). Indeed, the Terrace plan (drawing RE 1654-Z1-P-A147) somehow seems to show the hotel rooms joining existing contours with no consideration of how this might actually integrate into the existing/proposed terrain. In addition, the road which provides access to the Lodges and Coastal Cottages meanders up the slope when in reality wholesale cutting and filling will be required on each hairpin bend, which will further damage the integrity of the landscape and may have a wider impact upon important trees and woodland areas. Furthermore, we are concerned about the sheer quantity of spoil that will be generated by the many proposed subterranean buildings and SUDS engineering, which will be potentially spread or deposited within the RPG, potentially adversely altering the natural and designed parkland topography. The LVIA references a 'Sequencing Plan' and that spoil will be used to reclaim the coast behind the restored seawall but there is no evidence of the Sequencing Plan or that any cut and fill quantification has been undertaken.</p> <p>We find it very disappointing that public access is restricted and there is limited public benefit (NPPF 201 and 202) in what will essentially be a private, gated, exclusive estate. The Planning Statement at 4.71 refers to the provision of a small 2-4ha public amenity space within Springhill (Norris and Springhill cover around 80ha) but there are no further details of this and it is not protected within the Parameters Plan. The planning statement also suggests that 'event days' will be set up to allow occasional, controlled access but how can this be enforced? We are also disappointed that there is no intention of providing any public rights of way, which would have provided an opportunity for the public to experience at least part of the parkland at Norris and Springhill.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We are concerned about the introduction of a great number of new buildings along the coastal edge (namely the monolithic Sentinels, modern Restaurant, Coastal Cottages, numerous Lodges, and extensive Terrace and Crescent) which together, we believe, will have a substantial adverse effect on coastal views, and the setting of the Castle itself. We also remain unconvinced about the requirement to reinstate the sea wall along its full length, at a considerable cost, which will need to be financed by the construction of the Sentinels and other new buildings, when a cheaper gabion/rock wall solution could offer a more sustainable solution. This is an undeveloped, wooded coastline dominated by the Castle sitting proudly on its own, and new buildings here will dramatically change this. Whilst we support the proposed removal of woodland to open up views, this will increase the visibility of the Terrace and Crescent located immediately below the Castle, which is not considered within the LVIA. Indeed, the LVIA somehow suggests that the significance of effect for V5 (looking south towards the Castle from the Solent) would revert from minor adverse at year 1 (which we believe has been underscored) to moderate beneficial 'once the restored landscape has matured' (6.7.15), even though woodland areas are being cleared? We believe the significance of effect from these coastal locations has been deliberately underplayed and should be moderate / substantial adverse which would be considered 'significant' in EIA terms. As noted earlier, there are no photomontages to prove/disprove this.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the wholesale conversion and remodelling changes to the Model Farm itself, we are particularly concerned about the impact of the 13no. new buildings located within the confines of the Walled Garden, which is deemed to have a very high significance (Assessment of Significance). The justification of these being required for structural reasons appears unwarranted. The 'Viability Assessment – Appendix E' at 4.0 states that 'where the centre of gravity of the wall lies outside the middle third of its base section', there is 'no alternative other than to rebuild these sections' as they are 'unstable and cannot be remedied'. This being the case, as demonstrated by the Gurney Consulting Engineers accompanying survey sections and elevations, significant areas of the wall will need to be rebuilt and cannot be saved by structural additions, whether this is a buttress or new buildings. These drawings also illustrate that sections of the wall are not leaning, suggesting that parts of the wall do not require</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>structural additions. On this basis, we estimate that the remaining leaning parts of the wall which do require some form of structural support are limited, and at most would require approximately 11no. buttresses in total (at the suggested 7.5m spacing) and not the 44no. as argued. Clearly, 11no. sympathetically designed and constructed buttresses, whilst far from ideal, would be a far less imposing than 13no. 2-storey buildings, considering that buttresses are often part and parcel of historic walled gardens. This is at odds with the 'Heritage Impact Assessment', which states at 4.4.4 'The works are also considered to be less invasive and more sensitive than the provision of a series of large, traditional buttresses'. We are also concerned about the height of these 13no. buildings. Whilst no dimensions are shown on cross-sections, one can assume that the proposed buildings would be circa 7.5m in height, which would exceed the actual height of the grade I listed crenelated walls. The Gurney Consulting Engineers survey sections at Appendix E of the Viability Assessment show the height of the SW and NE walls to be between 5-7m, and the SE wall to be between 4.2-4.8m in height. Clearly this is unacceptable, for the proposed buildings would not only obscure the crenelated wall but they would be visible from outside of the Walled Garden, within the wider park. We are also concerned about the changes of level within the Walled Garden as a result of the partially submerged Spa, which raises a platform level and thereby further changes the character of this unique space.</p> <p>We are concerned about the introduction of the Terrace and Crescent buildings (and the car parking area), within the immediate context of the Castle, which will dramatically alter the character and setting of the Castle and views within the RPG. The justification for the 'Terrace' in performing a structural role in supporting the Castle is questionable, given that the Structural Survey within the Viability Appraisal Appendix C states, 'There is little evidence of foundation movement causing damage to the load-bearing external walls' and we understand that the Castle itself is built on geologically sound Limestone.</p> <p>We accept that any form of development change at Norris and Springhill would result in an increase in external lighting within parkland, which is currently not illuminated and essentially dark. However, the sheer amount of development, spread over a wide area and connected by a number of estate roads will result, in our view, to an unacceptable level of change to the parkland character, the Isle of Wight Dark Skies, and the Isle of Wight AONB. Many of the proposed buildings will be faced with large glass</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>windows, will be orientated towards the coast and will be highly visible from West Cowes and the Solent (night time views are not considered within the LVIA). The planning application fails to provide external lighting proposals, but it is reasonable to expect that estate roads and paths will be lined with 100s of light fittings, and many new external lights will be required to building entrances and external terrace/communal spaces. We are also concerned about the highway impacts on the parkland at Norris and Springhill. New roads, designed to meet highway standards required of emergency and refuse vehicles (wide roads or with frequent passing places and vehicle turning areas), will carve through the landscape, and will not only be highly visible but will cause undue harm to the intrinsic landscape character of the RPG and locally listed park. The Planning Statement at 4.7 suggests that the access road will be obscured by additional tree planting but this is not the case (see Springhill Landscape Restoration Plan RE1654-Z2-P-L107), since the IWGT agreed with the designers that tree planting lining the road is not appropriate as this would further degrade the open parkland character of the Springhill Estate. Furthermore, as a direct consequence of the scale of the proposed development, new extensive car parks and other parking areas adjacent to properties will also have a detrimental effect of the RPG and locally listed parkland.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (4.6) acknowledges that residential development, with associated infrastructure, and a new car park 'will change the character of the Springhill Estate as a historically simple, agricultural landscape'. It concludes that the proposal 'would therefore represent a moderate degree of harm to the Springhill Estate as a non-designated heritage asset'.</p> <p>Conclusions and IWGT Position</p> <p>To secure the future of the heritage assets and overcome any conservation deficit, we accept that an appropriate level of enabling development may need to take place within the RPG at Norris and locally listed landscape at Springhill. However, we strongly believe that the pursuit of creating a 5* luxury resort is inappropriate and not the 'Optimum Viable Use' (OVU) (contrary to NPPF 80 and 197), nor does it equate to the minimum necessary development but results in a considerable level of overdevelopment and harm. We believe the application has underplayed the negative effects upon this historic landscape, and in our opinion, it is not possible to suggest that the damage is mitigated by saving and/or</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>restoring parts of it. The conservation and restoration of the heritage assets should not come at the cost of irreparable damage to the RPG and locally listed park. Overall, we believe that the collective consequences of all the urbanising development changes as described above (extensive number of new buildings, roads, SUDS, lighting, level changes, and parking) would lead to a substantial harm to the RPG as a whole and the considerable group value of the listed buildings and structures within Norris estate. Separately, we believe the development would also lead to substantial harm to Springhill Estate, where much of the parkland will be lost to development (although, clearly it is not as significant as Norris). For the reasons outlined here, we do not agree with the Planning Statement at 7.27 which states 'Taken together, these changes represent a major intervention within the RPG, resulting in a moderate degree of less than substantial harm'. The 'major interventions' taking place across the RPG would, in our opinion, certainly lead to long-term, irreversible substantial harm, which under the NPPF 200 'should be wholly exceptional'. Furthermore, the development does not fulfil the 4 requirements of NPPF 201 meaning that 'local planning authorities should refuse consent'. Finally, this proposal does not demonstrate that it fulfils the 'exceptional' requirement for development within an AONB due to the likely substantial harm it will cause, severely outweighing the benefits to the heritage assets and/or landscape.</p> <p>We believe that doing nothing (if it means waiting for a more suitable alternative 'viable use') is actually a better option than the proposal put forward here. Under such circumstances, we accept that buildings and structures may continue to degrade⁴ but given the robustness of mature parkland, the landscape will remain reasonably intact for many years and can be readily restored.</p> <p>To conclude, we strongly object to this planning application for the reasons outlined above and recommend that consent is refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Dr V Basford Conservation and Research Lead</p>
Waldershare Park	Kent	E22/0063	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a two storey detached garage/office with external stairs to first floor (existing garage to be demolished)</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.04.2022 The Gardens Trust has been in extended communication with your colleague Vic Hester since September 2021 regarding a different application relating to Waldershare. We are therefore very surprised that Dover Council failed to consult us back in February 2022 when this</p>

				<p>Vyne House , Lordsvale Court, Kennel Hill, Waldershare BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>application, which has now been revised, was first submitted. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The site of the proposed garage appears to be on the boundary of the Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden of Waldershare Park and this part of the Park is known Malmains Wood, understood to be designated as Ancient Woodland.</p> <p>Vyne House is one of three attached dwellings, each dwelling having single storey timber garages to the north of each property along the site boundary with Malmains Wood. Vyne House has two connecting garages with a workshop to the rear and it is proposed that it is replaced by a significantly larger two storey double garage and carport with workshop and boot room to the rear, with an office, toilet and store at first floor level.</p> <p>Due to the applications sensitive positioning within the setting of the Grade II RPG, we would have expected the application to include a Heritage Statement and a design and access report. We consider that the applicant has not met the criteria set out within the NPPF Para 194 as there has been no attempt to 'describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.'</p> <p>If the council is mindful to grant permission for a replacement garage then it is considered that this proposal will have a detrimental impact on the adjacent ancient woodland unless Natural England's standing advice on mitigation measures for ancient woodlands are followed. The most appropriate mitigation measure for this application would be to allow for a buffer zone 15metres wide from the edge of the woods to avoid root damage and to allow for the effect of pollution from the construction of the new garage. A dustproof fence would be necessary to be maintained throughout the construction period.</p> <p>This large structure will adversely affect the setting of the Registered Park and Garden at this location and is out of character with the adjacent garages of the other two properties. The GT/KGT object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Castle Ashby	Northamptonshire	E21/1844	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of barn as eatery associated with cold water</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by</p>

				<p>swimming together with new access off Parkhill Road and associated car park and paths. Little Park Barn Park Hill Road Castle Ashby CHANGE OF USE</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.</p> <p>Castle Ashby is a landscape much valued by NGT members, over many years it has been utilised on numerous occasions to further the educational aims of the NGT. Unfortunately, the NGT has not been able to access Castle Ashby Park to inspect the impact of this proposal. We have consulted the online documentation along with other relevant digital data in the public domain (particularly HE List Entries), as well as research material held by NGT. A member of NGT has also inspected the site of the entrance into the proposed car park from the public highway.</p> <p>Castle Ashby is a Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) comprising formal gardens, probably by W B Thomas, with lavish use of terracotta work of 1862 (Grade II* Listed) adjoining a country house (Grade I Listed). These are set within a wider formal landscape, the park substantially improved by Lancelot Brown in the 1760s. The principal scenic vistas from the garden are eastward, the ground falling fairly gently to a chain of ponds within the valley. A circuit walk/ride with views was established in the mid 18th century, taking in on the east, the Temple Menagerie, which screened a menagerie behind (Grade II* Listed) and presumably the Knucklebone Arbour (Grade II Listed). The main landscape parkland is permanent pasture with a high density of mature parkland trees. Underlying the pasture are extensive areas of earlier ridge and furrow cultivation, notably north of the north terrace and along the ground rising east of Warren and Park ponds. A 1760 survey records the formality of the designed landscape prior to submission of new designs by Robert Adam and Capability Brown, also in 1760. Brown was contracted in 1761 and work began remodelling the park to the east of the house in particular, including softening of the Eastern Avenue with more planting around the refashioned Menagerie and Park Ponds and an eastern tree belt with walk/circuit carriage ride through it. A new entrance into the park was also created between The Menagerie and Park Hill Farm.</p> <p>It is principally the remodelling of the parkland during the Georgian period which is of most interest in assessing the impact of the development proposal WNS/2022/0072/FUL.</p> <p>The GT/NGT are pleased to note that the future of Little Park Barn is to be sensitively secured by its conversion to a cold-water swimming facility and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>eatery. We have no objection to this aspect of the application and commend the creative reuse of this attractive building and also the opportunity it presents to appreciate the parkland from a different perspective.</p> <p>However, the GT/NGT do have concerns about the siting of the proposed car park which utilises a linear clearing cut through the eastern parkland belt; there is little or no consideration of the value of this clearing as a heritage asset of the park within this application. Early edition Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping records this feature as existing from at least the 1810s and shows that if a straight line is drawn from Castle Ashby House to Easton Maudit church the line passes along this clearing. Furthermore, 19th century OS maps suggest that an east-west running linear space was left (or created) between the scattered planting of trees within the parkland to the west of Park Pond.</p> <p>As a response to our original comments the recent addendum to the original Heritage statement makes reference to the possibility that the clearing forming the sight line to Easton Maudit church may be a late 19th century creation, and therefore not part of the Georgian landscape improvements. This is presumably based on the image from a late 19th century OS map which was attached to our original response. However, there are earlier maps which show the clearing through the trees, in particular the original OS surveyors' drawings held by The British Library; we have now established that this is available to view via their website (a screenshot of which is attached below for your further information). This survey is dated to 1815 which clearly places the creation of the sight line within the Georgian period at latest and our original statement as below still stands.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that a sight line was probably created between Castle Ashby House and Easton Maudit church. This may have been created as part of Brown's work in the 1760s to create a view beyond the park (effectively using the church steeple as an eye catcher) and/or possibly to be viewed in both directions from Brown's circuit walk/drive, taking in both house and distant church steeple. But it is also possible that the view was created to symbolise the 1801 acquisition of Easton Maudit lands, a visual statement to accompany the removal of the gate piers from Easton Maudit for a new eastern entrance (with lodge) to the park c.120m to the south.</p> <p>It is uncertain whether a view from Castle Ashby House to Easton Maudit</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>church is viable now. Tree planting within the park during the 19th and 20th century may have obscured the view (as has happened with views across to Menagerie Temple), and there appears to have been unchecked growth of vegetation within, and certainly at the east end of the clearing cut through the eastern tree belt. However, the probable sight line would comprise a significant element of the history of this Grade I Registered landscape and as such retaining the integrity of the clearing through the woodland belt is desirable; it may even be feasible to reinstate the view. To this end GT/NGT recommend that further assessment of the probable “lost” view is carried out as part of the heritage statement to establish its credibility and also the impact that siting a car park here would have on the vista; alternative and less sensitive siting of the proposed car park might be considered.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Blagdon	Northumberland	E22/0031	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application South Lodge Clump	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Blagdon, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust who have been advised by Zoltan Varju to contact you direct regarding some comments which are included in the consultation documents.</p> <p>We stress that neither of our organisations has concerns about the thinning of Beech and Sycamore currently proposed in South Clump but are concerned about the longer term future of this compartment if no regeneration is permitted due to cattle-grazing. The Register entry for Blagdon indicates that the parkland was probably laid out during the rebuilding of the Hall circa 1700-10 but may have been relandscaped in the mid-18thC. Unfortunately the only mapping we have access to is the First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1858 where South Clump is clearly recorded as an area of mixed deciduous/coniferous/shrub planting but by that date is an established feature of the historic landscape and as such, future long-term management should ensure it’s retention. We would hope that if/when it becomes necessary to fell this compartment the usual re-stocking conditions for clear-felling will be applied. As natural regeneration appears to be impossible under the current grazing regime this will</p>

					<p>inevitably involve fencing and replanting. We confirm we have no further comments to add. With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Museum Gardens, York	North Yorkshire	E21/2189	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to form a 12 hole mini golf course for a period of 7 years Central Library Gardens Museum Street York CHANGE OF USE, SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Museum Gardens, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens 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. The Museum Gardens were laid out by Sir John Murray Naesmyth for the Yorkshire Philosophical Society in 1844. They were designed as pleasure grounds to provide a setting for the Yorkshire Museum (listed grade I) and the many ancient monuments in its vicinity and to incorporate botanical gardens. The Central Library Gardens or Library Lawn is an area between the grade II listed Central Library building and a section of the north-eastern boundary of Museum Gardens. It is therefore within the setting of Museum Gardens but also within the setting of several other designated heritage assets including the City Walls Scheduled Monument, the grade I listed Multangular Tower and remains of St Leonard's Hospital. The 12- hole mini golf course to a heritage themed design based on York's history is proposed for the Library Lawn. The layout would include kerbed paths of concrete with imprinted shapes and surfaces, rubber mulch and resin flexipave to represent differing styles of paving for the respective periods of the holes and a permeable grass-coloured 'carpet' putting surface. The various historic periods would have appropriate models of buildings and other features, made from 'art concrete' modelled and coloured to resemble natural materials, up to c.900mm in height. Information plinths containing brief historical facts relevant to the respective periods are also proposed with some low- level planting and an accessible path of in-situ cast concrete slabs. The application proposes a seven- year period (six years of use and additional time for construction and removal), then a return to the present state but with the concrete path retained. We understand from the City Archaeologist and Historic England that the</p>

					<p>construction of the mini golf course will not affect any archaeology due to previous excavations and by the creation of an air raid shelter in this location.</p> <p>As a family activity for visitors and residents we can appreciate that a history of York in a mini golf course could be a good deal of fun, however, we feel that the proposed location is far too sensitive for such a proposal; totally the wrong place.</p> <p>The Central Library Lawn is a secluded green space adjacent to the much more-busy Museum Gardens. It is a valued space from which to view and appreciate the Roman Walls and their full evolutionary history as the city walls from Roman to Medieval, the interior of the Multangular Tower and the remains of St Leonard's Hospital, and therefore it also contributes positively to the setting of these buildings and structures. The introduction of a mini golf course will detract from the heritage assets and their setting and introduce a visually and audially distracting environment.</p> <p>The proposed development would affect the aesthetic and communal heritage values of the site. It would not affect evidential or historical heritage values. We are concerned that the application is proposed to be temporary, but the timescale is for seven years, and such commercial development may continue for longer once established. This could lead to a change in the aesthetic and communal characters of the site so that future decisions would be based on the character of the site as it then was, not on its current character. We think that the use of part of St Leonard's Hospital as a ticket office/equipment storage demotes the heritage and adds to our concerns over the appropriateness of this location for a mini-golf course. We have not seen any information about the signage for this attraction which because of the location and the heritage assets would need careful consideration.</p> <p>We agree with your Authority's Landscape Architect that the 'seclusion provides a tranquil lawn, hidden from Museum Street and Museum Gardens; somewhere to rest, meet, take in the sounds of nature. The library garden is a simple open space from which views of the surrounding buildings and structures can be appreciated, in relative stillness, from any location of choice within the garden.' As she writes 'there is scope to enhance the amenity and quality of the garden experience with simple measures such as mixed border planting and seating in front of the library...'</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust is not convinced that the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>proposed change of use of the Central Library Lawn complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2021 paragraphs 199 and 200, and also paragraph 202, where the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset(s) is outweighed, in our opinion, by any public benefits of the proposal. We suggest that other locations are explored in less historically sensitive areas.</p> <p>For the reasons explained above the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust objects to this change of use proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Newburgh Priory	North Yorkshire	E22/0001	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Roman Plantation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2022</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 Newburgh Priory, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This consultation follows 012/3494/2021 - Newburgh House Farm, to which we responded on 2nd November 2021.</p> <p>012/817/2022 – Silvicultural thinning of the crop to favour the better stems. This is for compartments, 13j, 13l, 13m, part of the Roman Plantation (Mount Woods) within the registered boundary and involves thinning of downy birch, pedunculate oak in 13j; European larch and Scots pine in 13 l; hybrid larch in 13m. We have no objection to this proposal.</p> <p>012/865/2022 – timber volume shortage from the management plan application.</p> <p>17b, Clear fell. Ash dieback. Restock with Q robur and Q petraea, Prunus avium. Note mixed broadleaves.</p> <p>Compartment 17b is part of Crow Wood which is in the sightline from Newburgh Priory – it is part of the pleasure grounds to the east of the Hall, with the two historic vistas cut through. Compartment 17b is located in the angle between the two vistas and is potentially more sensitive.</p> <p>Our thanks to Chris Curry of Forestry Agents Hewetson and Johnson for responding to our queries so promptly:</p> <p>We understand that the replanting will be predominately Q. robur, which</p>

					<p>grows very well at Newburgh. (The condition for robur/petrea is a quirk of the Felling Licence Online multiple-choice dropdown options.) The P. avium will be interspersed evenly in the oak and being a faster growing tree will draw the oak up into better formed stems during the establishment period, and probably be thinned out in a few years' time.</p> <p>There are no plans to plant beech, in this compartment. Cpt 17a is mostly beech, and while it has grown well and beech is likely to become more suited to the area as climate change progresses over the projected lifespan of the trees, there is very little understorey, and it is not as biodiverse as an oak stand promises to be. Cpt 17d is predominantly softwoods, and there is an intention to fell this and replant with broadleaves in a decade or two's time when 17a is well established.</p> <p>We also understand that there is a gradual transition of woodland edge into parkland out onto the lawns of Newburgh Priory, which will be maintained and possibly thinned slightly where there are ash trees which warrant removal. The estate will ensure there is a level of screening and there won't be a wide-open sightline from the hall straight into the clearfell site. The front lawn will be used as a wedding reception venue every weekend and for the rest of the season.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are pleased to have been consulted. Thank you for answering our queries. We have no objection to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth</p>
Newburgh Priory	North Yorkshire	E21/0355	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Crow Wood	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2022</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 Newburgh Priory, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This consultation follows 012/3494/2021 - Newburgh House Farm, to which we responded on 2nd November 2021.</p> <p>012/817/2022 – Silvicultural thinning of the crop to favour the better stems. This is for compartments, 13j, 13l, 13m, part of the Roman Plantation (Mount Woods) within the registered boundary and involves</p>

				<p>thinning of downy birch, pedunculate oak in 13j; European larch and Scots pine in 13 l; hybrid larch in 13m. We have no objection to this proposal. 012/865/2022 – timber volume shortage from the management plan application.</p> <p>17b, Clear fell. Ash dieback. Restock with Q robur and Q petraea, Prunus avium. Note mixed broadleaves.</p> <p>Compartment 17b is part of Crow Wood which is in the sightline from Newburgh Priory – it is part of the pleasure grounds to the east of the Hall, with the two historic vistas cut through. Compartment 17b is located in the angle between the two vistas and is potentially more sensitive.</p> <p>Our thanks to Chris Curry of Forestry Agents Hewetson and Johnson for responding to our queries so promptly:</p> <p>We understand that the replanting will be predominately Q. robur, which grows very well at Newburgh. (The condition for robur/petrea is a quirk of the Felling Licence Online multiple-choice dropdown options.) The P. avium will be interspersed evenly in the oak and being a faster growing tree will draw the oak up into better formed stems during the establishment period, and probably be thinned out in a few years' time.</p> <p>There are no plans to plant beech, in this compartment. Cpt 17a is mostly beech, and while it has grown well and beech is likely to become more suited to the area as climate change progresses over the projected lifespan of the trees, there is very little understorey, and it is not as biodiverse as an oak stand promises to be. Cpt 17d is predominantly softwoods, and there is an intention to fell this and replant with broadleaves in a decade or two's time when 17a is well established.</p> <p>We also understand that there is a gradual transition of woodland edge into parkland out onto the lawns of Newburgh Priory, which will be maintained and possibly thinned slightly where there are ash trees which warrant removal. The estate will ensure there is a level of screening and there won't be a wide-open sightline from the hall straight into the clearfell site. The front lawn will be used as a wedding reception venue every weekend and for the rest of the season.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are pleased to have been consulted. Thank you for answering our queries. We have no objection to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Wentworth Castle	South Yorkshire	E21/0675	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new dormer bungalow with detached one and half storey outbuilding and associated works</p> <p>Pine Lodge, Stainborough Lane, Hood Green, Barnsley, S75 3EZ</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconconsulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Wentworth Castle, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade 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>As you know Wentworth Castle Park and Garden is of exceptional interest (around 9% of registered sites are Grade I) and is the only Grade I registered park and garden in South Yorkshire. It is significant for having so much of the early 18th century designed landscape surviving, for the political and ideological rivalry that was expressed in the landscape by the branches of the family at Wentworth Castle and Wentworth Woodhouse, and recently the large amount of public money that has been spent in conserving and restoring the site and making it accessible to the public. You will appreciate from earlier letters that the Pine Lodge site, located just within the south-western registered boundary, was part of the woodland belt that contained the designed landscape and its range of special buildings. Pine Lodge site is also within the Wentworth Castle and Stainborough Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>As we wrote in our letter of 5th August 2021, the GT and YGT consider that although the existing bungalow contributes little to the surrounding historic assets, its low form and reduced visibility in the landscape render its impact as neutral. However, we would support its demolition if the new building responded to this part of the designed landscape as we discussed. We note that the massing and overall design of the building remain, but its impact has been reduced somewhat with the removal of the dormer windows formerly proposed.</p> <p>Regarding the glazing in general, we are pleased that there is no glazing on the north side of the garage roof which may help to screen that of the house although this will be limited owing to the topography.</p> <p>We are concerned about the very large gable windows on the east and west elevations – the east gable window is the most concerning as it faces over a wide area of parkland and we think would be intrusive. We are</p>

					<p>disappointed to see on the Landscape Layout the retention of the proposal for a 'primary vista from the proposed dwelling' from the glazed eastern gable.</p> <p>There are also six varying sized rooflights facing north towards the main Wentworth Castle building and designed area that includes Stainborough Castle, Archer's Hill Gate and the Sun Monument. The light shed and the potential glare from these and the gable windows will be a distraction in this very important historic landscape. We wonder if there is scope for having all the rooflights on the north side of the house at the lower level as per the south elevation, which might help reduce the impact a little more. We have not seen an assessment of the views from the parkland comparing the existing bungalow with what is proposed which would help assess the impact on significance. We think that the proposals will inevitably increase the visibility of this property.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that a landscaping scheme has now been developed which helps to assimilate the domestic nature of the property into the wider landscape. The inclusion of estate railings to the boundaries increases the permeability of the site, and the reinstatement of the 'avenue' to the east boundary represents a positive enhancement to the scheme.</p> <p>Although there have been positive revisions, the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust still considers that the proposal will cause harm to the significance of the Grade I registered landscape. Your authority will need to judge whether the harm is balanced by the public benefits of replacing the deteriorating existing bungalow and whether the proposal complies with the NPPF (July 2021), paras 199-202 and the Barnsley Local Plan Policy HE1 (The Historic Environment) and HE4 (Developments affecting Historic Areas or Landscapes). We are of the opinion that it does not.</p> <p>We also have concerns about the Coal Mining Risk Assessment June 2019 and the points regarding the bore hole exploration (Risk Assessment & Method Statement for Geoenvironmental Survey, Patrick Parsons January 2020) that we wrote about in our letter of 5th August 2021. The report advises that more exploration needs to be carried out prior to building which could well invalidate the new house position and compromise the tree and shrub planting.</p> <p>We understand that the current proposals have not reached a detailed stage and strongly advise that your authority ensures that there is no</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>diminution between any permission granted and the completed scheme and that the landscape scheme is implemented to the highest standards. This is important in reducing the 'domestic/suburban' character of the site. The latter should be in place before completion and occupation. We also advise that permitted development rights should be removed and strongly advise that safeguards are put in place to ensure that all these aspects are adhered to for years to come.</p> <p>In the light of our concerns the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust maintain their objection to the current proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Wentworth Castle	South Yorkshire	E21/2037	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of Home Farm buildings from C2 'Residential Institution' to short term residential letting units (24no bedrooms) Wentworth Castle, Northern College, Lowe Lane, Stainborough, Barnsley, S75 3ET CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail of the 15th March with the appended letter from Diane Lawson, Assistant Principal Northern College regarding issues in the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust letter of 10th March, to which we also refer.</p> <p>The College has responded by noting that there are no material changes to any of the current change of use request and no changes which would affect the heritage assets.</p> <p>Parking arrangements will be within the main College car park, with pedestrian access to the Home Farm (HF) Complex via the HF Arch. Should non-ambulant access be required then discussion with Wentworth Castle Commercial and Events will take place prior to the booking confirmation. Parking for non-ambulant guests would be taken from within the car park outside the Main House with agreed access arrangements.</p> <p>This is helpful information, but we have several concerns regarding this change of use of Home Farm buildings. These concerns are largely centred around the continued access to the gardens of this grade I historic park and garden:</p> <p>a) will the one- way system for garden visitors remain, starting in front of the Long Barn and returning from the gardens through the Home Farm Courtyard. How will College, National Trust and Airbnb visitors be kept safe (and in view of continuing Covid cases) if a one- way system is no longer in place?</p> <p>b) if the one-way system is to be removed, how will the National Trust's visitors be able to visit the Home Farm area and learn about its history and rescue from dereliction courtesy of HLF's Phase I grant which we</p>

					<p>understand was in the region of £17,000,000 of public funding? We consider that this public funding is obligation for visitor access for at least the next ten years until the twenty- five years from first opening to the public are completed.</p> <p>c) how will Northern College keep the garden visitors' one way system separate to any vehicle access needed for Airbnb clients, in particular service and disability vehicles?</p> <p>d) Will Airbnb visitors be given free access to the gardens as part of their "contract"?</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>e) What is happening to the two central buildings within the red zone which appear to have been omitted from the written planning application. Are they to remain as student accommodation and therefore 'mixed in' with this change of use?</p> <p>f) In terms of Airbnb access, will vehicle access be allowed for luggage drop off?</p> <p>g) How will the National Trust's visitors access the Long Barn and the disabled lift within it?</p> <p>h) how will visitors to St. James Church interact with the National Trust and Airbnb clients?</p> <p>We trust that the College is not intending to exclude the visiting public from the Home Farm complex almost in its entirety.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Shugborough	Staffordshire	E22/0016	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of land to operational site for new site extension, to accommodate the installation of 1 no. new borehole (BH4), with associated kiosk, crane pads, access road and landscaping Land To The East Of Milford Borehole Pumping Station Tixall Road CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) in its role as Statutory Consultee over proposed development affecting Shugborough Park 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.</p> <p>Although the application site lies within the boundaries of the RPG and the Great Haywood and Shugborough Conservation Area it is outside and well screened from the core area of the historic landscape. The scale of the proposed development and its position on degraded land adjacent to the existing Pumping Station will not cause harm to the significance of the</p>

					<p>heritage asset. The Trusts have no objection to the application. Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Culford Park	Suffolk	E21/1778	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Planning application - a. Installation of a golf short practice game area comprising two bunkers and seven pitching/chipping tees b. one all weather tee box on existing driving range Culford School Culford Park Culford IP28 6TX SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022 Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) about the increased bunker width the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We do not feel that the increase in bunker width will make an appreciable difference to the impact upon the RPG as outlined in our previous response dated 19th January 2022, and we have no further comments to add. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Christchurch Mansion	Suffolk	E21/2231	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from bowling green to dog day care centre with erection of wooden cabin, and erection of 2.5m high chain link fence (retrospective consent sought for fence) Park Grounds Christchurch Park Ipswich Suffolk CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.04.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the fairly sparse online documentation accompanying this application and whilst we appreciate that the applicants have provided a statement 'As Requested by the Gardens Trust' their planning and heritage statements do not adequately explain how the proposed new building might impact upon the setting and views within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Christchurch Mansion. We would have expected at the least some photographs showing views of the site shown from key areas within the RPG – in particular the NW, W and SW directions, and no indication of exactly where the 2.5m high fence runs (presumably all around the edge of the former Bowls Green?). We appreciate that the fencing is necessary to ensure that the dogs do not escape, but the western edge of the site may well be open to the rest of the RPG. If this is the case it may be appropriate to suggest a clump of strategically placed trees/shrubs (with the planting palette mirroring what is already in existence). The area chosen for the new wooden cabin is discreetly sited and as long</p>

					<p>as there is no excessive signage and night-time lighting, we do not consider that it will impact too heavily upon the RPG.</p> <p>We would ask that your officers satisfy themselves that the 2.5m chain link fencing and new building are not obtrusive from other areas of the RPG.</p> <p>With these caveats in mind, the GT has no objections to the application in principle.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E19/1487	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION REVISED PLANS Application for Listed Building Consent for works of restoration, conversion and development to the Mansion House, Stables and Coach House, Camellia House, curtilage and associated buildings within the Bretton Hall Estate and relates works of demolition, new construction, car parking infrastructure and landscaping for hotel, conferencing exhibition uses, offices, non-residential institutions and associated uses. Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton. HYBRID Julie Haycock dmsplanning@wakefield.gov.uk</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.04.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting 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 Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Our previous response to this application is dated 20th July 2020 followed by notes dated 26th November 2020 after our site visit on 17th November with Helen Bower, Wakefield Council Conservation Officer and representatives of the developer, Rushbond.</p> <p>We applaud the long- standing aim to restore this property and its gardens for hotel use and are impressed by the clearance works that have been carried out to remove temporary educational classrooms left over from higher education days.</p> <p>We welcome:</p> <p>(i) the improvements to the proposed car parking in front of the stable block – now a combination of the more informal with a formal arrangement facing the east elevation of the Stable Block which will be less intrusive in approaches to Mansion from the north and east.</p> <p>(ii) the removal of car parking spaces along Beaumont Drive which will much improve the sense of arrival at the hotel and enhance the landscape.</p> <p>(iii) the reduction in the number of car parking spaces to the Grasshopper car park to the south-east of the Mansion which will minimise the visual impact on the setting of the Mansion and 07 proposed planting to existing slope to help screen car parking.</p>

					<p>(iv) the Formal East Lawn 03, but we have concerns about the impact of the Hotel Wings Extension (Future Phase), although the proposed extension appears to have been reduced and not project beyond the line of the mansion into the Lawn as shown on the Landscape Variations 20417_P502 Rev C, South -East Landscape Plan, June 2021.</p> <p>(v) that there will not be any new physical boundaries between Yorkshire Sculpture Park (YSP) and Bretton Hall.</p> <p>Although overall we have much to applaud, the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust wish to raise our particular concerns regarding :-</p> <p>a) the repair of the Camellia House doors and windows and the design of its new access paths</p> <p>b) the proposed new roofing to the Orangery</p> <p>c) the single clerestory light shown over the Conservatory</p> <p>d) the supposed existing car parking at the far north- west corner of the site</p> <p>e) demolition and further building works to erect a new kitchen north of the Orangery because of the root protection zones needed for the superb mature English Oak and London Plane tree close by</p> <p>f) the proposals to remove all trees to the south of the Bretton Hall Mansion terrace</p> <p>g) the proposed temporary marquee in location A1.</p> <p>h) the proposed office blocks, (Future Phase)</p> <p>a) The Camellia House</p> <p>On page 17 of the Heritage Impact Statement section 5.10 it states that the wooden windows and doors are of poor thin quality, probably from the 1990's and should be replaced by better thicker ones to the original glazing pattern. We note that no such upgrades are planned.</p> <p>However, windows and doors in the mansion, including the Orangery designed by George Basevi of 1836 I.e. some twenty or so years later than the Camellia House are to be upgraded as per the Heritage Statement's recommendations. We consider this an inappropriate cost saving for such a well- known building as the Camellia House.</p> <p>We also draw your attention to the 6" and 25" mile Ordnance Survey maps of Bretton Hall's surroundings (1847-1939) which show that the Camellia House's access paths were always curved. Three are shown to the north and one to the south- east, the latter leading gracefully to the main house. As a result, we see no problem in reinstating two or more of them but not in such an angular way as proposed.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>b &c) Bretton Hall, listed Grade II* has two important garden buildings attached to it, Jeffrey Wyatt's Conservatory from 1814 and George Basevi's Orangery put up c.1836. They were commissioned by Diana Beaumont and her son respectively and both had glass roofs which are shown on the OS maps (25" to the mile scale) from their erection until at least the sale post 2nd World War to Wakefield City Council some 100 to 120 years later. We believe that the Orangery's glazed roof at least lasted longer until the 1990's.</p> <p>We are surprised and much regret that neither area of glazed roof is to be reinstated and whilst we very much support the plan to provide bat roosts for this huge mansion, query whether this is the best place with a new kitchen directly behind and the venting and clatter that will result. We support opening up the interconnection between the Orangery and Conservatory but regret the loss of daylight and sunshine that restoration of their original glazing would have provided.</p> <p>d) As per our previous response comments, we note the inaccuracy in the Landscape Masterplan which shows "existing parking" in the far north-west corner of the site where none exists. YSP use this forested area for outdoor sculpture workshops and their hard standing for a temporary fabric roof is in a different place.</p> <p>We would advise that permission from the appropriate authority will be needed to fell these trees and should be part of a later planning application.</p> <p>e) Tree number, 119b an excellent mature English Oak and tree no 119g an excellent mature London Plane have large root protection zones around them in the Tree Survey included with this planning application. Not only is a van turning circle shown predicting regular vehicle traffic to this area but due to the demolition and rebuilding of the kitchen to the north side of the Orangery vehicles, materials, scaffolding and possibly access to the main house are proposed for this area.</p> <p>We are very concerned that this will lead to the loss of both specimens and request that no materials or contractors' accommodation be allowed within this courtyard in particular. That access for house works or contractors' plant should also be withdrawn and that as much as possible of the courtyard root zone be kept free from compaction. Even on completion we request that delivery vehicles should be excluded completely, and goods delivered and removed by hand.</p> <p>The old sports courts could be used instead, their restoration to grass</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>following the new kitchen's completion.</p> <p>f) We question the proposals to remove all the trees to the south of the Hall Mansion terrace. Several are dedicated trees, and all are young and - if healthy - capable of being relocated by a tree spade machine. The consequences will be reciprocal; views out from the Mansion and views back from YSP.</p> <p>g) As the earlier proposed temporary marquee in location A1 is not now marked on Landscape Masterplan All Phases Rev H-1012655 but is marked on another (Bretton Park Landscape Masterplan A0-1012934 dated 08 09 2020) can we trust that this has been removed from any proposals? We note the following in the Bretton Hall Landscape design Statement 24 06 21, p5/6: ' Condition 10 of the existing permission 16/01095/FUL relates. This limits the provision of marquees to a maximum of three locations within any of the five areas identified including the area A1.....'</p> <p>As we have explained in our previous responses, this location would be very damaging to the reciprocal views to the south that are such an important part of the intended historical and aesthetic experience and important for the public visiting YSP and we object.</p> <p>h) We have serious concerns about the positioning of the proposed office blocks, (Future Phase) S, T, U, V, north-east of the Stable Block. They will be very evident from the New Hotel Guest Approach Drive 01.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E21/2186	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 2 of approved application 16/016095/FUL dated 16th May 2017 (relating to approved application 12/01524/HYB dated 18th April 2013) (part detailed, part outline application for the re-development of former Bretton Hall campus. Detailed application: the conversion of the Mansion House to form a 120 bed hotel with ancillary restaurants, bar, spa, conference,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.04.2022</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 Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We do not have any record of us ever having been consulted on 16/016095/FUL.</p> <p>On the planning portal 16/016095/FUL shows as 12/01524/HYB and condition 2 of the consent is a very general one:</p>

			<p>wedding facilities and temporary marquee locations (C1) including erection of 3-storey extensions to the north and east wings and the partial demolition of later addition extensions to the Mansion and full demolition of Ezra Taylor, Alec Clegg, Victor Pasmore (including Music School and Dance Studio) buildings, Refectory, Student Services bungalow and hostel/ancillary buildings; conversion of the Camellia House to ancillary hotel use; conversion of the Stables, Coach House, Theatre, Gym, Library and link block to 7 office units (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1); erection of two 2-3 storey office pavilions (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1); and associated new access roads, car parking infrastructure and landscape works. Outline application: Erection of six 2 storey office pavilions (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1)). Application to amend some of the detailed drawings to which the application and approval relates Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>Planning permission GRANTED for the following PART of the development: in accordance with the plans and specifications hereby approved subject to the following conditions and reasons:-</p> <p>2. None of the 6, two-storey office buildings subject to outline planning permission shall be commenced until details of the following reserved matter(s) for that building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: (a) appearance; and (b) landscaping. Application for approval of all the reserved matter(s) shall be made before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason : Pursuant to the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>Our previous response to a planning application was for 19/02294/LBC dated 20th July 2020 followed by notes dated 26th November 2020 after our site visit on 17th November with Helen Bower, Wakefield Council Conservation Officer and representatives of the developer, Rushbond. In principle the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are very supportive of the re-development of the former Bretton Hall campus. We welcome:</p> <p>(i) the improvements to the proposed car parking in front of the stable block – now a combination of the more informal with a formal arrangement facing the east elevation of the Stable Block which will be less intrusive in approaches to Mansion from the north and east.</p> <p>(ii) the removal of car parking spaces along Beaumont Drive which will much improve the sense of arrival at the hotel and enhance the landscape.</p> <p>(iii) the reduction in the number of car parking spaces to the Grasshopper car park to the south-east of the Mansion which will minimise the visual impact on the setting of the Mansion and 07 proposed planting to existing slope to help screen car parking.</p> <p>(iv) the Formal East Lawn 03, but we have concerns about the impact of the Hotel Wings Extension (Future Phase), although the proposed extension appears to have been reduced and not project beyond the line of the mansion into the Lawn as shown on the Landscape Variations 20417_P502 Rev C, South -East Landscape Plan, June 2021.</p> <p>(v) that there will not be any new physical boundaries between Yorkshire Sculpture Park (YSP) and Bretton Hall.</p> <p>Although overall we are supportive of the proposed new use for the listed buildings, we underline that we are eager to ensure that the proposed</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>works conserve and enhance the buildings and their setting within the registered park and garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust wish to raise our particular concerns regarding :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the repair of the Camellia House doors and windows and the design of its new access paths b) the proposed new roofing to the Orangery, (and we note Historic England's concerns about the proposed change to the design of the orangery windows and doors). c) the single clerestory light shown over the Conservatory d) the supposed existing car parking at the far north- west corner of the site e) demolition and further building works to erect a new kitchen north of the Orangery because of the root protection zones needed for the superb mature English Oak and London Plane tree close by f) the proposals to remove all trees to the south of the Bretton Hall Mansion terrace g) the proposed temporary marquee in location A1. h) the proposed office blocks, (Future Phase) <p>a) The Camellia House</p> <p>On page 17 of the Heritage Impact Statement section 5.10 it states that the wooden windows and doors are of poor thin quality, probably from the 1990's and should be replaced by better thicker ones to the original glazing pattern. We note that no such upgrades are planned.</p> <p>However, windows and doors in the mansion, including the Orangery designed by George Basevi of 1836 i.e. some twenty or so years later than the Camellia House are to be upgraded as per the Heritage Statement's recommendations. We consider this an inappropriate cost saving for such a well- known building as the Camellia House.</p> <p>We also draw your attention to the 6" and 25" mile Ordnance Survey maps of Bretton Hall's surroundings (1847-1939) which show that the Camellia House's access paths were always curved. Three are shown to the north and one to the south- east, the latter leading gracefully to the main house. As a result, we see no problem in reinstating two or more of them but not in such an angular way as proposed.</p> <p>b &c) Bretton Hall, listed Grade II* has two important garden buildings attached to it, Jeffrey Wyatt's Conservatory from 1814 and George Basevi's Orangery put up c.1836. They were commissioned by Diana Beaumont and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>her son respectively and both had glass roofs which are shown on the OS maps (25" to the mile scale) from their erection until at least the sale post 2nd World War to Wakefield City Council some 100 to 120 years later. We believe that the Orangery's glazed roof at least lasted longer until the 1990's.</p> <p>We are surprised and much regret that neither area of glazed roof is to be reinstated and whilst we very much support the plan to provide bat roosts for this huge mansion, query whether this is the best place with a new kitchen directly behind and the venting and clatter that will result. We support opening up the interconnection between the Orangery and Conservatory but regret the loss of daylight and sunshine that restoration of their original glazing would have provided.</p> <p>d) As per our previous response comments, we note the inaccuracy in the Landscape Masterplan which shows "existing parking" in the far north-west corner of the site where none exists. YSP use this forested area for outdoor sculpture workshops and their hard standing for a temporary fabric roof is in a different place.</p> <p>We would advise that permission from the appropriate authority will be needed to fell these trees and should be part of a later planning application.</p> <p>e) Tree number, 119b an excellent mature English Oak and tree no 119g an excellent mature London Plane have large root protection zones around them in the Tree Survey included with this planning application. Not only is a van turning circle shown predicting regular vehicle traffic to this area but due to the demolition and rebuilding of the kitchen to the north side of the Orangery vehicles, materials, scaffolding and possibly access to the main house are proposed for this area.</p> <p>We are very concerned that this will lead to the loss of both specimens and request that no materials or contractors' accommodation be allowed within this courtyard in particular. That access for house works or contractors' plant should also be withdrawn and that as much as possible of the courtyard root zone be kept free from compaction. Even on completion we request that delivery vehicles should be excluded completely, and goods delivered and removed by hand.</p> <p>The old sports courts could be used instead, their restoration to grass following the new kitchen's completion.</p> <p>f) We question the proposals to remove all the trees to the south of the Hall Mansion terrace. Several are dedicated trees, and all are young and - if</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>healthy - capable of being relocated by a tree spade machine. The consequences will be reciprocal; views out from the Mansion and views back from YSP.</p> <p>g) As the earlier proposed temporary marquee in location A1 is not now marked on Landscape Masterplan All Phases Rev H-1012655 but is marked on another (Bretton Park Landscape Masterplan A0-1012934 dated 08 09 2020) can we trust that this has been removed from any proposals?</p> <p>We note the following in the Bretton Hall Landscape design Statement 24 06 21, p5/6: ' Condition 10 of the existing permission 16/01095/FUL relates. This limits the provision of marquees to a maximum of three locations within any of the five areas identified including the area A1.....'</p> <p>As we have explained in our previous responses, this location would be very damaging to the reciprocal views to the south that are such an important part of the intended historical and aesthetic experience and important for the public visiting YSP and we object.</p> <p>h) We have serious concerns about the positioning of the proposed office blocks, (Future Phase) S, T, U, V, north-east of the Stable Block. They will be very evident from the New Hotel Guest Approach Drive 01.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Nostell Priory	West Yorkshire	E22/0010	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of CCTV to main entrance gates with associated trenching for electric supply. Nostell Priory , Nostell Priory Estate, Nostell COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.04.2022</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 the park, garden and designed landscape at Nostell Priory, which is registered Grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Nostell Priory, a house of Augustinian Canons, was founded during the 12th Century and some of its buildings were converted into a house post the Dissolution. The site was acquired by the Winn family in 1654. The parkland retains elements of an early 18th Century scheme by the notable designer and writer Stephen Switzer (1682-1745), and there are later additions by Robert Adam (1728-1772) who also of course worked on the house.</p>

					<p>The proposed CCTV installation will be installed c.25metres within the main visitor entrance (Eagle Gates) to Nostell Priory, on the north side of the access road and located in grass. It is within the southern boundary of the registered park. We understand that CCTV is required as a priority for security reasons as it will enable surveillance of the entrance to the property. It is anticipated that the presence of CCTV will act as a deterrent for any potential vandalism. Another main area of concern is one of personal safety as the proposed CCTV will enable the key rep personnel to respond safely to out of hours calls to the main entrance gate.</p> <p>The proposed CCTV column will be 4.5m high and the concrete foundation for the column 1.1m (W) x 1.1m (L) x 0.55m (D); this will vary slightly onsite due to the sloping ground surface.</p> <p>The proposal will introduce a new piece of modern steel infrastructure to the landscape and will inevitably have some impact on the setting and significance of several designated heritage assets as well as the registered park and garden. The harm should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (NPPF July 2021, Para 202). We have noted the detailed Heritage Statement and consultee comments from West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service and from the TPO Officer.</p> <p>Regarding the archaeology (Romano-British and early medieval) and the tree roots, there may be potential for damage from the CCTV column's footings and the trenching, although we have not been on-site to look at the location. We advise that if permission is granted that there should be an archaeological watching brief and recording prior to and during the work. There will also need to be special care of any tree roots as per the comments from your TPO Officer.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---