



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES MAY 2022

The GT conservation team received 185 new cases and re-consultations for England and one for Wales in May. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 67 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Sneyd Park <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Avon	E21/1781	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing public toilet block and construction of single storey building comprising café (use class E), education booth (use class F1[a]) and replacement toilets (resubmission of planning permission 18/04727/F). Public Conveniences Circular Road Sneyd Park Bristol BS9 1ZZ DEMOLITION, MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2022 Thank you for further consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting The Downs Conservation Area, The new, mainly glass, single storey building will be set within The Downs, a designated site of nature conservation [SNCI] and it will be adjacent to a listed heritage asset, the drinking fountain donated by William Hind in 1883. The Avon Gorge is immediately to the south and west of the site and is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest [SSSI]. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that you have provided and on the basis of this, and the fact that planning permission for the 2018 proposal expired in March 2022, AGT have no objection to the scheme, P21/06762/F. Yours sincerely,

					Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust
Hedsor House	Buckinghamshire	E21/2009	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of two existing buildings creating 1 x 3-bed short term let holiday dwelling with creation of linked walkway and demolition of redundant out buildings</p> <p>Buildings At Woolmans Wood Hedsor Park Farm Heathfield Road Hedsor</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2022</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>You emailed us on May 19th with regard to some of our comments and an error in our previous response dated March 9th so please accept this letter as our response to those matters. We apologise for repeating some of the following information but it is important that our correspondence accurately reflects the matter in question.</p> <p>As we previously noted, Hedsor is a Grade II registered park and garden (RPG). The history of the site dates back to 1583 and has a strong connection with the adjacent Cliveden Estate dating back to 1706 when, as the listing states "Lord Orkney planted his northern, axial, 250m long lime avenue approach to Cliveden House (qv), which stretched north from the Cliveden turning circle into the Hedsor estate for 330m, as shown on the Survey of Cliveden House and Gardens, 1749." It is thought that the grounds were remodelled when the 'new house' was built in the late 18th century and formal gardens were added at the start of the 20th century. The application site sits just outside of the RPG in the southern section of Woolman's Wood although seemingly within part of the former parkland. It is therefore located in the immediate and sensitive setting of the RPG. We attach the Historic England Guidance note which defines and addresses the assessment of the setting of heritage assets and recommend that its guidance is followed. This is further addressed in our own guidance note on setting specifically related to designed landscapes which is also attached. This application seeks to convert two existing structures constructed for the purposes of water storage into one holiday let. Whilst the application site is just outside of the RPG, the Gardens Trust is concerned about the impact of converting two functional structures effectively into a residential dwelling on the immediate setting of the designed landscape. In our first response, we noted that the proposals show a substantial increase in the amount of external glazing, the introduction of a glazed link, a new patio area and other alterations consistent with the change to</p>

					<p>residential use. Whilst the applicants have attempted to mitigate the extent of light emittance and reflection through the use of timber shutters, this is not sufficient to mitigate the effect of introducing residential accommodation at this point, with the noise, substantially increased glazing resulting in light emittance, reflection and domestic paraphernalia all of which will have a dramatic and detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent RPG. We therefore objected to these proposals for the above reasons unless it could be clearly demonstrated that the impact that these proposals in the immediate setting of the RPG have on the RPG itself is not significant. We have reviewed the application details again and cannot see anything that addresses the potential impact on the RPG which is so close to the application site. We note the comparative views but these do not appear to show the impact on the RPG and, whilst we are aware that there is surrounding tree cover, it cannot be assumed that the proposed works will therefore not be visible from the RPG. If there is such information within the application, we would be grateful to be directed to it. Otherwise, we recommend that the planning authority request the applicant to produce a Visual Impact Assessment and follows the guidance in the two documents attached. In the absence of this additional information we continue to object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Latimer Park	Buckinghamshire	E22/0141	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of new outbuilding, spa pool and associated landscaping works Parkfield House, Church Lane, Latimer, Buckinghamshire, HP5 1UG MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We were previously consulted on the earlier application at this site, PL/20/3019/FA which was granted planning permission. We note that this revised application omits the outdoor pool which is welcomed. However, the soft landscaping plan proposes the removal of even more of the existing trees. As we noted in our response to the previous application, the existing tree planting dates from the 1970s and we regretted the loss of most of the evidence of the former orchard here as it echoes the historic</p>

					<p>use of the site. Therefore, removal of yet more trees further detracts from the setting of the site and we would like to take this opportunity to encourage the LPA and the owners to retain more existing trees or to perhaps plant further new fruit trees to retain some of the historic character of the site</p> <p>However, if your officers are minded to approve the application, the GT/BGT do not offer any objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E22/0143	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building application for refurbishment of the entrance lobby, common room and associated areas at lower ground floor Level</p> <p>Grafton House Stowe School Stowe Park Stowe Buckinghamshire MK18 5EH REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.05.2022</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>We have considered the application which we do not think has any landscape implications. We would ask that your officers reassure themselves that this is the case and if this is so, then we have no comment to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E22/0173	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing conservatory and replacement with single storey rear extension</p> <p>3 Garden Mews Newport Road Gayhurst Newport Pagnell MK16 8LG BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2022</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>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. Whilst we do not know the site in detail, we understand that the Gardens Mews are south of the main house and close to the sewage works.</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposals and consider that the demolition of the</p>

					<p>conservatory and its replacement with a solid structure in the form of the garden room is acceptable. We would prefer the omission of the rooflights which can result in inappropriate light reflection and emission in the registered park and garden. However, we acknowledge that the replacement of the fully-glazed conservatory already marks a considerable reduction in light reflection and emission into the landscape. Therefore, if the Local Planning Authority is minded to grant consent to this scheme, the Gardens Trust offers no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E22/0206	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The reduction of a large overextending limb by 7m on Hornbeam tree (T2985) and reduction in height of Sycamore (T2986) by 5m protected by Milton Keynes Council Tree Preservation Order no. PS/540/15/36C 1 The Woodyard Filgrave To Gayhurst Road Tyringham Newport Pagnell MK16 9ES TREES</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the above TPO 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. The above TPO relates to arboricultural work on two trees : the reduction of a large overextending limb by 7m on a Hornbeam tree and the reduction in height of a Sycamore (T2986) by 5m , both trees protected by TPOs. If the planning authority is minded to permit this application on the grounds of good arboricultural advice, then we have no objection to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Sale and Brooklands Cemetery	Cheshire	E22/0111	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of the former lodge building to a residential dwelling, erection of single storey side extension together with alterations to existing outbuilding, new sliding gates and boundary treatment Sale Cemetery, Marsland Road, Sale, M33 1UN CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2022 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 Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The lodge house lies within the Grade II listed registered park and garden (RPG) of Sale &amp; Brooklands Cemetery and together with the existing gates and adjacent railings, forms one of the main entrances to the cemetery. The GT has no objection to the conversion of the lodge to a residential dwelling and the extension has been married sensitively into the original building. We do however, have strong concerns about the proposed</p>

					<p>boundary treatment. In our opinion, moving the existing gates would substantially alter the sense of arrival for a visitor to the cemetery. The design of the proposed new wrought iron automatic sliding vehicular access gate &amp; manually operated pedestrian access gate jars strongly with the aesthetics of the whole period ensemble. The replicated wrought iron railing design is inferior to the original fencing, but is sufficiently similar, and clearly considerably less expensive, for us not to object to its use in less visible areas, along with the replicated piers.</p> <p>We object to the moving of the existing gates and would suggest that they are left in situ and if necessary locked at night to prevent unauthorised access to the cemetery.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Derwent Gardens	Derbyshire	E22/0112	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Use of public open space for temporary siting of market stalls/ catering units, children's funfair, ticket office and toilets for the period between 22/08/2022 to 06/11/2022 and for periods covering 8 weekends (to be confirmed) between August and November of 2023, 2024, 2025 and 2026</p> <p>Derwent Gardens South Parade Matlock Bath Derbyshire</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.05.2022</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 this joint response.</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on this application, which might have a material impact on the significance of Derwent Gardens, a historic designed landscape which is Registered by Historic England at Grade II. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>As it stands, the application does not include any form of Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and therefore fails to comply with National Planning Policy. This is sufficient reason in itself for a refusal of planning permission. The HIA should include consideration of the potential impact of any vehicle movements within the site. We understand that an assessment of potential risks to the site was undertaken as part of the DerwentWise Heritage at Risk project. The outputs from the project should be available at the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>There is national policy of relevance to this application. We refer you to National Planning Policy Framework Section 6 (Paragraphs 189 to 208). Applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets and to identify the impact of their proposal on that significance.</p>

					<p>We therefore object to this application, and our objection will be maintained until an adequate HIA has been submitted for consultation.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Parnham House <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Dorset	E21/1318	II*	<b>PLANNING APPLICATION</b> Erect a marquee and provision of a services structure to function as a restaurant, erection of a gazebo for the service of BBQs within the walled garden and the provision of a 49 space car park and associated driveway improvements. Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster DT8 3LZ <b>MARQUEE, PARKING</b>	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2022 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 Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. The above application is one of four current applications linked to the generation of sufficient cashflow and profits to finance the eventual restoration of Parnham House and its estate. We appreciate the enormous cost of repairs to the Grade I fire damaged Parnham House and the considerable additional outlay necessary for ancillary development to support the proposed commercial use of the house and its Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG), their ongoing maintenance and management. The applicants' proposals for bringing Parnham back to life are reasonable and we can only commend them for their ideas. What we feel is lacking within the supporting documentation is anything about conservation of other heritage assets as only the house is mentioned. We would also like to see a landscape management plan. The Grade II* grounds of Parnham are an important representative example of an early C20 formal garden illustrating the taste for Revivalism in English garden design at that time. In addition, HE's register entry considers that 'the design and layout of the gardens are of a particularly high quality as expressed in the successful combination of the geometrical arrangement of planting and formal architectural features, along with their appropriateness as settings to an exceptionally important mid-C16 house.' The site chosen for the proposed new dwelling/boathouse lies in very close proximity to the end of the formal stepped terracing leading down to the lake, on the north-eastern edge of the water. The lake itself is a relatively recent addition to the RPG, as part of the formal gardens and pleasure grounds to the south of the house which 'assumed their present form in the early C20, when they were remodelled, perhaps by Inigo Thomas... While the south terrace received its architectural form at this time, the late-C19 OS map (1890) indicates that a terrace approximately conforming

					<p>to the extent of the present terrace was already in existence'. The Heritage Impact Assessment by Purcell shows a photo (c1912) which includes a small, thatched boathouse (now gone) close to the position of the proposed new dwelling. Even in the poor-quality photograph, in our opinion, the original boathouse appears incongruous and inappropriate in that position. The terracing running south from the house draws visitors towards the lake - the focal point looking south, and if viewed looking north from the far end of the lake, the steps at the base of the balustrading on the lowest terrace, lead the eye naturally up towards the mansion. The original boathouse distracted from both of these vistas and its loss is an improvement. A contemporary, larger structure would have even greater impact, and would form an unwelcome distraction from arguably the most important view within the RPG.</p> <p>The Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment by ARC Landscape Design &amp; Planning Ltd (LVIA) (5.12) states the new building 'will result in a very limited and localised change and therefore, in the context of the landscape character area ... the magnitude of change ... is considered to be low'. It concedes (5.40) that the building will be 'a prominent feature of the landscape view' but that due to its function as a boathouse it 'has the potential to make an overall positive contribution to the lakeside view.' We disagree on the first and last points. A contemporary reversed 'C' shaped structure building 12.1m wide by 16.3 long with a 3.1m high flat roof, in close proximity to the end of the southern terrace would make a very considerable change to the setting and experience of the lake. We also consider that it would not immediately be thought of as a boathouse, but in the context of other proposed developments at Parnham, as a holiday house – which of course, it would be. It would introduce an incongruous element to this previously natural and tranquil area of the RPG.</p> <p>The photographs within ARC's LVIA indicate clearly how prominent the building site would be. For a site of this sensitivity and importance, we would also have expected to see photomontages of the boathouse taken from various key view points to demonstrate the full impact of the proposed structure. These view points would include the various terraces, points along the footpath on the opposite side of the lake, the bridge at the southern end of the lake, and potentially others taken from a drone approximating to a view from the upper story of the mansion itself. We do not see how mitigation of this large new structure by planting would be possible due to its prominence and proximity to the terracing and clear</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>view from across the lake.</p> <p>We also have concerns about light spill from the full height glazing over the lake. The LVA touches on this (5.46) suggesting 'internal blinds or similar' but their success depends entirely on their use by guests. As the main views from the building face towards the lake and the evening sun, it seems very unlikely that any blinds would be drawn as it would negate the main USP of the property.</p> <p>The Planning Statement (PS) explains that the current position of the proposed building has been chosen with regard to flood levels. We do not know whether any other less sensitive sites around the lake were considered and disregarded due to potential flooding problems. We assume that the finished floor level (PS 5.13) 600mm above the water level of the lake and the extension of the decking over the lake is the lowest safe level to ensure it will not flood. However, this has the effect of making the building over-dominant within the landscape.</p> <p>We concur with HE's concerns about the lack of clarity as to the status of the access route to the building : on the one hand temporary and just for the construction phase, and on the other, a potentially permanent access route to comply with Building Regulation B5 in respect of Fire Service Operational Access. This needs clarification so that we are able to assess the impact this may have on the RPG.</p> <p>The current planning applications are all within the Grade II* RPG at Parnham, as well as the Dorset AONB. The Orchard Lodges, Marquee/car park and River Lodges are clustered around the mansion house, but the boathouse application site is on its own, in an extremely prominent and important position on the edge of the lake. As such, whilst it is part of a cumulative change within the RPG, in our opinion, the latter is liable to have the most damaging impact upon the setting and significance of the various heritage assets. We therefore disagree with the assessment in ARC's Addendum to Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal – Cumulative Effects, where Table 2 summarises the effects of the Boathouse proposals as 'Major Positive'. The impact of the other proposals will be considered in our separate responses to the other applications.</p> <p>The boathouse would be the jewel in the crown of the proposed hospitality venues around the mansion house, commanding a premium rental, and as such is critical to the success of the venture. We do not in principle object to such a building or its contemporary design, but for all the reasons given, we object to a boathouse in the current position. We will be happy to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>consider alternative sites with fuller landscape mitigation proposals elsewhere around the lake.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/DGT are supportive of the three linked applications in the immediate vicinity of the main house : P/FUL/2021/05746 - Orchard Cottages, P/FUL/2021/05299 River Lodges and P/FUL/2021/02707 temporary marquee/parking area. We do however, have serious concerns about the fourth application (P/FUL/2021/02977) boathouse/dwelling by the lake which we are unable to support.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Parnham House <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Dorset	E21/1597	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erect 4.No. River Lodges and realignment of the existing access track.</p> <p>Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster DT8 3LZ GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) on the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We originally commented on the above application in December 2021 and since then the lodges have been reduced in height. The GT/DGT did not object in our first letter and the reduction in height is to be welcomed. We have subsequently had an opportunity to study all four current applications linked to the generation of sufficient cashflow and profits to finance the eventual restoration of Parnham House and its estate. We appreciate the enormous cost of repairs to the Grade I fire damaged Parnham House and the considerable additional outlay necessary for ancilliary development to support the proposed commercial use of the house and its Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG), their ongoing maintenance and management. The applicants' proposals for bringing Parnham back to life are reasonable and we can only commend them for their ideas.</p> <p>We have considered this alongside the concurrent applications for the nearby orchard cottages (P/FUL/2021/05746) and the temporary marquee/parking area (P/FUL/2021/02707). Please see our separate consultation responses. We were very much concerned at the possibility for overdevelopment of this area within the RPG but are able to support the above application in its current form.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/DGT are supportive of the three linked applications in the immediate vicinity of the main house : P/FUL/2021/05746 - Orchard Cottages, P/FUL/2021/05299 River Lodges and P/FUL/2021/02707 temporary marquee/parking area. We do however, have serious concerns about the fourth application (P/FUL/2021/02977) boathouse/dwelling by</p>

					<p>the lake which we are unable to support.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
<p>Parnham House <b>RECONSULTATION</b></p>	Dorset	E21/1753	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erect 6 no. Orchard Cottages and installation of a new bridge Parnham Estate Parnham Beaminster DT8 3LZ RESIDENTIAL, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) on the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Dorset Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We originally responded to this application on 19th January 2022. We have subsequently had an opportunity to study all four current applications linked to the generation of sufficient cashflow and profits to finance the eventual restoration of Parnham House and its estate. We appreciate the enormous cost of repairs to the Grade I fire damaged Parnham House and the considerable additional outlay necessary for ancillary development to support the proposed commercial use of the house and its Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG), their ongoing maintenance and management. The applicants' proposals for bringing Parnham back to life are reasonable and we can only commend them for their ideas. Since our first response, the layout of the orchard cottages has been amended. We have considered this alongside the concurrent applications for the nearby River Lodges (P/FUL/2021/05299) and the temporary marquee/parking area (P/FUL/2021/02707). Please see our separate consultation responses. We concur with your comments as Senior Conservation &amp; Design Officer, having also been concerned at 'the possibility for overdevelopment of this area within the RPG'. Appreciating the need for additional commercial development to support the restoration of the house and estate, we consider that the proposed 'layout (of the orchard cottages) sufficiently loose and the design concept sufficiently high-quality so as not to warrant that conclusion. Taking into account the extent of development and the nature of the sites' contribution to significance, it is therefore not considered that cumulative effects on significance of the asset arise additionally to those identified.'</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/DGT are supportive of the three linked applications in the immediate vicinity of the main house : P/FUL/2021/05746 - Orchard Cottages, P/FUL/2021/05299 River Lodges and P/FUL/2021/02707 temporary marquee/parking area. We do however, have serious concerns about the fourth application (P/FUL/2021/02977) boathouse/dwelling by</p>

					the lake which we are unable to support. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E20/0175	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Prior Notification of change of use of agricultural buildings to 4 no. dwellings. Longrove Barns, Shortgrove, Newport, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 3TX. CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION, RESIDENTIAL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2022 Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) regarding your latest proposals for the barns at Shortgrove. We note that the second barn is retained and can be converted. We do not understand how a design proposal based on a fake Dutch barn is an improvement on the original, particularly when it would have a large brick extension. We regret that we do see no merit in the updated proposal. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E22/0124	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed agricultural building for machinery storage and general storage Shortgrove Farm Shortgrove Newport MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.05.2022 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 Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This proposed barn would be located a little to the west of a pair of modern barns, for which a Class Q consent has recently been obtained for residential conversion. In view of this circumstance, it is difficult to see what the justification can be for building a new barn nearby. Although its location would be just outside and on the boundary of the Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Shortgrove, important for its association with Capability Brown, it would add to the built form around it. In the absence of any convincing justification, we therefore find this application objectionable. Were it to be approved there should be conditions restricting the use of the building to agricultural purposes only. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Westonbirt	Gloucestershire	E22/0250	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Demolition of existing building and erection of replacement building comprising changing rooms and an office and	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscape, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.

				<p>associated works at Westonbirt School Westonbirt Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8QG DEMOLITION, EDUCATION</p>	<p>The demolition of this existing building, which is considered to have little heritage merit, opens the way to provide greater spatial clarity and ease of circulation across the school site. The Heritage Statement gives a clear demonstration of the evolution of the building's volume, which quite rightly should be designed as a background feature and keep a low profile. The selection of external materials has been outlined in the elevations and the three dimensional renderings. The final selection should be made with care to balance the need for blending into the background, and having sufficient visual interest when seen from close range. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Dulwich Park	Greater London	E22/0116	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of kiosk unit in association with existing cafe Dulwich Park, Dulwich Park Cafe, College Road, London MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application. They have already written separately. I write on behalf of the London Historic Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (LHPGT). The LHPGT 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 LHPGT 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 LHPGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Dulwich Park is included as a grade II* in the HE Register and is also on the LHPGT Inventory: <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=SO_U025&amp;sitename=Dulwich+Park">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=SO_U025&amp;sitename=Dulwich+Park</a> This application seeks permission to erect a free-standing coffee kiosk to the left/east of the main café ('refreshment house' on the HE list entry). The kiosk will go on some existing hard-standing, currently occupied by bike stands. The bike stands will in turn be moved closer to the café building. It would have been helpful if the documentation on the planning portal</p>

					<p>had included a Heritage and Design assessment. Having consulted with the Friends of Dulwich Park, LHPGT understands that the contractors that operate the café, Colicci's, have consulted the community on the designs and position of the kiosk at Dulwich Park, which they believe to be a temporary measure. The Friends have indicated that placing the kiosk slightly away from the café is more appropriate than attaching it to the existing listed building, which would have affected the symmetry of the original design.</p> <p>The Dulwich Clock Café is very busy at weekends and long queues form. The temporary kiosk will allow Colicci's to trial serving people more quickly and prevent queues blocking the area around the café. The kiosk will be placed on the existing cycle racks stand and the cycle racks will be moved behind the café, which is likely to make the area more attractive.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, the LHPGT supports this planning application for a temporary kiosk on the following grounds:</p> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals respect the symmetry of the existing building and will improve the functionality of the space.</li> <li>• The cycle racks will be reprovisioned in an area which will improve the attractiveness of the landscape concealing them from view</li> <li>• This temporary arrangement will be reviewed after no more 3 years and further consultation undertaken.</li> </ul> <p>Should the designs prove a success we would urge a more complete assessment of the heritage impacts before giving approval for a permanent structure.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Helen Monger Director</p>
Regent's Park	Greater London	E22/0190	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a roof extension at the side and rear and partial conversion of existing plant room to provide 5no. self-contained flats together with private amenity space, cycle storage and refuse &amp; recycling facilities. Farley Court, Allsop Place,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and Gardens LPG). LPG 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 Historic England (HE)</p>

				<p>London, NW1 5LG RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. LPG 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 LPG’s Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a> ) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). As noted in the Heritage Statement accompanying this application, the proposals are near to Regent’s Park – Grade 1 in the HE Register. These proposals also fall within the Dorset Square Conservation Area. Dorset Square is a site on the LPG Inventory forming the setting of a number of Grade 2 listed buildings and itself protected by the 1931 London Squares Preservation Act. See: <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=WST027&amp;sitename=Dorset+Square">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=WST027&amp;sitename=Dorset+Square</a></p> <p>Based on the Heritage Statement submitted by the applicant, there appears to be negligible impact to the Dorset Square and its associated Conservation Area.</p> <p>However, LPG observes the proposals will impact on views towards from Regent’s Park (See Plates 5-6) increasing the mass and height behind the Grade 1 Nash/Burton Cornwall Terrace. As noted in the heritage statement “The park and buildings are such a complete and integrated composition, handled with absolute thoroughness, that all views from within the park have significance.”</p> <p>Part of the significance and designation of Regent’s Park is that it gives a sense of being in the country. The space is encircled by the palace-fronted terraces and punctuated by spires. Increasing the height and mass of Farley Court will disrupt the design intent of this historic landscape to give a sense of wellbeing and access to open space within this Royal Park. The LPG therefore objects to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The carefully designed historic setting of the Grade 1 Regent’s Park will be diminished by the disruption of the roofscape above Cornwall Terrace, leading to a decline in the amenity value and sense of open space currently afforded in this public park.</li> </ul> <p>Yours sincerely, Helen Monger</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Witley Court	Hereford and Worcester	E22/0148	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Remove existing roof coverings and repair. Repair parapet gutters</p> <p>Worcester Lodge Worcester Road Great Witley Worcester WR6 6JT</p> <p>REPAIR/RESRTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.05.2022</p> <p>This lodge, which is of very distinctive construction, is part of the entrance composition to Witley Court registered historic park and garden. The proposed repairs to the roof would not affect the registered park but clearly might have an effect the listed building and I presume your conservation officer will be looking into that.</p>
Bayfordbury <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Hertfords hire	E21/2188	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of agricultural land to create, archery range with creation of 42 parking spaces, erection of wooden clad storage structure/shelter and toilets. Installation of photovoltaic solar panels</p> <p>Bayford Hall Farm Bayford Lane Bayford Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8PR</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE TI RECONSULTATION 24.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the amendments to this application.</p> <p>We do not wish to alter our comments submitted on 24 March 2022 in light of these amendments.</p>
347 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0140	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>T1 Reduce 45ft Oak tree by 30%</p> <p>347 Knightsfield Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NB</p> <p>TREES</p> <p>OUTCOME 26.05.2022 Approved</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The application contains no information as to the reasons why this drastic pruning is considered necessary/desirable and no advice has been sought from the WHBC officers.</p> <p>The trees in this area of the town are part of the medieval Sherrardspark Wood, landscaped by Capability Brown in the 18th century and a part of the garden city aesthetic of the New Town. We consider that sufficient justification, on ground of health of the tree or Health &amp; Safety issues, should be supplied before this application is determined.</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E22/0219	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing house and outbuilding and erection of three, three bedroom detached dwellings with private amenity space, associated parking, new vehicular access and associated hard and soft landscaping works (resubmission following refusal of</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.</p> <p>25 North Cottages, Napsbury is the former North Lodge of the Napsbury Hopsital and was first planned along with the initial hospital designs in 1898 to act as an entrance and as part of the deliberate 'country estate' aesthetic required for this therapeutic facility. The style of the lodge, in an Arts &amp; Crafts idiom, contributes to the character of the area.</p> <p>The Lodge still fulfils its role as a marker at the northern edge of the drive and lies entirely within the Registered Landscape of Napsbury Hospital, one</p>



				5/2 25 North Cottages Napsbury St Albans Hertfordshire AL2 1Ap DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	of the first of this type of landscape recognised by English Heritage in 1998. The site also lies in the Green Belt adjoining the southern boundaries of St Albans city. The demolition of this property is contrary to the NPPF which encourages the 'sustaining and enhancing of the significance of heritage assets'. The loss of this significant element of the designed Registered landscape and the significant harm it would do to the reading of this landscape, would need substantial justification in terms of special circumstances and public benefits. There are no special circumstances submitted nor any public benefit. Further, the crowding of three houses onto the area occupied by this lodge is overdevelopment in the Green Belt and within this area of the historic parkland. We therefore object to this proposal
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E22/0224	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey mono pitch roof extension (following demolition of existing structure) and alterations to wall. 28 Lemsford Village Welwyn Garden City AL8 7TN BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We are disappointed with the basic Planning Statement which neglects to mention that Brocket Park is a Registered Landscape and that 28 Lemsford Village is within the setting of this heritage asset and of several listed buildings nearby and that any development at No 28 would affect the significance of the heritage assets. The fact that the historic wall has partly collapsed through neglect should not play any part in any decision as stated in NPPF 191. The NPPF 192a states that heritage assets should be conserved and enhanced. We consider that this application does not address the issue of the heritage assets and that. as there is no public benefit accruing from this development to weigh against harm, further information is required before determination.
2 Purdom Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0230	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of garage door and Installation of window and installation of new hardstanding for additional parking space 2 Purdom Road Welwyn Garden City Hertfordshire AL7 4FH MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments on the change of use from garage to kitchen/dining area. We do note however, that the replacement of the garage door with a window will affect the regular rhythm of the streetscape of this side of Purdom Road, and that there is a young tree planted in the verge between the road and the proposed new car parking space which should be relocated to prevent accidental damage, if this planning application is approved.

Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E22/0257	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two storey front extension, a first floor side extension and new garage following the demolition of the front utility room, with minor alterations to the front landscape and the creation of a new crossover 20 Roundwood Drive Welwyn Garden City Hertfordshire AL8 7JZ BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments on the proposed alterations to the building but are concerned about damage to the mature tree in the front garden. This is not mentioned in the planning application and the tree position on map PL07 makes it appear further from the proposed drive to the new garage than it is. Should permission be granted, a protection plan for the tree and its root system needs to be included both during construction and afterwards.
Hatfield House	Hertfords hire	E22/0269	I	PLANNING APPLICATION erection of two storey side extension, new front porch and external works to rear of property 120 Boundary Lane Welwyn Garden City Hertfordshire AL7 4DL BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments on the proposed alterations to the house but are concerned about the loss of the hedge on the west of the property. The planning application form states that no hedges will be affected by the work but the proposed plans show it to be replaced with a wooden panel fence. This area of Welwyn Garden City has many boundary hedges between the houses and round the greens, giving it a 'garden city' character. This local character would be adversely affected by the removal of the hedge.
196 Knightsfield, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0276	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of laurel bushes/hedges to be replaced either privet, hornbeam, yew or beech 196 Knightsfield Welwyn Garden City AL8 7RQ MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no objections to the laurel hedge being replaced by hornbeam, yew or beech.
Woodlands Vale Estate	Isle of Wight	E20/1540	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline for up to 50 residential dwellings (with details of access), creation of a new access off Puckpool Hill, and provision of public open space, landscaping and associated works (additional information available to view online - ecology report and	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Isle of Wight Gardens Trust (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. We responded to a previous application for this site on 21 January 2021 as

				<p>revised road widening and access plan) (readvertised application).  Land North Of Woodland Close  And Adjacent Cedar Lodge And  Thornton Cottage Puckpool Hill  Seaview Isle Of Wight  RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>follows:  'The site of this application is adjacent to the Woodlands Vale Estate which is shown on the National Heritage List as a Grade II Registered Park and Garden. However, there is no known documentary evidence that this site has ever been part of the historic Woodlands Vale Estate. It is located just north of the former walled kitchen garden of Woodlands Vale which has subsequently been built over and to the west of Cedar Lodge which itself has an interesting garden but is not on the national or local list for its parks and gardens interest.  We restrict our comments to those relating to the potential impact of the development of this site on the adjacent registered area. Having looked at the submitted information we have made the following conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The substantial existing tree belt between the area and Woodlands Vale provides significant visual screening between this site and the registered park. This is already protected under a Tree Preservation Order. This helps to reinforce the separation between the two areas.</li> <li>• The local topography and the level of existing mature trees and shrubs on site boundaries mean that the site is well contained and benefits from existing screening.</li> <li>• This latest iteration of the layout of the site includes a greater separation than originally shown with the closest proposed property being set back approximately 40 metres from an open area which is included as an attenuation basin.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, we do not believe there to be any adverse impact on the registered park and garden from the proposed development.  This site and the setting of the adjacent Woodlands Vale Registered Park and Garden could be further enhanced through some additional planting of evergreen parkland trees in the south-eastern corner of the site. We would ask the applicant to consider this as part of their proposals and recommend Cedrus libani, Pinus sylvestris and Taxus bacata as appropriate for this purpose.'</p> <p>We note that the present amended application states no trees or scrub to be removed and to be enhanced.  Yours faithfully  Vicky Basford</p>
Knole <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Kent	E22/0174	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Increase in height of boundary fence</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2022  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>

				West Heath School Ashgrove Road Sevenoaks Kent TN13 1SR BOUNDARY	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This application is a revision to 21/00497 which was for a green boundary fence 1800mm high. This application is retrospective as a black fence 2400mm high has been installed. The fence has also not been installed in the location shown on the original planning application, but this has now been amended by revised drawings on 24 May 2022.</p> <p>A colleague from the KGT has made a site visit and GT/KGT do not object to the installed boundary fence and prefer the black colour, as it lessens the visual impact on the surrounding AONB landscape and Historic Park and Garden. The Conservation Officer is of similar views. The increase in height is presumably to provide additional security to the school, but it is disappointing that the applicant has not provided an explanation for the change in this latest planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Hatch Park	Kent	E22/0197	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Replacement Cricket Pavilion (Resubmission of Application/Consent No.17/01923/AS) Mersham Le Hatch Cricket Club, Hythe Road, Smeeth, Kent SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2022</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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This is a resubmission of application 17/01923 when the KGT commented that they were in favour of the development subject to the recommendation of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Method Statement being followed. As the original response was some time ago, we repeat for ease of reference, that provided the recommendations contained in the document are implemented, then any risk of damage to the root systems of the mature trees will be minimal.</p> <p>We would however emphasise, that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Abbey Park	Leicestershire	E22/0188	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid planning application comprising:</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.05.2022</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</p>

			<p>Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings on site (excluding 2 chimneys and the façade of the 1865 OTB building), the retention and alteration of the southern façade of the 1865 building (OTB) the erection of new building to the rear to provide residential (UseClass C3) accommodation and/or commercial uses (Use Class E and F2).</p> <p>Outline planning application with all matters reserved for the erection of buildings to provide up to 1,143 dwellings (Classes C2 and C3), commercial uses (Classes E, F2 and Sui generis (public houses, wine bars, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways)), hotel (Use Class C1), a multi-storey car park and a pedestrian footbridge with associated landscaping, public realm and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Burleys Way, Corah Factory Site MAJOR HYBRID</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 Leicestershire Gardens Trust (LGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the extensive documentation accompanying this application in particular the excellent Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) by Locus. The application site is currently in poor condition and overdue for improvement and is substantially hidden from the Grade II* registered park and garden (PRG) of Abbey Park by the naturalized band of trees on the elevated embankment adjacent to the northern boundary of the canal separating the application site from the RPG. We concur with 3.3.57 in the HIA that the ‘derelict areas beyond to the north (of the site) create a highly unwelcoming area of townscape that actively discourages access to the park from the city centre.’</p> <p>Two options for development are offered, a low rise (Option 2) which is more intense on the site itself, or a high rise (Option 1) which would be marginally more visible from within the RPG. Barron’s design of the park focused internally with ‘no established or intended views outwards towards key eternal landmarks. As such, there are no designed views of the site and buildings within it which, including once expansive industrial complexes, were likely intentionally screened from view by planting along the earth bund running along the north of the canal.’ (HIA Para 3.3.55). Of the existing buildings, it is mainly the chimneys which were visible from within the RPG. We therefore welcome their retention along with the façade of the Old Textile Factory and the open space of Corah Green. Should your officers approve this application, the RPG will be drawn far more into the urban area of the city, especially with the inclusion of a new bridge, whereas it was formerly quite separate. This difference in emphasis of the relationship between the park and the application site is not necessarily a bad thing, but it will change the experience of the RPG. The wire frames provided within the HIA indicate that the visibility of the new buildings will not be substantially different to what currently exists, even if Option 1, the High Rise version, is chosen.</p> <p>On balance, the GT/LGT considers this to be a carefully thought-out scheme whose impact upon the RPG will be minimal. We would suggest that a condition is imposed to ensure that management of the wooded areas adjacent to the canal is an ongoing requirement in future.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Waterloo Park	Norfolk	E22/0092	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Hybrid (Part Full/Part Outline) application for the omprehensive redevelopment of Anglia Square, and car parks fronting Pitt Street and Edward Street for: up to 1,100 dwellings and up to 8,000sqm (NIA) flexible retail, commercial and other non-residential floorspace including Community Hub, up to 450 car parking spaces (at least 95% spaces for class C3 use, and up to 5% for class E/F1/F2/Sui Generis uses), car club spaces and associated works to the highway and public realm areas.</p> <p>Anglia Square Including Land And Buildings To The North And West Norwich</p> <p>MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. NGT is authorised to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. NGT also welcomes consultation on development affecting sites in Norfolk which are not registered but are nevertheless of significance and value.</p> <p>The importance of redevelopment of this site is acknowledged. The existing Anglia Square development is extensive, outdated and visually intrusive. Its removal and replacement with a major new development is a high priority and is long awaited. The principle of redevelopment is therefore supported. As you know, the GT objected to the previous application for this site, which included a tall tower block. The removal of the tower block from this scheme is acknowledged but should not, of itself, weigh in its favour. This new scheme must be considered on its own merits. The GT and the NGT object to the development now proposed because of its effect on views from Waterloo Park and St James Hill/Kett's Heights.</p> <p>Waterloo Park</p> <p>Waterloo Park is a Grade II* registered park to the north of Anglia Square. The applicant acknowledges that views across the park towards the city are of high sensitivity and susceptibility. They include a view of the cathedral. Photo montages are provided and the effect of the development is assessed by the applicant as "moderate- neutral". It is correct that the view of the prominent water tower on top of Sovereign House would go. However, the development fringing the southern side of the park is of a domestic scale. In that context and given the height and bulk of the 8 storey blocks which form part of the development is is considered that there would be moderate harm to views from Waterloo Park.</p> <p>St James Hill/Kett's Heights</p> <p>In the applicant's assessment these views are considered to be highly sensitive and susceptible. Photo montages are provided and the effect of the development judged to be "major-beneficial". Anglia Square features prominently in views from and near the Mottram Monument on St James</p>

					<p>Hill. It forms part of a highly important wider vista, perhaps the best view across the city, taking in the most iconic buildings of a Norwich. Views from most vantage points on Kett's Heights are limited by trees, although they would be more extensive in some seasons. The site is prominent when viewed from the Armada Beacon at the top of Kett's Heights.</p> <p>The removal of the existing Anglia Square development certainly provides the opportunity for major benefit to these views. The site is seen from St James Hill behind recent development off Barrack Street, which includes two mid-rise blocks. Nevertheless, the height and bulk of the proposed 8 storey blocks is of concern. The development would result in significant harm to these important views rather than, as the applicant asserts, providing a development sitting comfortably in the visual background.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In view of the harmful effects set out above it is recommended that revisions to the scheme be sought, including a reduction in the maximum building height. As it stands the scheme would fail to make the most of the opportunity offered by the redevelopment of this major site.</p>
Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan	Norfolk	E22/0209	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as a Statutory Consultee with regard to the Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan presubmission (Reg14) consultation. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. NGT is authorised to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. NGT also welcomes consultation on development affecting sites in Norfolk which are not registered but are nevertheless of significance and value.</p> <p>I should note that the consultation requirements document has a schedule of consultation contacts but it does not include The Gardens Trust (or NGT). We ask that our name be added to the list of consultation contacts. We strongly support Policy 21 and, in particular, the requirement that any planning or listed building consent application for works to a designated or nondesignated heritage asset will need to be supported by a Heritage Statement. We note the supporting document, NonDesignated Heritage Assessment, and welcome the detailing of such assets, especially as they relate to parks and gardens.</p> <p>We commend the protections that Policy 21 affords to both designated and nondesignated heritage assets.</p> <p>Final Comments</p>

					Q13. I am generally in favour of the Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan Yes
Lexham Hall	Norfolk	E22/0265	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Proposal to undertaken thinning of conifer and broadleaf species	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.05.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this matter. The Trust notes that the application is for the thinning of existing plantations by no more than 30% and will promote better stems for the remaining trees. Taking that into account the Trust does not object to the application. Yours Sincerely Mr Keri Williams Planning Adviser
Fishpond Wood, Risplith <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	North Yorkshire	E21/1895	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 5 (to allow for the permanent siting of the fixed tents but not in operation between 31st December and 1st March) and condition 6 (for the Managers accommodation to not be occupied between 31st December and 1st March) of planning permission 19/02600/FULMAJ - Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping. Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.05.2022 Thank you for reconsulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The area of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood is not on the Register. We refer you to our letter of 30th September 2019 responding to the earlier application: 19/02600/FULMAJ   Change of use of land to form camping site to include erection of 1 no. communal and 12 no. accommodation yurts, spa facility, managers lodge and associated facilities with parking and soft landscaping.   Land Known As Fishpond Wood Risplith North Yorkshire, in which we expressed our concerns. In that letter, we explained in some detail the significance of Eavestone Lake and Fishpond Wood. The application site is situated on land just off the B6265, c.9km to the west of Ripon, within the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The landscape shows signs of historic design with its sinuous lakes which have been dammed, high gritstone cliffs and accompanying careful planting and boathouse. We understand that the lakes may have been medieval fishponds for Fountains Abbey which is located c.5km to the east. In our letter of 17th February 2022, we noted that planning permission for this application was granted on the 12th November 2020 and we wrote the following: The Decision Notice for 19/02600/FULMAJ states: 5 The fixed tents, including the spa tent, shall be removed from the site



					<p>between 31 October to 1 April the following year.</p> <p>6 The managers accommodation hereby permitted shall not be occupied between 31 October to 1 April the following year.</p> <p>The reasons being:</p> <p>5 The provision of year-round residential accommodation would be unacceptable in this location.</p> <p>6 The provision of year-round residential accommodation would be unacceptable in this location.</p> <p>We also note the reason for condition 7:  ‘To provide adequate mitigation and compensation for the loss of habitat within the SINC and for the indirect impacts on the SINC of increased disturbance’.</p> <p>We are concerned that any extension of the period of operation must result in increased disturbance for the SINC and result in added risk to the beauty and tranquility of the lake and this part of the AONB.</p> <p>Our objections remain to the above proposed Variations from the Decision Notice for 19/02600/FULMAJ.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Museum Gardens, York	North Yorkshire	E22/0151	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extension to existing boundary fence with single and double access gates and installation of polytunnel</p> <p>St Marys Lodge Marygate York YO30 7BH</p> <p>BOUNDARY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.05.2022</p> <p>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 &amp; 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.</p> <p>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. On the west side of Museum Gardens, the boundary is formed by the crenellated wall of St Mary’s Abbey precinct (listed grade I), the Gatehall and St Mary’s Lodge which are also listed grade I.</p> <p>This application is for a 25m long area against the Abbey Walls south- west of St Mary’s Lodge. The polytunnel will take up 7.6m of the length and is proposed to be 3m wide and 2m high. The proposed site will, in effect,</p>

					<p>extend an existing working area that is hidden by planting, as is the proposed site.</p> <p>The fencing and hedge are 1.4m high, the three trees are to be retained and as there will not be any groundworks any archaeology should be unaffected. We had some concerns that the polytunnel may be visible between the Abbey Wall crenellations (not mentioned in the application) but have noted that there is a significant drop to ground level to Marygate outside the wall, so visibility is unlikely.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application and consider that the proposals will improve the gardens both visually and practically.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Cricket House	Somerset	E22/0083	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing Cottages and part of the existing factory and the erection of two extensions to provide additional Production and Warehouse space Manor Farm, Lubborn Cheese Ltd Windwhistle Cricket St Thomas Chard TA20 4BZ (GR:336619/107886) DEMOLITION, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.05.2022</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 Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) and our colleague Julian Gibbs from the SGT made a site visit recently which informs this joint response. We have separately submitted a response for 22/00843/FUL.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the fine examples of early 19th century vernacular Home Farm buildings around the courtyard were not included in the listing at the first change of use when the farm became industrial. Loss of these buildings would be extremely regrettable and we would have preferred that they were re-purposed for further offices, storage or similar, as their destruction will destroy the remaining character of this corner of the landscape. The current cheese business moved to the premises approximately 20 years and its success has necessitated the need for expansion which has resulted in an overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>One of the cottages is near derelict but there are other buildings including a barn around the courtyard, all due for demolition, to be replaced by a huge building for production and warehousing. We note that the roof of this structure has been kept to the level of the other factory buildings. 22/00771/FUL relates to a metal clad drainage covering shed which we understand was intended to be timber. Although, this structure lies on the more prominent side of the drive we consider that it could be planted out</p>

					<p>with thorns and actually is fairly de minimis.</p> <p>In our opinion, both the application site and indeed the whole landscape needs a proper planting conservation plan. There is a small area reserved in the present plan for planting but species and detail are not provided. We would request that should your officers decide to approve these applications, a long-term plan is produced as a condition for this site. Currently the large production area is well hidden by maturing Cupressus but these will start to fall apart in the next 20 years. A landscape plan is essential to provide continuity of screening and we feel that there is scope for considerably more planting within the site as well.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0119	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for shopfront alteration to align with occupier requirements</p> <p>Unit 311-312 Trentham Retail Village Stone Road</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposed development within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The application site is within the modern retail development at Trentham Gardens. The proposed works will have no impact upon the appearance or significance of the heritage assets. The Trusts raise no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0120	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The retention of five dining pods, a catering service unit and associated access and landscaping.</p> <p>Land To The West Of The Italian Gardens Tea Rooms Stone Road</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>Trentham Gardens is a nationally significant historic landscape the design of which has evolved and still contains elements from the Middle Ages</p>

					<p>onwards. One of the key defining features is the Italianate Parterre Garden, laid out in the 1830s to the design of Sir Charles Barry as the frontispiece to the then newly remodelled Trentham Hall, and forerunner of a new style of landscape gardening. Historically the parterre formed a self contained unit in the park, its open rectangular form aligned on the axis between the house and lake and enclosed by the rose arbour on the east and a screen of yew trees on the west was renowned for its displays of carpet bedding. The application site lies immediately to the west of and at a slightly higher level than the Parterre Garden. The picnic pods which it is sought to retain were erected under temporary permitted development powers during the COVID pandemic and can be seen from and across the parterre. Although their bulbous glazed form is at first sight incongruous within this context the majority of the units have been partially set back within the surrounding yew trees which, together with the angled alignment of the new access path, mitigates their impact on the historic landscape. When the writer visited the site with the applicants and your Council's conservation officer in December 2021 it was suggested that additional screen planting around the easternmost unit (closest to the parterre) would be advantageous as would a softening of the path junction and borders. Although the applicants were understood to have agreed to these slight revisions to the existing arrangements they do not appear in the current application. Perhaps the applicants could be reminded of this and encouraged to amend the submitted scheme.</p> <p>Although the Trusts would have preferred for there to be no modern development within the context of the Parterre this development is not considered to cause unacceptable harm to the significance of either the conservation area or the grade II* RPG. Subject therefore to the minor modification to the proposals suggested in the previous paragraph the Trusts do not object to this application.</p> <p>Your sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0171	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Two Storey Front Extension - Removal of Existing Conservatory and Erection of a Two Storey Side Extension - Internal alterations</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.05.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to</p>

				<p>Keepers Cottage Newcastle Road Knowl Wall BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>Trentham Gardens is a nationally significant historic landscape the design of which has evolved and still contains elements from the Middle Ages onwards.</p> <p>The application site lies towards the south-west corner of the park in an area known historically as “The New Park” which was added to the wider estate in the 1720s (although previously it may have lain within the medieval deer park).</p> <p>As the 2013 conservation area appraisal document notes this part of the park lies beyond the north-south ridge which separates the ornamental parts of the historic landscape to the east from the more agricultural area sloping down towards the M6 and has few features of designed landscape significance.</p> <p>Keppers Cottage is a mid 19th century estate cottage in the characteristic “Trentham Estate” style with blue-brindle brick elevations (presumably once limewashed), Staffordshire blue clay tiled roof and faux timber framing in the gable end. The siting of the dwelling suggests it was designed to be viewed looking southwards across the New Park. The house has been unsympathetically altered in modern times with installation of plain glazed windows and unbalanced rear rooftop dormer. The proportions of the north (front elevation) have remained relatively unchanged maintaining the significance of the dwelling as a feature in views across the park.</p> <p>The Trusts do not object in principle to extending the property but object to the submitted scheme which will enlarge what was historically a simple estate cottage still retaining something of its original proportions into a bland suburban style house. This will be out of keeping with its position in the RPG and conservation area and be harmful to the significance of the heritage assets. The loss of the remaining faux timber framed gable is regrettable; it is disappointing that no works are proposed to enhance the south elevation. It is a concern that this application for work in a sensitive heritage location is not supported by either a Design or Heritage Statement in which the architect could have assessed the historic context of the dwelling and set out his justification for the proposed design.</p> <p>The Trusts suggest that the harmful impact of the proposed two storey extension might be mitigated by reducing its width and lowering the ridge line thus breaking the visual mass of the enlarged property without</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>compromising the desired accommodation. Although the proposed large glazed gable faces west away from the core historic park it does not sit comfortably on an older property in the historic landscape. It would be preferable to reduce its dimensions and visual impact. A design change to facilitate this might offer an opportunity to reintroduce some mock timbering as a reflection of the original character of the property.</p> <p>Your sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Bawdsey Manor	Suffolk	E22/0149	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey garage. Garage to be constructed of a reinforced ground bearing floor slab, steel frame and composite cladding panels. To the external grounds, creation of concrete pathway 3000mm x 600mm leading to the garage from the road. Creation of a shingle pathway 600mm wide around the perimeter of the garage structure.</p> <p>Maritime And Coastguard Store, Bawdsey Manor Estate, Bawdsey MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.05.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We are responding to both these applications together as they are on the same site and could potentially have a cumulative negative impact upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Bawdsey Manor and other heritage assets.</p> <p>The museum is a utilitarian early 20th century former defence building in the middle of the registered parkland but obviously has great historical significance and is listed at grade II*. It is difficult to establish from the online documentation exactly what is currently within the application area. The plans indicate that there is an additional structure, unexplained, to the south of the mast and linked to it, which is not the same as the structure in the 2012 plans. Although the mast site is some distance from the main 'garden' area of the RPG the Heritage Statement does not include any views of the application site or views from Bawdsey Manor itself to the application site.</p> <p>In 2013 when the 'temporary' structures were first given consent, Robert Scrimgeour, Suffolk Coastal District Council's Senior Design and Conservation Officer commented 'The new building will hardly enhance the Registered Park not the Transmitter Block and I do feel strongly that we should avoid any degree of permanency associated with these functional and unattractive structures; and also avoid any aggregating effect of proliferating structures.' We entirely concur with these comments. The structures on the site certainly neither enhance the RPG or the Transmitter Block and should in our opinion definitely be regarded as</p>

					<p>strictly temporary, with a defined life. They have already been in situ for 9 years. If the Coastguard need further buildings we would suggest they undertake an analysis of future requirements and prepare a Masterplan to ensure that any additional structures will accord with their sensitive setting.</p> <p>We would like to understand the justification for additional structures and ask that the applicant demonstrate the visual impact the temporary structures and the proposed new garage have on the heritage assets.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Honington Hall <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	Warwicks hire	E21/2141	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a garden office along with the removal and replacement of an asbestos shed. Park View , Honington, Shipston On Stour, CV36 5AA . MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.05.2022 Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the above application. We have no further comments to add to our original response of 23rd March 2022. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Bretton Hall <b>RECONSULTATION</b>	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</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.05.2022 Further to our letter of 1st April, thank you for your e-mails of 27th April with revised plans and Mr Finch's notes on the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust's concerns explained in that letter of 1st April. Thank you also Mr Finch for the response to our subsequent queries about the North-west car park and the oak and London plane trees. a. Camellia House: Mr Finch's Notes: Windows and doors: following further survey, these are seen to be capable of restoration and works of repair have now been completed. Pathways: the revised plan attached shows a revised curved link path between the House and the Mansion. If this is acceptable to all including, of course the Council, we can arrange for the plan to be substituted. GT/YGT: We agree. b.&amp;c. Orangery: Mr Finch's Notes: There is a maternity bat roost in this location and for nature conservation reasons, as a statutorily protected species, the existing roof arrangements have to be retained (modified in so far as necessary). GT/YGT: Understand the problem and conservation of the bats; but unfortunate. d. Car parking: Mr Finch's Notes: The additional area of car parking to the north-west is as consented and is annotated on the</p>

					<p>masterplan as 'proposed'. It is not intended to advance this element in the initial phase of work however.</p> <p>His further note to our query: The car park was approved on the original 12/01524/HYB decision, granted 18 April 2013, copy attached. The car park has been designed to work around the existing trees with no-dig construction methods being used as appropriate. I have attached the Constraints Plan and the Master Plan from that submission. There are other elements that have changed since though as far as I am aware, that particular car park design has been constant. It was originally designed to be a staff car park and as I said in my previous email, its delivery does not feature in the planned works at the moment. The revised and current Master Plan submission simply reflects the consent.</p> <p>GT/YGT: Thank you for the explanation.</p> <p>e. Oak and London Plane: Mr Finch's Notes: This area has been re-considered and following further input from The Landscape Agency, the Site Plan has been updated to respect these two specimens and their root protection zones.</p> <p>GT/YGT: We are pleased that this has been re-considered and the trees will be protected.</p> <p>f. Trees to the south of the Mansion: Mr Finch's Notes: These trees are all rated as Category C trees and with species which are inappropriate for this sensitive location. If practical they could potentially be relocated and this is something that could be considered by the landscape contractor at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>GT/YGT: There should be a survey of the trees, and a plan in advance, of which ones are to be retained and which should be relocated. We advise that the survey and plan should be done by your advisor, The Landscape Agency. Suitable areas for the relocated trees should also be identified in advance. This is not something to be left to the contractor 'on the day' to decide.</p> <p>g. Marquees Mr Finch's Notes: Temporary marquee consents are governed by the previous consenting which showed marquee locations A1, A2 and A3 around the Mansion. Locations A2 and A3 have been removed from the revised arrangements leaving only location A1 for occasional event use. The use, frequency and design of this single marquee can be limited by planning condition. The ability to use this area for occasional marquees is important as part of the business plan needs and fulfilling potential larger events and wedding</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p>markets, without further disruption to the Mansion House itself, and would be temporary in nature so as to respect the integrity of the landscape and views of the historic buildings.</p> <p>GT/YGT: We remain dismayed about the marquee in location A1. We have two concerns: the length of time that the marquee will be in place. Will the marquee be in situ virtually permanently or erected on an as and when needed basis? Secondly the colour. White will be at odds with this sensitive location. The outer shell needs to be more muted to try and blend in with the house.</p> <p>h. Office locations Mr Finch's Notes: These are shown in their consented locations.</p> <p>GT/YGT: We understand this, but our concerns remain.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---