



## CONSERVATION CASEWORK LOG NOTES JUNE 2022

The GT conservation team received 208 new cases and re-consultations for England and five for Wales in June. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 74 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Newton Park	Avon	E22/0305	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Restoration of historic First Pool at Newton Park First Pond Bath Spa University Campus Newton St Loe Bath Bath And North East Somerset	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Newton Park. 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. Restoration of the First Pool at Newton Park would restore a lost feature that was part of the original design by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and the subject of one of Humphry Repton's proposed enhancements in 1797. Avon Gardens Trust consider that the restoration would enhance the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden as well as providing mitigation to the issue of silting to the Upper Lake. The Trust notes that an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been provided and assume that the measures set out in the Statement would be made the subject of a planning condition should consent be granted. The submitted Heritage Statement mentions at

					<p>paragraph 4.2 ii that there is the potential for remnant structures to survive under the silt of the Pool and the Trust expects that the excavation of the silt would be carried out under the supervision of an archaeologist. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust have no objection to this application subject to appropriate measures in respect of tree protection and archaeological supervision during construction.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Kay Ross MA.  Chair, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Wrest Park	Bedfordshire	E22/0226	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline Application: Erection of up to 3,750 residential units (Use Class C3); up to 80 extra care apartments (Use Class C2); care / nursing home of up to 70 bedrooms (Use Class C2); creation of a new local centre including provision of up to 600 sqm of retail floorspace (Use Class E(a) or E(b)), up to 12,000 sqm of employment floorspace (Use Class E(g)), health centre (Use Class E(e)) and community building (Use Class F.2(b)); provision of a Nursery, 4FE Primary School and 7FE Secondary School, including Sixth Form facilities (Use Class F.1(a)); provision of additional Nursery and 3FE Primary School (Use Class F.1(a)) and community building (Use Class F.2 (b)); provision of an Electric Vehicle Charging Station (Sui Generis); provision of landscaped communal amenity space including children's play space and sports facilities; creation of</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.06.2022</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>As is stated in the documentation accompanying this application, the Gardens Trust responded to the original withdrawn application CB/21/A02011/OUT and objected to those earlier proposals. We have considered the new application and continue to strongly object for many of the same reasons.</p> <p>Despite the application site having been repeatedly put forward for consideration in the local authority's Call for Sites in 2014, 2016, 2017 and 2018, it was not allocated for any development in the Local Plan due primarily to the impact development here would have on a site of the highest heritage value, the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Wrest Park and its numerous listed structures.</p> <p>In addition, part of the site lies within the Green Belt – specifically put in place to 'assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment' (NPPF Para 138c). Development here would harm the openness of the green belt contrary to national policy and mass housing does not conform to the usual types and density of building within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The applicant suggests that the new way of calculating housing needs – the 2020 Standard Method - (which postdates the system applied during the creation of the current Local Plan) indicates that rather than there being a surplus of 5406 homes, there is instead a shortfall. The method of calculation of housing need is irrelevant as the current Local Plan including housing numbers and sites has been approved by the Planning Inspector and adopted by the Central Bedfordshire Council. Regardless of whichever method is used, the bottom line is that this area is not allocated in the</p>

			<p>new publicly accessible woodland comprising up to 32 hectares; creation of solar park comprising up to 16 hectares; together with associated highways (including dualled section of A6), landscaping, drainage and utilities works. All matters reserved except for details of access to and from the A6, Higham Road and Gravenhurst / Barton Road.</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessment Greenwoods, Land North of Higham Road and East of the A6 Bedford Road, Barton Le Clay, Bedfordshire</p>	<p>Local Plan for housing or indeed any development, it lies partially within the Green Belt and is adjacent to one of the most important groupings of heritage assets in the country. The sheer quantity of these are graphically shown in Figure 2.7 of the Planning Statement. Therefore, the application fails to meet the criteria set out in Paras 147, 148, 149 and 151 of the NPPF merely in terms of the Green Belt before we even consider the impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>In our original letter we asked for photomontages/wireframes showing the proposals from within Wrest Park. The only viewpoint within the RPG is No 23 taken from the upper floor of Wrest Park mansion itself. Even though the formal garden itself is inward-looking, this is not representative of the larger site (which the RPG includes, eg. the old deer park and the trackway from Upper Gravenhurst to the house), external views are also key here. Cain Hill lies to the East and the rural land backing the Archer Pavilion is also crucial to the setting not only of the RPG and the pavilion but also for the distant views from the house. The woodland to the south of the Grade I Archer Pavilion contains a considerable amount of ash which is vulnerable to Ash dieback within the next few years, thinning the existing canopy. In a local decision (APP/D3505/W/19/3230839) a planning inspector emphasised that limited reliance should be placed on the ability of planting to screen views of developments, given the variability of such planting. In order to fulfil even a partial screening role, trees and associated dense undergrowth must be managed and maintained permanently by the long-term implementation of a management plan. Even with such a management plan in place we remain unconvinced that the development will not result in urbanising, physical form at the edge of the RPG being prominent, even if filtered to some degree, from within the RPG, negatively affecting its significance.</p> <p>This southern wooded boundary of Wrest Park adjoining the proposed Greenwoods development is an area of high flood risk, so we are doubly concerned that firstly if the delicate water balance is disturbed by the building work it could adversely affect the existing designated heritage assets and the woodland, but it would also make it harder to establish new trees to mitigate the effect of the huge development. Recent restoration of Wrest Park included hydrological work to restore the historic water table, which had been affected by silting up of the waterways, and adversely affected the root systems of the yews and other trees within the park. Should the large quantity of housing be permitted, the character of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>setting of the RPG will be permanently changed and become urbanised. This will be accompanied by night time light emissions, both static and moving, increasing light pollution. The tranquillity of the site, so important to its setting as a country estate, would also be lost. We consider that the impact of the proposals would be contrary to Para 199 of the NPPF.</p> <p>We also have strong concerns that should this development be allowed, the ancient woodland of Buckle Grove would be placed under considerable extra recreational pressure, stressing the trees which could require additional thinning to manage the wider paths and clearings, all reducing that element of the tree screen. Your officers will be aware of the document : Planning for Ancient Woodland (PAW).  <a href="https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/media/3731/planners-manual-for-ancient-woodland.pdf">https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/media/3731/planners-manual-for-ancient-woodland.pdf</a></p> <p>One of the three guiding principles compiled from The Standing Advice and professional good practice, which should guide both site selection and the subsequent design of development, relates to Biodiversity Net Gain. 'DEFRA consulted on the concept of implementing biodiversity net gain in December 2018. The Chancellor subsequently confirmed in his 2019 Spring Statement 'that new developments must deliver an overall increase in biodiversity''. (PAW p11) Irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woods and veteran trees 'must never be included in net gain calculations and that mitigation and compensation measures must not form part of the considerations in making planning decisions. ... Impacts on irreplaceable habitat always results in net loss. These impacts cannot be offset elsewhere. Where ancient woodland or veteran trees are lost or damaged there will always be net loss of biodiversity and it is impossible to secure net gain.' (PAW p11) Relevant biodiversity enhancement is supported in Paras 174d, 179b and especially 180c of the NPPF : 'development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons').</p> <p>Your officers will also be familiar with 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). On p2 of SHA it states that 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.’ It goes on to say (p5) ‘While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site’s visual boundary.’</p> <p>The Gardens Trust strongly objects to the proposals and urges your officers to refuse this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E22/0006	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 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 Burwood House , Taplow Common Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2022</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 GT/BGT previously objected to an earlier, similar application (PL/19/4100/FA) in April 2020 and appreciate the efforts that the applicants have subsequently made to address our concerns about the construction of a new house in such a sensitive setting. Having reviewed the current documentation, the GT/BGT have no objection in principle to the submitted designs for a new house, but it should NOT be positioned within the RPG. A site within the RPG is not appropriate for such a landmark building, or indeed any new structures/development other than refurbishment of the Walled Garden to bring in back into horticultural use, within this little damaged parkland valley, and so our objections to the revised site remain. The revised site would still be prominent from the parkland and particularly in dynamic views along the south drive. We suggest alternative options in the area to the west, in the current garden but outside the RPG, to include visual mitigation in the views particularly from the south drive with proposed and future ancillary structures positioned on the site of the existing house.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office
Denham Place	Buckinghamshire	E22/0202	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of former stables building to ancillary living space with changes to doors and windows; construction of outdoor swimming pool The Clock House, Denham Place, Village Road, Denham, Buckinghamshire, UB9 5BL	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022 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 joint response. We have considered the online documentation but have unfortunately been unable to make a site visit so this response is the result of a desk based assessment. The Heritage Letter from Alax Baxter Associates is very helpful as are the axonometric drawings provided in the landscape design documentation. Denham is a Grade II listed registered park and garden (RPG) and the Stables receive a considerable mention in the listing " The stables (listed grade II) lie 75m south-east of the house; said to be C17 (Pevsner 1994), they are not shown on the 1705 painting and possibly were constructed after the 1770s' landscaping from C17 bricks reused from the earlier stables to the south-west of the house which were removed at this time. The red-brick building is constructed around a small, east-facing, three-sided courtyard, with a brick wall closing the court on the east side. A semi-circular arched carriageway runs through the west range with a wooden cupola above, with ornamental features on the west side including a pediment, Diocletian windows and blind arches flanking the archway below, presumably designed to be seen from the park on the west side. Adjacent to the east side of the stables lies a courtyard bounded to the south and east by the estate boundary wall, with lean-to coach houses attached, and the main (originally service) entrance. South of the stables a small, enclosed area is bounded to the south and east by the boundary wall, running down to the river where it emerges from beneath the Old Bridge before disappearing under the wall." Whilst the main part of the gardens and landscape is to the west side of the Stables and not the East/application site side, the area proposed for the conversion is a historic service area, so the amendments would be at variance with this historic character. (They are keeping the historic doors and glazing the entrances but will have the doors to close over). The proposed pool is screened behind an existing yew hedge (we are unaware of how tall this is) and behind that a thicket of existing trees.

					<p>Whilst the site is likely to be mostly hidden during the day, at night we have concerns that the light emittance from the buildings and around the pool will adversely impact upon the hitherto darkened area of the RPG and its immediate surroundings.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Formal Gardens at Stockgrove House	Buckinghamshire	E22/0365	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of barn Land At Stockgrove Park Soulbury Buckinghamshire LU7 0BB</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2022</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 Gardens Trust notes that a previous application 21/02786/APP was refused by the LPA and that this is a revised application for a barn in a different location. The applicant has addressed some of our original objections by removing the rooflights from the proposed structure and relocating the proposed structure to reduce the impact on the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>The Heritage Officer's report identified a better location for the proposed barn within the landscape "It is recommended that this option is more fully explored by the applicant, including moving the siting of position 4 further to the east, so as to form a closer relationship with the existing built development and to avoid encroachment into the open pastureland." As the proposed site in this application appears to be 'position 4' we assume the LPA considers that the new application site is appropriate. Therefore, the Gardens Trust has no objection to this application on condition that glazing and rooflights are not introduced at a later date.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mentmore Towers	Buckinghamshire	E22/0375	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of first floor balcony to side of dwelling. Spinney Barn Crafton Lodge Road Crafton Mentmore Buckinghamshire LU7 0QJ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the above inquiry. Neither the GT or the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) were consulted on the original application (21/00874/APP - Erection of first floor balcony to side of dwelling. Spinney Barn, Crafton Lodge Road, Crafton, Mentmore,</p>

					<p>Buckinghamshire LU7 0QJ). The BGT's local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have reviewed the documentation relating to the application and consider that the proposals would damage the historic character and appearance of the Grade II* Mentmore registered park &amp; garden (RPG). The site is in a prominent position at the termination of one of the two most important approaches to Mentmore Park, and close to one of the former main entrances. There has already been considerable alteration in this area. An additional balcony structure on a visible elevation adjacent to the road and close to the former entrance would worsen the damage to the historic character. We therefore object to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Cheadle Royal Hospital	Cheshire	E22/0308	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of the site to provide 27 residential dwellings with associated access, landscaping and parking rovision. 100 Cheadle Royal Hospital, Nurses Home , Wilmslow Road, Heald Green, Cheadle, Stockport, SK8 3DG</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.06.2022</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 Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response concerning the detailed application for new housing which has a material impact on the significance of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Cheadle Royal Hospital. The inclusion of this site on the national register is a material consideration.</p> <p>Cheadle Royal Hospital and its designated area was registered in 1998 and the hospital itself in Oct 1994. The hospital was seen as a rare and important institutional landscape of national significance and was used as a prime example of an increasingly rare landscape typology. This point cannot be overstated. EH used the hospital within its marketing leaflets for several years. The Register of Parks and Gardens should not be compared directly with the register for listed structures as there was a change in approach to the listing of parks and gardens at the time. Listed parks and gardens were to be limited in numbers and reflect a tougher selection criterion than structures. Cheshire has 24 listed parks and gardens, of which 9 are in the historic county of Cheshire. English Heritage (1996) stated that there were more than 400 parks and gardens within the county of historic interest. As such, parks and gardens on the register are highly selective and restrictive.</p>



					<p>Cheadle Royal Hospital, originally the Manchester Royal Hospital for the Insane, sits within a Grade II registered mid-19th century landscape of park and gardens (RPG). Its original 280 acres has been significantly reduced and encroached with later housing developments as well as buildings and car parking related to current use. It does, however, retain key garden and spatial components which are contemporary to the original layout and a significant number of mature trees. An understanding of the parkland and gardens is shown within the English Heritage (EH) listing description. It is worth re-stating these points as they are fundamental reasons for the listing of the parkland and gardens: 'One of the chief [sic] of the indirect remedial means of treating mental disease is a cheerful, well-arranged building, in a well-selected situation, with spacious grounds for husbandry, and gardening, and exercise. As built the hospital had thirty acres of meadow and eleven acres of arable land, two-and-a-half acres of kitchen garden, and five acres of flower gardens with avenues, shrubberies and gravelled walks.' Patients were involved in gardening, planning, improvements to the grounds and areas for recreation.</p> <p>There have been several applications which the Trust has commented upon regarding development on the Cheadle Royal site, most recently related to St. Anne's Hospice (DC/076341). The Trust supported this application although it had some concerns; however, the Trust felt that the developmental impact was offset by public benefit and fulfilled an import need within the area. We are not convinced by the argument that increased housing is necessarily for public benefit, but rather for financial gain. Application DC/068368 (2018) for two new buildings to increase capacity for the hospital met with an objection from the Trust due to its irreversible impact on the historic fabric. This development would have been more appropriate on the site of the current application.</p> <p>The submitted Heritage Statement has a strong focus on the existing and derelict nurses' home, but less so in terms of the RPG. Policy SIE-1 identifies the need for a 'high regard to the built environment...Specific account of the sites characteristics, including landform, landscape, views or vistas...'. Other policies support the need for considered action when dealing with Cheadle Royal's historic landscape: Policy SIE-3 Protecting, Safeguarding and Enhancing the Environment; Policy HC1.3 Special Control of Development in Conservation Areas; HC4.1 Development of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest.</p> <p>There are several issues with this application, and as such the GT/CGT</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>object to the proposed development on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development is not support Stockport Council Core Strategy Policy CS8</li> <li>• It fails to enhance the significance of the heritage assets as stated in NPPF</li> <li>• Substantial harm and permanent loss will impact on the historic fabric and spatial form</li> <li>• The Trust sees this development as inappropriate in terms of its scale, nature and irreversible impact</li> </ul> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Arley Hall	Cheshire	E22/0441	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extension of hardstanding on area of existing car park and associated landscaping; Arley Hall, Arley Park, Cheshire CW9 6LZ.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.06.2022</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 Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The significance of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Arley lies not only in its rich assemblage of buildings and gardens, but also in its intact and unspoilt parkland. The parkland provides the setting and is an important part of the character and approach.</p> <p>We are delighted that Arley is experiencing increased visitors and that the gardens are being enjoyed by a wider audience. We appreciate that this, together with increased use for filming, means that additional parking is required. Extension of the existing parking area, which formerly served farm visitors, appears to be an easy option, but we do have concerns that this will, if permitted, have a negative visual impact on the character and significance of the designed landscape, particularly on the southern approach to Arley Hall and gardens. The increased visibility of parked vehicles in the open parkland would be harmful to the quality and character of the designed landscape.</p> <p>The submitted plans do not show how the further extension would relate to the existing car park, how the whole area would be used, how many cars/coaches it would accommodate, and how the circulation would work. In practice, there might need to be additional marker posts, fencing to exclude grazing animals and perhaps some signs to guide visitors. The existing car park extension already breaks up the open parkland with a</p>

					<p>clutter of fencing, posts, notices and hut and is not a good precedent. Have alternative locations in close proximity to the hall, but outside the RPG, been considered, or any alternative treatments of the proposed site been assessed? Although the application area has historically been open, the parkland to the west of the access drive has clearly been altered quite a lot over the years, so further changes such as a substantial belt of new tree planting around the proposed car park, to tie in as well as possible with existing planting could be considered? Radbroke Hall, Barclays Bank HQ, to the south of Knutsford has well-thought out parking arrangements with a generous amount of space for lines or groups of trees amongst the parking. Something similar, breaking up the parking into cells within a woodland setting, with the more peripheral areas remaining as stabilised grass, could work here. The old maps of Arley (I am afraid I wasn't sure if this comment related to Arley or Radbroke so you may well need to change/delete my sentence) show ponds within the existing woodland belt, and also within the parkland. The proposals could also include a new pond within the extended parking area to provide some further biodiversity gain in keeping with landscape character.</p> <p>We would like to stress that we wish to support everyone at Arley who has worked so hard to welcome visitors during the pandemic, and to continue their successful enterprise. My colleagues in the CGT would be happy to work together with the applicants to find a more sensitive solution which will achieve these aims, without degrading part of the designed landscape which is Arley's unique selling point</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Elvaston Castle	Derbyshire	E22/0331	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for the conversion and extension of buildings to provide commercial, recreational and educational uses, and the demolition of a section of retaining wall Elvaston Castle Country Park, Borrowash Road, Elvaston, Derby, DE72 3EP</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022</p> <p>The above listed building consent application has been brought to our attention yesterday and we are surprised that your officers failed to consult The Gardens Trust (GT) as we responded very fully to CD9/0222/34 which included a new access drive and car park alongside the work to the buildings listed above.</p> <p>As we were not notified, and we can see that the date for responses expired on 4th June, we have had no time whatsoever to put together a suitable response. The above application relates solely to the buildings side of the widespread plans for Elvaston. Therefore, due to the lack of time for a targeted response to SDDC's application details, I am copying below our</p>

				<p>previous response to Derbyshire County Council which we sent on 24th April 2022. This includes a considerable amount of comment on the impact which the new road will have on the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Elvaston Castle. Your officers will be able to extrapolate the appropriate comments which relate directly to DMPA/2022/0318, but will also appreciate our thoughts as to the impact the entire project is likely to have upon this important RPG..</p> <p>Letter to Derbyshire CC :</p> <p>Ref : CD9/0222/34 – Conversion and extension of existing buildings to commercial use, and construction of access drive and car park; Elvaston Castle Country Park, Borrowwash Road, Elvaston, DE72 3EP</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 beyond the boundary of the RPG. The HS (Paras 4.2 &amp; 4.3) refers to the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>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 rural sweep of encircling farmland can be glimpsed. This sets it apart from</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>many other more open designed landscapes where extensive views draw in surrounding land, making it appear as a seamless extension of the designed landscape. 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.</p> <p>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 the project (mentioned within the Environmental Statement Vol 1) with reference to the conversion of the Dog Kennels into holiday</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>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  <a href="https://www.futureelvaston.co.uk/current-">https://www.futureelvaston.co.uk/current-</a></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 the proposals on the RPG. 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	E22/0350	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Submission of reserved matters for the erection of 550 dwellings, strategic landscaping and POS and associated infrastructure following the approval of outline application AVA/2019/0297 (This proposal may affect the setting of the Mackworth Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings and the setting of Kedleston Hall Historic Park and Garden)</p> <p>Land Boarded By Ashbourne Road And Radbourne Lane Ashbourne Road Mackworth Derby Derbyshire</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.06.2022</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>This is the second (detailed) part of an application first made in 2019 (AVA/2019/0297) to which we objected strongly at the time.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the explicit recognition included at the time within the officer's report on this proposal, that it would cause harm to the setting of the Grade I Registered Kedleston Park and Garden and hence to its Significance, and that moreover the proposal was outwith the then Local Plan, it is regrettable that Amber Valley's Councillors appear nonetheless to have decided that the Setting of Kedleston no longer has merit or validity within the planning system as regards applications of this kind. Outline permission for this development was thus granted, subject to a number of Conditions and a Section 106 Agreement (dated December 2021), none of which are likely to be of any benefit to the Setting of Kedleston Park or to mitigate the effects of this development.</p> <p>We are further similarly troubled by reports that an even larger housing development is currently being discussed for adjacent areas, which again, if</p>



					<p>allowed, will be clearly visible from the Registered Park area of Kedleston Park and will further cause damage to its Setting and hence to its Significance.</p> <p>We wish to put on record our grave disappointment at the current decision and have nothing further to add to our previous comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Arlington Court	Devon	E22/0191	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building consent for re-roofing the outbuildings and undertaking essential repairs or replacement to the decayed timber structure</p> <p>Arlington Court Arlington Barnstaple Devon EX31 4LP</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above applications which affect Arlington Court, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to statutory consultations in the County of Devon. In addition, and in conjunction with The Gardens Trust, Devon Gardens Trust may comment on proposals affecting sites included on the Devon Gazetteer of historic designed landscapes of local and regional significance.</p> <p>We have examined the documents relating to these linked applications on your Authority's website, and are satisfied that the proposals, will not have any adverse impact on the historic designed landscape. We therefore raise no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E22/0261	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Removal of 14,000 cubic metres of sediment from Stover Lake through wet dredging.</p> <p>Temporary storage of material in geotextile bags within felled woodland, and spreading of dried material within the felled area.</p> <p>Restoration of bag storage area</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above request for a scoping opinion which affects Stover Park, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in</p>

				to broadleaved woodland, at Stover Country Park, Access To Stover Country Park, Stover, Devon, TQ12 6QG	responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information published on your website, and conclude that the proposed works will not have any significant adverse impact on the designated historic designed landscape, and will, in the longer term be highly beneficial to its conservation. Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer, Devon Gardens Trust
Bicton	Devon	E22/0299	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The proposed development is a 25.5m x 16m steel framed building to provide housing for livestock. This building is to include 4 bays, separated by concrete panels and fencing. Bicton College East Budleigh Budleigh Salterton EX9 7BY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects Bicton, an historic designed landscape which is included by Historic England in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade I.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations affecting nationally designated designed landscapes in the County of Devon.</p> <p>Bicton is one of only five historic designed landscapes in Devon included on the Register at Grade I, and only some 10% of sites on the Register are included at this highest grade; this means that Bicton is one of the top 150 historic designed landscapes in England, and can be understood to be of international significance.</p> <p>We have reviewed the information relating to this application on your website, and on the basis of that information we wish to OBJECT to this proposed development.</p> <p>We note that the proposed development would be located within the Grade I designated landscape, in an area of parkland visible from the Monkey Puzzle Avenue. Despite this, no assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the internationally significant historic designed landscape has been submitted in support of the application, and no justification of the choice of location has been made. The application therefore fails to fulfil the requirements of NPPF para 194, and can be considered to be defective. In the absence of such an essential required document, it would not be proper for your Authority to grant permission for the proposed development.</p> <p>On the basis of the plans submitted, we conclude that the proposed development is very likely to have a significantly adverse impact on the</p>

					<p>Grade I historic designed landscape and on the setting of the Grade II* Listed Bicton House. The proposed development would introduce a large and potentially highly visually intrusive element into what is, at present, an undeveloped area of parkland.</p> <p>We note, and strongly commend to your Authority’s attention, the comments of Historic England (1st June 2022) on this application. We are in agreement with Historic England that the proposed new structure would lead to a “cumulative, negative impact on views within and in/out of the park and contribute to the incremental degradation of the parkland character”.</p> <p>We also note Historic England’s comments with regard to the inclusion of the designed landscape at Bicton on the Heritage At Risk Register, and would agree that the proposed development would compound the “at risk” status of the designed landscape arising from incremental development pressure. We are strongly in agreement with Historic England in advocating a long-term strategic management plan for the whole of the historic environment at Bicton. We would very much encourage the applicants to explore the development of such a framework, and would be happy to work with Historic England and your Authority to help them bring such a plan to fruition.</p> <p>With regard to the present application, we must advise your Authority that we believe it would be improper for consent to be granted for such a potentially damaging development within an internationally significant designed landscape, and especially in the absence of the impact assessments and options appraisals required by the NPPF. For these reasons we OBJECT to the proposal and advise that consent should not be granted.</p> <p>On the wider question of the “at risk” status of the designed landscape at Bicton arising from incremental development pressure, we would welcome a positive dialogue between interested parties to ensure both a beneficial use for the designated designed landscape and Listed buildings, and an appropriate conservation strategy for their on-going management.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Dartington Hall	Devon	E22/0341	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of 6No. two-storey	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above proposed

				residential dwellings with associated landscaping Proposed Development Site East Dartington Lane Dartington TQ9 5LB	<p>development which affects Dartington Hall, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon.</p> <p>We have given careful consideration to the information relating to this proposed development posted on your website. We note that the proposed development site forms part of a larger proposed development comprising Dartington East and Dartington West; the smaller, eastern phase is the subject of the present application and consultation.</p> <p>We further note that the development site lies just outside the boundary of the Grade II* historic designed landscape at Dartington, but within its setting and close to the Grade II Listed Dartington Lodge, which forms part of the historic approach and the historic landscape design.</p> <p>The Lane End East Heritage Statement (Stephen Bond, 12th April 2022) submitted in support of this application and the overall proposed development is helpful in analysing the impact of the proposed development on the setting of these designated heritage assets (especially pp 18-23, 32 and 33-34).</p> <p>Having regard to this analysis and our own detailed knowledge of the Dartington historic designed landscape, we conclude that, while the proposed development will undoubtedly have an impact on the setting of the Grade II* historic designed landscape, that impact will cause less than substantial harm to the two designated heritage assets which fall within our remit. We therefore do not wish to comment on this application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Weald Park	Essex	E21/1733	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Recreational use of land for clay pigeon shooting in woodland area and demolition of 2no. existing buildings. Construction of a courtyard of buildings including a	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2022</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.</p>

				<p>country store (retail use) and clubhouse with associated hospitality uses including restaurants/bar with changing room facilities and offices. Construction of a woodland management building. Widening of vehicle access including additional hardstanding and new parking area. Hard/soft landscaping proposed with the creation of bunds.</p> <p>Bennets Farm Weald Road South Weald Brentwood Essex CM14 5QR</p>	<p>The GT responded to this application on 6th January 2022 and the EGT responded separately on 29th December 2021. Our objections remain as outlined in our previous correspondence.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E22/0270	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing agricultural building and erection of a single dwelling Barn At Shortgrove (former Byfords Farm Services) Shortgrove Newport</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2022</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 grade II registered landscape at Shortgrove is one of the best Capability Brown landscapes in Essex. It retains parkland with veteran trees, lakes, streams, the Brettingham bridge, a magnificent Georgian grade II* stable, a grade II dovecot, two walled gardens and other walls, glasshouses, an ice-house, and other features.</p> <p>It is accepted by the applicants that the conversion of the two modern barns to four dwellings under Class Q permitted development rights is undesirable in terms of design, and hence unsuitable in this sensitive location. They have attempted to mitigate the harm initially by proposing to substitute a large house for one of the barns. The designs proposed lacked merit and would have introduced a more overtly domestic character to the scheme in a part of the registered landscape hitherto free of residential development. The current proposal strives to make one of the barns more acceptable by reducing its size slightly yet greatly extending it with a brick wing, which enhances the liveable accommodation but creates an unlikely collision which does not improve its appearance. Crucially, the second barn would be retained.</p>

					<p>The GT/EGT believe that in the circumstances, with the Class Q consent in place for the barns, little can be done to improve the situation and reduce the impact of residential development on this part of the registered landscape. In terms of the NPPF, there would be less than substantial harm, and no public benefit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Snowhill Manor	Gloucestershire	E22/0249	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>To upgrade the existing footpath surface within the outer court garden. Existing surface is loose gravel. New surface to be new, smooth York flag stones of random sizes, laid in a random pattern with pointed joints to match the new footpath surface in the inner court garden, as per previously approved application 21/01400/FUL.</p> <p>Snowhill Manor , Snowhill, Snowhill</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.06.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>The proposed path improvement which replaces the existing gravelled path surface with York stone will be a great improvement for the users, the site managers; and very importantly, for its visual impact.</p>
Toddington Manor	Gloucestershire	E22/0293	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of 1No. self-build dwelling and associated parking and landscaping.</p> <p>Land Off, Olde Lane, Toddington</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.06.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this application on its behalf.</p> <p>Development proposals for Olde Lane have been a prominent feature of GGLT's past consultations in Toddington. This latest iteration to reduce the impacts on this site to zero, reduces the scale of the proposal to that of a flat roofed dwelling with excellent sustainable credentials, self-built, well designed and detailed using materials that causes no offence to AONB policy.</p> <p>The case made for the acceptability of this proposal is well made--its location, design, compliance with national policy, the Borough's apparent housing shortfall, and sundry other supportive development exemplars. However, in spite of the decades of poor management of the Manor's parkland, the rather casual E H. Listed park boundary, and the equally</p>

					casual approach to adjacent planning consents; this site abutting Olde Lane remains one of the few uncluttered vistas over the parkland. GGLT, when considering proposals for development along the North side of Olde Lane, has over the years consistently recommended and continues to recommend that the Borough Council takes a firm position to protect the views towards the parkland, the Manor and the church from any further intrusion from residential, or any other development. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)
Barnsley Park	Gloucestershire	E22/0398	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Conversion of existing stable to a dwelling at Barnsley Park House Barnsley Park Barnsley Cirencester Gloucestershire	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.06.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this proposal in its behalf. The proposal to bring this ex stable building into a beneficial use is to be welcomed; and it would have no adverse impact on both its immediate and its wider setting. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).
Barnsley Park	Gloucestershire	E22/0412	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Alterations and conversion of existing building for the creation of a dwelling and associated works at Pumping House About 360 Metres East Of Barnsley Park Barnsley Gloucestershire.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.06.2022 The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might create an adverse impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust to respond on its behalf. This pumping house forms a very imposing feature within the Barnsley House parkland setting. The proposal to restore and convert this structure into a two bedroom residence will support its future survival in a beneficial use. The external interventions have been handled with a light touch, and there has been a positive design response to clearing away the inevitable "residential clutter" from its immediate setting within the parkland. The pumping house located within a circular enclosure of park railings will help anchor the project within the historic parkland. Yours sincerely, David Ball ( on behalf of GGLT).
Greenwich Park	Greater London	E22/0259	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Request for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion under Regulation 15 of	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning applications. I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the

			<p>the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended), in respect of a hybrid planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the Application Site, comprising new buildings up to 94m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) in height, which will provide a total of approximately 1,840 residential units, and 6,000sqm of non-residential uses.</p> <p>Teviot Estate, London, E14 6QU</p>	<p>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) 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). We were made aware of this application by the Gardens Trust, because of its potential impact on Greenwich Park a Grade 1 Public Park on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England and on the LPG Inventory.</p> <p>LPG has now considered the information that you have provided and makes the following observations. The historic landscape of most relevance is Langdon Park which is also on our inventory here: <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=THM026c">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=THM026c</a></p> <p>From the documentation the proposed development will not encroach on the land provided for public use which we welcome. However, Annex 4 of the Scoping Report produced by Trium for the Teviot Estate Development states:</p> <p>“It should be noted that Langdon Park will not be assessed in the overshadowing assessment as the Proposed Development will not impact the park due to the sun paths location, hence has been scoped out.”</p> <p>We would ask the planning team to satisfy themselves that this is an accurate assessment of the sun path before scoping out further research. There is also another statement in the Ecology and Biodiversity Topic Sheet (in the Annex 4 document), which refers to the enhancement of the park and creation of new public spaces:</p> <p>‘The proposals include the enhancement of Langdon Park, creation of new amenity and recreational space which seek to improve the existing biodiversity on the site.’</p> <p>We welcome the introduction of biodiversity and horticultural interest into</p>
--	--	--	---	---



					<p>the landscape, alongside maintenance of amenity value.</p> <p>The Trust has no further comments to make at this time but would welcome further consultation as the project progresses.</p> <p>These observations do not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals and should new information come to light that may have an impact on the heritage asset the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p>
Ladbroke Estate	Greater London	E22/0382	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of rear extension at lower ground level and enlargement of window opening at rear upper ground level; alterations to mansard roof including construction of new (replacement) dormer windows at front and rear; installation of rooflights; and construction of bottle balustrade around perimeter of roof</p> <p>103 Elgin Crescent, LONDON, W11 2JF</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning applications.</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) Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>We were made aware of this application by the Gardens Trust, because of its potential impact on Rosmead Garden, Grade 2 on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England and on the LPG Inventory. Having considered the information provided LPG makes the following observations. The site is within a conservation area and forms the setting of Rosmead Garden, part of the Ladbroke Grove Estate. Our inventory entry for Rosmead Gardens is here:</p> <p><a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=KAC091&amp;sitename=Rosmead+Garden+%28Ladbroke+Estate%29+%2A">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=KAC091&amp;sitename=Rosmead+Garden+%28Ladbroke+Estate%29+%2A</a></p> <p>The Ladbroke Estate was laid out as a planned garden suburb with a coherent layout of concentric crescents and large communal gardens whose features were first suggested in a plan by architect and estate</p>

					<p>surveyor Thomas Allason in 1823. His scheme was later modified by others. Rosmead Garden is part of that planned scheme. It is a large curving garden near the foot of the hill, lying between painted stuccoed houses along the south side of Elgin Crescent, mostly built 1852 to north and Lansdowne Road built c.1862 to south with their private gardens.</p> <p>The garden retains most of its mid C19th paths although is simplified in the centre. It has its original railings with cast iron coping along Rosmead Road. Shrubberies back three large oval-shaped lawns and there are also dense evergreen shrubberies at the west and east ends. This garden was made famous in the 1999 Notting Hill film starring Hugh Grant and Julia Roberts, when the couple climbed a fence to sneak into the private communal gardens at night.</p> <p>The Garden has taken part in our London Open Gardens Weekend for many years and is a popular choice to visit due to the historic nature of the site - this year it recorded 791 adults and 69 children visiting over the weekend.</p> <p>Paragraph 195 of the current NPPF states: Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>Paragraph 200 states: “Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;”</p> <p>The Design and Access statement provided, notes that the building that is the subject of this application is not listed. The statement also considers the siting within a conservation area.</p> <p>This property forms the boundary and is the setting of a grade II registered park. The current Design and Access statement insufficiently assesses the impact to the setting of Rosmead Garden with no photographs showing current and potential views from the gardens.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The Local Authority would benefit from a more detailed Heritage Impact Statement to understand this proposal and the precedents it may be setting for other properties in the area in relation to the roofscape and also the rear extension. The Trust has no further comments to make at this time but would welcome further consultation.</p> <p>These observations do not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals and should new information come to light that may have an impact on the heritage asset the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Helen Monger</p>
Bramshill Park	Hampshire	E22/0183	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of Bramshill Park, Bramshill House, Stable Block and Nuffield Hall / Newsam Hall for use as a wedding and events venue (Sui Generis).</p> <p>Change of use of Bramshill House for overnight guest accommodation associated with the wedding and events use.</p> <p>Change of use of Dixon Hall for use as guest accommodation associated with the wedding and events use.</p> <p>Change of use of Bramshill Park, Bramshill House, Stable Block and Nuffield Hall / Newsam Hall, Foxley Hall, Sports Hall, Oak Hall and Conference Centre, Reprographics and Graphics, Shop, Rowan Hall, Willow Hall and Reception for use associated with film-making activities (Sui Generis).</p> <p>Demolition of police college buildings.</p> <p>The construction of 197 new</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2022</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 response. Hampshire Gardens Trust have been very proactive in commenting upon earlier incarnations of the proposals for Bramshill, and the Gardens Trust concurs entirely with their detailed response to these and the current application. We wish to respond separately due to the enormous importance of the Bramshill Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) along with its Grade I Jacobean mansion and associated structures.</p> <p>Edward, Lord Zouche, diplomat and patron of science, was connected to leading statesmen and builders of high-status houses and gardens of the period, notably William Cecil, Lord Burghley and Robert Cecil. Aspiring perhaps to establish his place in society, he created the present mansion and landscape within easy reach of London from 1605 onwards. The C17 and early C18 landscape at Bramshill is an exceptionally legible and important survival despite the assorted accommodation blocks, lecture rooms etc. which were built in the park to the north-east of the Jacobean mansion after the site was purchased by the Home Office for use as the national Police Staff College. Away from the house and its courtyards and gardens are two major 'destination' gardens contemporary with the house. The immense lake and island is now confirmed as a Jacobean water garden which is one of the best-preserved Jacobean water gardens and as a group with the house, is unique.</p> <p>The second 'destination garden', the Maze, is unusually large at 130 metres</p>

				<p>residential (Use Class C3) dwellings (a net increase of 177 dwellings Use Class C3), 147.92 sqm GIA of employment floor space (Use Class E, F.2) and undercroft car parking. Associated repair works to buildings and gardens. Refurbishment of Hazeley Lodges including demolition of modern rear extensions and structures and erection of single storey rear extensions. Associated roads, footways, cycleways, open space, creation of parkland, creation of enhanced ecological habitat, landscaping, drainage, ancillary works and infrastructure Bramshill House Bramshill Park Bramshill Hook RG27 0JW</p>	<p>in diameter, and survives as legible earthworks, now completely overgrown. Both these destination gardens were designed to offer exercise and entertainment, a walk or a short ride from the house. Historic England's register entry gives a comprehensive list of the reasons for the site's Grade I listing which, in addition to the destination gardens, also includes amongst other things, a survival of a succession of C17 walled enclosures, a parterre and substantial earthworks of a C17 or early C18 Italian garden, their still legible relationship to the high status house and the topography revealing how the house was perceived in its landscape set above formal enclosures, opening directly onto and overlooking open parkland traversed by formal avenues and walks. The above application is for a reduced quantity of housing (197 residential units in three interlinked clusters on previously developed land) as opposed to the earlier construction of 308 residential units sited with little regard for the historic landscape (18/01584/FUL). The GT is relieved that previous proposals to build across Reading Avenue and around the Lake have been removed. We concur with the HGT that the current application would appear to be the 'least-worst option' and welcome the proposals for extensive works to the RPG to improve and restore the historic landscape including the House and its northern courtyards, the Walled Kitchen Garden, the Approach Avenue, the Lake and Island, the Dog-kennel and White Ponds, Reading Avenue, The Maze and the NE avenue (partial). We are also glad to note that a Landscape Management Plan will be prepared and adopted but would welcome the opportunity to comment on this document during its preparation. However, we would ask that your officers should your officers approve this application, the schedule of works contains conditions which will ensure the restoration proposals are completed and phased in order of urgency before each stage of building is allowed to proceed. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shobdon	Hereford and Worcester	E22/0291	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed extension to existing hatchery Avara Hatchery, Shobdon Court, Shobdon, Leominster, Herefordshire HR6 9NA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.06.2022 We have looked at the relatively sparse documentation accompanying this application and are disappointed that there is no mention that the hatchery and its proposed extension lies well within the Grade II registered park and garden of Shobdon, is next to the walled garden and not far from the Grade I listed gothick church of St John the Evangelist. It is a most</p>

					<p>unfortunate location for the poultry unit and we have concerns that should the extension be permitted, the existing sparse tree belt which partially hides the industrial building could be adversely affected by building work within its root zone.</p> <p>Should your officers approve this application we would request that you ensure that the applicant thickens up this tree belt for increased mitigation.</p> <p>The GT objects to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Brocket Hall	Hertfords hire	E21/0855	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of 2x two-storey detached houses and associated parking and access on the land to the rear of 52 &amp; 54 Bridge Road. Rear of 52 and 54 Bridge Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The estate cottages at 52/54 Bridge Road (built by Earl Cowper in 1876 on the edge of SherrardsPark Wood) which has been in existence since at least 1599, are noted in the WGC CA Appraisal. Bridge Road itself is the southern boundary of these historic woodlands and has been for centuries. Development to the rear of these cottages would severely harm the setting of the cottages, both in the approach to it via the proposed drive and the destruction of the rear woodland aspect. It would, in addition, be an intrusion into an area which has formed part of the historic woodland for years and introduce a built element close to the line of the old railway, currently a green walk for the residents of the Garden City.</p> <p>We consider this development inappropriate and harmful in the location. We have objected to development here several times prior to this and do so again</p>
Campus East The Campus, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0229	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Request for screening opinion Campus East Car Park College Way</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.06.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has been consulted on this application and we have been informed that our deadline for response is 8 June 2022. However, on viewing the application in the WHBC website this morning (5 June), I find that the consultation period has already closed. Nevertheless, we would like to comment on this Scoping Application.</p> <p>The proposed development lies with the Welwyn Garden City Conservation area which also contains various listed buildings and the important 'City Beautiful' landscape along Parkway, Howardsgate and the Campus laid out by de Soissons. We note that some of the buildings proposed are 5 storeys high and thus would expect the impact of these on the town centre to be considered from a heritage point of view, including its setting and Zones of</p>

					Theoretical Visibility as set out in GPA3.2 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' by Historic England
7 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0274	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>T1 Oak to reduce by 2m in height and 2.5m in width to maintain size and spread</p> <p>T2 Oak to reduce by 2m in height and 3 m in width to allow more ambient light into property and lawn area. This tree is very central and dominates the sky.</p> <p>T3 Oak to fell to ground level. The tree is suppressed by the larger trees so has little lower growth and mainly on to the top and rear. The tree is not helping with debris and bird feces on the clients hot tub and decking area. This would also help with light improvement in the main lawn area.</p> <p>T4 Cherry (located in Scholars mews) to fell to ground level. The tree is leaning heavily and is in poor condition.</p> <p>T5 Ash (located in Scholars mews) to fell to ground level Again this tree leans excessively over the boundary and is of poor condition.</p> <p>7 Densley Close Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JX</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The property lies within the area of the historic Sherrardswood park, an important woodland area for centuries and retained in the modern Garden City.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposals to severely prune T1 and T2 oaks and fell T3 oak have no compelling justification in the planning application, for example for public health and safety reasons or proper arboricultural management ; merely householder amenity. We consider these trees to be part of the historic environment which contribute to the character of the Garden City and as such should be conserved. The proposals to fell the cherry, T4, and ash, T5, due to poor condition would not cause us undue concern, although we note that no evidence for the poor condition has been included in the application and should be sought before a decision is made on this application.</p>
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E22/0284	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of two storey and single storey rear extensions. Erection of two storey rear extension. Enlarged first floor rear window. Insertion of one</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Orchard House is set within the Grade II registered Park of Goldings with views south eastward over the park designed by Charles Bridgeman in the early 18th century and considerably altered in the 19th century. The large amount of glazing proposed in this application may cause some</p>

				velux rooflight in rear elevation. Orchard House Broad Oak End Hertford Hertfordshire SG14 2JA	glare and reflection but the tree belt between the developed area around Orchard House, and the undeveloped parkland area should prevent any considerable harm being caused to the wider historic landscape to the southeast.
7 Guessens Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0390	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey side extension and garage 7 Guessens Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6QW	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The application is for a side extension and garage but it appears that no elevation drawings are included. We also note that on the 'block plan' of the proposed layout the block paving on the existing drive appears to be extended across the whole of the front of the house. Whilst we would not object in principle for a side extension and garage, we cannot comment without further information. However, we would be concerned at the loss of green space in this area of Welwyn Garden City if the block paving were to be extended
12 Woodgate Avenue Northaw, Potters Bar	Hertfords hire	E22/0396	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of outbuilding 12 Woodgate Avenue Northaw Potters Bar Hertfordshire EN6 4EW	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The site lies within the Green Belt,. It also lies within the former landscape of Barvin Park, of Local Historic Interest. There is no detail of any landscaping provided to screen the proposed outbuilding from the wider Green Belt to the west and the plans show the building to be sited right on the edge of the property. We note from the photographs provided that much of the tree screen is deciduous and therefor provides no protection in the winter months. Without adequate screening we consider that this building would impinge on the Green Belt and thus be in contravention of purpose (c) of Chapter 13, clause 134 of the NPPF., assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This visual encroachment could be mitigated if sufficient screening to the west of the building were planted, if necessary by moving the building further from the boundary to give more room for an augmented tree/shrub belt
9 Osborn House, Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0418	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 2 sets of externally illuminated fascia text and 1 externally illuminated projection sign. 9 Osborn House, Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire AL8 6AT	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have commented on previous applications for signage at this location that the design is inappropriate in this important site in the town centre and would cause harm to the heritage value of the Garden City. We are unable to discern any noticeable improvement in design in this latest application and therefore our previous comments still stand,

Knole	Kent	E22/0278	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Removal of existing discharge lighting and installation of new low energy LED floodlights on to existing columns.</p> <p>Knole Paddock And Raleys Field Plymouth Drive Sevenoaks Kent TN13 3RP</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.06.2022</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. We have considered the submitted documentation and applicant has not stated which lights they propose to use but just submitted the manufacturer's catalogue which shows the whole range of available lights. We would ask that your officers request that the lights should be shaded to ensure that the glare from the replacement lights is not greater when viewed from the adjacent Registered Park and Garden</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Harris Knowledge Park (Former Harris Orphanage)	Lancashire	E21/1582	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of site for residential use,including conversion of the former Harris Conference Centre (to 3 dwellings),Clayton Hall,Pond House,the Lodge and six existing villas (namely; Holly House,Poplars,Chestnuts,Oak House,Glenrosa,and the Laurels),erection of 3no. new build dwellings in the eastern part of site,erection of 16no. new build dwellings in western part of site,following demolition of the former Laundry Room,Yewtree House and former Workshop,including associated vehicular access,parking,and landscaping</p> <p>Harris Knowledge Park,Garstang Road,Preston,PR2 9XB</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your letter advising Lancashire Gardens Trust of the amendments to the above application. We note that in this case the letter was not passed to The Gardens Trust (GT). As previously notified to you, GT as the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to the County Trusts. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case.</p> <p>The Harris Knowledge Park comprises the former Harris Orphanage (including its wider site and the Recreation Ground) which is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden on the Historic England List, as well as a number of Grade II listed buildings and structures.</p> <p>Historic England advised in recent responses that the site is an example of 'a rare and intact purpose-built orphanage' which importantly has a strong domestic scale. Whilst there are some extensive intrusions from recent car parking, on the whole the site survives demonstrating the intentions of the original design. In addition, the whole site is a Conservation Area, enlarged in 2007 and reviewed and confirmed in 2017.</p> <p>LGT objected to applications to redevelop this site for residential development in 2013, in 2020, and also to the current application in January 2022. We continue to have concerns about the current application, these were stated at length in our letter of 7 January 2022.</p> <p>The current application has reduced the number of new build dwellings</p>



					<p>from 3 to 2 in the east and from 16 to 14 in the west by removal of plots 15 and 16. This has to some extent accommodated our suggested removal of plots 13 to 16 and has increased the impression of openness in the centre of the development. We continue to recommend the removal of plots 14 and 2A in the latest layout, to make a more effective extension to the central green which was a feature of the original Harris layout. Our concerns about the scale of development within the RPG remain, which was one of the reasons for the previous refusal.</p> <p>Important details of planting and specific landform design remain to be provided, as well as the requirement for a management plan. Furthermore, mechanisms are required to ensure that any eventual approved scheme is delivered as shown on the application, to avoid their change and diminishment by subsequent amending applications.</p> <p>The retention of the War Memorial on its existing site within the development is welcomed. Providing adequate long term provision for public access is ensured, this overcomes our objection on this element. Whilst LGT cannot support the current application we are prepared to remove our objection as we accept that the degree of harm to the RPG has been slightly reduced.</p> <p>We would have preferred a solution which was less intensive and retained far more openness in the final development.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me, by email <a href="mailto:conservation@lancsgt.org.uk">conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</a>.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson</p>
Moor Park	Lancashire	E21/2104	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey extension to side, rear and front of Summer House to form annex accommodation ancillary to main dwelling. Increase height of existing roof to accommodate first-floor accommodation. North Park Lodge, Blackpool Road, Preston, PR1 6AU BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your re-consultation letter advising Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) of the amendments to the above application. We note that in this case the letter was not [passed to The Gardens Trust (GT). As previously notified to you, GT as the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to the County Trusts. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case.</p> <p>This application site lies within Moor Park, a Registered Park and Garden Grade II* designed by Edward Milner. The significance of Moor Park is enhanced by the group value of the three Milner sites in Preston where, Avenham and Miller Parks are by the same designer. As described in the</p>

					<p>Historic England listing, Moor Park is an 'especially early example of a municipal park', and 'having a design essentially unchanged from its C19th layout'. It retains numerous C19 features and structures. North Park Lodge is one of three surviving structures contemporary with the C19 design and lies fully within the RPG. In addition, the property lies within the Moor Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>LGT objected to the initial submission of the above application by our letter of 17 March 2022 in view of the cumulative scale and volume of the initial proposals which would detract from the appearance of the Lodge. The latest proposals are for a building of slightly reduced height which has lessened the impact upon the Registered Park and Garden. We are prepared to set our objection aside as a result of the amendment but would not support the proposal which nevertheless is for a very substantial annexe. We would suggest that any permission for this development should restrict use of the annexe as ancillary to the Lodge and prevent the creation of a separate dwelling.</p> <p>Our remaining concern is in relation to the extension to the south which intrudes into the thick hedge which separates the property from Moor Park. We cannot comment on whether the Council's ownership may be affected here, but as a minimum there is a requirement for an appropriate landscape scheme for making good the unavoidable loss and damage to hedging both as a result of the new building and construction working areas.</p> <p>As mentioned in our letter of 17 March, we acknowledge that the Lodge is not listed, nor are any of the other park lodges, however in view of its location within the Grade II* RPG, and the integrity of the original park buildings, there is a case to promote the listing of the lodges themselves. If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me, by email <a href="mailto:conservation@lancsgt.org.uk">conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</a>.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson</p>
Whatton House	Leicesters hire	E22/0320	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Scoping Opinion under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 in respect of the development of a logistics/industrial park (use class</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.06.2022</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 Leicestershire Gardens Trust (LGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. It is apparent from the online documentation that a Flood Risk Assessment</p>

				B2 and B8), with ancillary offices and associated parking, highway infrastructure and landscaping Phase 2 East Midlands Gateway Development Ashby Road Castle Donington	is required before this application can proceed. We would ask that you please contact us again when all the relevant reports are available and we will respond then. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Draft Broads Plan	Norfolk	E22/0253	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee. 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 parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of consultations that may impact such sites, as well as having an interest in sites of heritage significance but not registered. We have reviewed the Broads Authority Plan for 2022-27 with particular attention to the section which deals with protecting the landscape character and the historic environment. There is no mention of heritage parks and gardens in the context of the cultural heritage of the Broads, and ask that you will consider a specific recognition that the cultural heritage includes significant parks and gardens, both registered and unregistered. sincerely, Susan Grice
Sutton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0211	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Planning application for the siting of a marquee. Sutton Park Main Street Sutton On The Forest York	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The historic park and garden at Sutton Park are not currently included on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens however they are of some significance. Sutton Park is the setting for the Hall (Grade I listed) and its associated stables. The house sits prominently in the landscape and is surrounded by walled gardens, rolling parkland and a shelter belt, in the heart of the village. There is a statement of significance for Sutton Park, created by the

					<p>Yorkshire Gardens Trust, derived from research carried out as part of Hambleton District Historic Designed Landscapes project see reference below. The following is an extract:</p> <p>The designed landscape of Sutton Park was developed by its owners, the Harland family and their successors for over 300 years, with major developments in the early 19th century and the 1960s. Philip Harland is thought to have rebuilt the house, enclosed part of the former village green with the village pond to form a walled garden and probably started to develop the pleasure grounds and parkland between 1750 and 1766. An undated plan by Adam Mickle II for proposed alterations to the grounds commissioned by Philip Harland's son-in-law the Reverend Henry Goodricke survives. Whilst the proposals do not appear to have been fully carried out, they give an indication of the owners' interest in contemporary landscape design. The historic landscape including formal and productive walled gardens, an icehouse, pleasure grounds, parkland, woodland copses and woodland shelter belts largely remains. The estate therefore provides an important aesthetic and community asset for the village of Sutton on the Forest and its visitors. The house, Sutton Park (formerly Sutton Hall) is grade I listed, the icehouse, former stables and wall to kitchen garden are listed grade II. The house and gardens lie within the Sutton in the Forest Conservation Area. There are possible connections with the Goodricke family of Ribston Hall. Ribston Hall's 18th century gardens, developed by Henry Goodricke's father, were noted for their collection of rare and unusual trees and as the birthplace of the Ribston Pippin apple. At Sutton Park, the extent of the involvement of the landscape architects Percy Cane and Peter Coates in the 1960s is not clear.</p> <p>The parkland, woodland and gardens are an important part of the designed landscape with reciprocal designed views linking the house to its setting and as such the designed landscape contributes to the setting of the Grade I listed building.</p> <p>The marquee is proposed for existing hard standing (used for a marquee 2009, 2010, 2011) to the east of the Hall and gardens with woodland to its eastern flank. Access will be via an existing access from Main Street to the north to the existing visitor car park which is a short distance south of the proposed marquee. The marquee is proposed to be white material.</p> <p>We note that there were additional controls for the earlier three- year marquee consent and consent is now sought for the permanent continued siting from April to September to be used for a maximum of 12 licensed</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>events in that period.</p> <p>Although a 27mx9m white marquee will have some impact on the historic park and garden and its setting and the setting of the Hall even though screened by existing planting, and the existing concrete base in conservation terms is not so easily reversible, we consider that the harm will be limited.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the marquee in such a historic setting is proposed to be a bright white and query whether it could be a more subdued colour. In order to review the situation over time, and any impact on heritage and local residents, we also suggest that any planning permission granted has a time span of say three to five years.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Thorp Perrow	North Yorkshire	E22/0311	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building Consent for the construction of a garden room to the rear elevation of the dwelling Snape Castle Barn Snape Bedale North Yorkshire</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2022</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 Thorp Perrow 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>Thorp Perrow has pleasure grounds and lakes laid out c.1800 by Adam Mickle II of the Mickle dynasty of landscapers and who's father worked with Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. The park nearest Snape Castle Barn has 17th C origins enlarged in the first half of the 19th C. Thorp Perrow is now probably best known for Its arboretum created by Sir Leonard Ropner (1895-1977).</p> <p>Snape Castle Barn is located to the east of Snape Castle owned by Lord Latimer of Snape in the 15th C and the home of Catherine Parr whilst she was married to the third Lord Latimer. The Milbanks acquired Snape Castle and adjacent lands in the early 19th C when the area was incorporated into the park. Snape Castle and the adjacent buildings including Snape Castle Barn are situated within the registered park and garden at the southern boundary, and within the Snape Conservation Area.</p> <p>Snape Castle is visible from the arboretum but due to the north-south sloping terrain the lower Snape Castle Barn may not be visible from the</p>

					<p>arboretum but will be from the registered parkland itself and the associated footpaths. The proposed garden room is on the north elevation which overlooks the registered park. We note from the Heritage, Design and Access Statement at 7.3 that the garden room is proposed to be built of Douglas Fir and Sapele mahogany using traditional joinery methods and will have a painted finish. The roof will have an inset glazed roof light, with lead dressed hips and ridge and surrounding aluminium secret gutters. Fig 2, p9, the current rear elevation of Snape Castle Barn shows an elevated 'pleached' hedge around the sitting out area that will become the site of the garden room. We trust that this pleasing feature will be retained. We have not noted any information regarding outdoor lighting.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the construction of the garden room as proposed, and trust that the paint finish will be of a subdued and sympathetic colour for this historic setting. However, as we noted in our letter of 16th August 2020 (20/01545/FUL), that although views from the property are important, it is equally important that reciprocal views from the registered park and garden are also conserved. As the room will have year-round use, (Statement at 7.1) we do have some concerns about light being shed and if possible, it would be beneficial to have some additional trees planted that would soften the views of the extension and the lighting, from the registered park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Bolton Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0335	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Planning Permission to Create a New Avenue from Bolton Hall to Lords Bridge by Converting a Corridor of Intensive Dairy Grassland to Low Intensity, Species Rich Grassland, a New Avenue of Trees, a Drive Down the Centre and a Carriage Sweep in Front of Bolton Hall</p> <p>Bolton Hall Wensley Leyburn North Yorkshire DL8 4UF</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.06.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the Statutory Consultee with regard to sites included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens. We appreciate that Bolton Hall park and garden in Wensleydale is not on the register but as it provides the setting for Bolton Hall (Grade II), it is historically important and this planning application has come to our attention.</p> <p>The proposed drive will run due North from Lords (Bolton) Bridge as a continuation of Bay Bolton Avenue, to the South of the A684. As it approaches Bolton Hall, it will fork either side of the existing terrace and curve back around to tie in with the existing gravelled hard standing to the front of Bolton Hall. It will also connect with the existing access running East-West, which will remain.</p> <p>An avenue between Bolton Hall and Lords (Bolton) Bridge is shown on 18th</p>

				<p>century maps:</p> <p>1723 Map of the manors [sic] of Wensley and Preston held by North Yorkshire County Record Office (NYCRO) ZBO(M)1/1</p> <p>1733/1737 map, held at Bolton Hall</p> <p>Undated map of Preston NYCRO ZBO(M)2/1</p> <p>1778 Plan of manors of Wensley and Preston belonging to his Grace the Duke of Bolton, NYCRO ZBO(M)5/1.</p> <p>1775 Engraving by R Godfrey shows a carriage arriving along the avenue to Bolton Hall.</p> <p>The avenue was felled in the 1780's following the fashion (after Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and other 18th century 'landscape improvers') to create uninterrupted parkland in front of the Hall.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement notes that:</p> <p>'the avenue corridor would be 150 metres wide and create a 4.5 hectare wildlife corridor between the river, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest to the south and the wildflower meadows surrounding the hall. The central 70m corridor would be managed as herb-rich meadow with a simple farm track running down the middle, from the bridge to the hall. To either side of the central vista would be 40m wide bands of trees. Two lines of native, locally sourced, small-leaved limes (<i>Tilia cordata</i>) would be backed by lines of local oaks (<i>Quercus petraea</i>) planted in a traditional quincunx pattern at 10m centres. The avenues would be enclosed in the baroque style with low (1.2m) clipped native hedges of thorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>) and holly (<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>). Stock and rabbit fencing, concealed within the hedge line, will protect the establishing trees.'</p> <p>The re-instatement of the earlier avenue will potentially be a positive addition to the designed landscape and with the species rich grassland, the corridor would have significant environmental and biodiversity benefits. It would be a 21st century addition to the designed landscape and an interpretation based on the still existing 17th century formality of the gardens north of the Hall and in the 'wilderness' area west of the Hall. However, we have some concerns about the proposal as the documents submitted give insufficient detail:</p> <p>The Planning Statement at 3.0 Construction. '3.1 The drive's construction will comprise a compacted hardcore basecourse with a tarmacadam running surface, to tie in with the existing surface to the front of Bolton Hall.'</p> <p>Tarmacadam would not be an appropriate surface for the avenue across</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the parkland both in historic, aesthetic, and environmental terms. This has been queried with the applicant and we understand that it is proposed to use chip with pea gravel around the carriage sweep, which is in keeping with the existing surrounding of the hall and will work on the slope. The drive through the park would be locally sourced ungraded hardcore limestone, which includes very fine to coarser particles and binds well. There are no details in the application about the actual width of the drive, edge treatment, colour chips, together with no details of the size, treatment, potential archaeological implications of the turning circle or how the cattle will access the parkland to the east of the avenue. To summarise therefore, although we consider that the re-instatement of the earlier avenue will potentially be a positive addition, we cannot support this application in its current form and can only advise that the outstanding information is requested from the applicant to allow a more informed assessment of the proposals. We look forward to being included in this consultation and being advised of receipt of the outstanding material in due course.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Annesley Hall	Nottinghamshire	E21/1947	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of an office building (use class E (g)(i)) with car parking, landscaping and associated works. Access and drainage infrastructure including new highway from A611 signalised junction. Top Wighay Farm, Land east of A611, near Hucknall</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.06.2022 Thank you for re-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 reviewed the new LVIA information and it is clear that the proposed new building and other eventual development will alter the surrounding countryside considerably, changing the way in which views to and from the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Annesley Hall will be experienced. However, as our response is entirely based on a desk assessment, we are happy to concur with the comments made to your officers by Jason Mordan, Nottinghamshire CC's Senior Historic Buildings Practitioner. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E22/0084	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a Fusion</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>



				<p>Demonstration Plant with ancillary office space, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including plant and machinery.</p> <p>Land in the North East Corner of Culham Science Centre near Clifton Hampden OX14 3DB</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation and agree with the comments in the Donald Insall Associates Heritage Impact Assessment that the primary designated area affected by the Fusion Demonstration Plant (FDP) tower is the southern part of the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Nuneham Courtenay, laid out by 'Capability' Brown in the 1780s. The RPG shares its southern boundary with the Science Centre development, and the proposed FDP tower, approximately 150m away from the edge of the RPG, would be visible from several places despite the coppice and Furze Break woodlands which partially obscure the boundary. We understand that this screening is due to be enhanced by additional tree planting which is to be welcomed.</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 (GPA). On page 2 of this document, the following is relevant : '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.' The Science Centre's collection of buildings is already a significant departure from the wider rural setting of the RPG and 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' (GPA p4). The experience of the RPG and its setting will be altered by the proposed development – in particular (GPA p11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrounding landscape or townscape character</li> <li>• Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset</li> <li>• Visual dominance, prominence</li> </ul> <p>Whilst the new FDP will be part of the wider Science Centre, its height of 38m will be conspicuous within the view from the RPG and as such will contribute towards the negative impact of the Science Centre upon the setting of the Grade I RPG. We also have concerns about the proposed illumination of the drum of the FDP, which is designed to be lit from within which we feel would further exacerbate the impact upon the setting of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>RPG.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the Heritage Statement, and the importance of the research at the Science Centre, it is self-evident that a building 38 metres high lit 24 hours a day on the edge of the historic park will have a highly detrimental effect on its setting and should be strongly resisted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office</p>
Lilleshall Hall	Shropshire	E22/0172	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Drainage improvements and refurbishment of existing raised external patio area and external undercroft</p> <p>Lilleshall Hall , Lilleshall Hall Drive, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.06.2022</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 Shropshire Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the submitted documentation and although this is principally a listed building application, it is apparent that the terrace affected is clearly visible from the Grade II registered park and garden of Lilleshall Hall. The Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the architects appointed by Sport England (OL3) is wholly inadequate for this work and does not even begin to describe how they will protect the significances of Lilleshall Hall. It would appear that building conservation work is not what OL3 normally engage with. SGT has had previous applications from Sport England using these architects and have had to object to their proposals on each occasion.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Patshull Hall	Staffordshire	E21/2101	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of modern hotel extensions and removal of hard standing car parking, retention of the listed Temple, siting of 100 holiday lodges and construction of new Boathouse Central Facilities Building, including associated access, parking and servicing</p> <p>Patshull Park Hotel Golf And</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the SGPT and The Gardens Trust on the additional information submitted by the applicants' agent. As in our initial consultation response of 16 March 2022 SGPT is commenting on behalf of both trusts in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two organisations.</p> <p>The Trusts have carefully reviewed the additional material and rebuttal statements provided by the planning agent and heritage advisor. While we remain supportive of the principle of demolishing the modern hotel extensions attached to the grade II* listed Temple we remain concerned at the lack of information about the extent of demolition anticipated (e.g</p>

				<p>Country Club Patshull Park Burnhill Green WV6 7HR DEMOLITION, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>does it include the 19th century cottage for example, a feature of historic interest in its own right), treatment of demolition scars, fabric repairs and proposed future use. Fuller information is required before we can fully endorse this aspect of the applications.</p> <p>The Trusts remain concerned at the lack of analysis of the historic landscape; how missing or damaged features and planting might be recreated and managed for the future; and how the proposed holiday chalets/lodges would be accommodated within it. Insufficient information is provided about the proposed fence around the development such as its height, design, colour and any measures to avert it appearing an arbitrary intrusion into the parkland. The proposed design of the chalets/lodges remains insensitive; the tenancy/lease/licence arrangements for individual occupiers remains unclear. These and other matters must be clarified in detail before determination of the applications. This would demonstrate that the applicants have a clear understanding of the historic significance of the site; how the development has been devised to respect and integrate into the historic setting and that they have prepared robust, enforceable management procedures in place to protect and uphold that heritage significance. The answers to these matters are fundamental to understanding the impact of the scheme in heritage terms and cannot be deferred, as suggested by the applicants' agents, to resolution through planning conditions. Their absence is a serious omission from the application.</p> <p>The Trusts dispute the applicants' argument that because the development site comprises only a limited proportion of the RPG and designed landscape it should be found acceptable thereby. Designed landscapes can rarely be divided into self-contained compartments. Their character and appearance derives from the integrity of the whole design whether as the work of a single creation or from cumulative evolution over time. Although Patshull Park contains elements from the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries the key components pertinent to the current applications are the sequence of wood pastures running south from the Hall across Middle Ley past the church into Far Ley where they are bound together by the mid 18th century Great Pool created by Lancelot Brown. The current proposal to subdivide this sequence would create an artificial segregation at variance with its historic character. The intrusion into the open space of roadways and other structures at the high density shown on the revised Masterplan of 19 May 2022 would harmfully alter both its internal appearance and</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>views of it from other parts of the wider historic park (for example from across Great Pool). Redistributing the lodges further away from the Temple would be useful but would not mitigate their overall intrusive presence in the historic park.</p> <p>While the Trusts agree there is potential public benefit from increased public access to and across the site as suggested in the submission creation of permissive rights of way is not exclusively contingent on granting planning permission for the development. The applicants' arguments in this respect are misleading. No compelling argument has been submitted to show that commercial development is a public benefit essential for the future upkeep of the parkland such as to outweigh harm to the heritage of the park. The Trusts reiterate that reversion to grazing would be an acceptable reuse of the site and be fully in accordance with its use historically.</p> <p>In conclusion the Trusts concur with the views of Historic England and your Council's conservation officer that the rebuttal material submitted by the planning agent and heritage advisor does not give cause to revise our previous overall objection to the applications. While supportive of the principle of demolishing the existing modern hotel as an enhancement to the setting of the grade II* listed temple and the wider setting of the grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden the Trusts remain of the view that these applications are deficient in information and, on the basis of the evidence provided, will cause severe harm to the significance of the heritage assets. No overriding public benefits are adduced. The Trusts still consider the applications should be refused.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E20/0087	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved, access to be considered) - Erection of up to 190 residential dwellings, purpose built care home for up to 60 bedrooms, and associated infrastructure including landscaping, public open-space, car parking and means of access</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) regarding the above application.</p> <p>We wish to repeat our strong objection to the proposals as per our original letters, in particular, our most recent one dated 30th April 2021. Despite statutory consultees and other relevant bodies objecting strongly, many on heritage grounds, the applicant continues to maintain that this application will not cause harm to the setting or significance of the various heritage assets it affects.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the site is recognised by the emerging Joint Local Plan</p>

				<p>off Church Field Road. Land On The North Side Of, Church Field Road, Chilton Industrial Estate, Chilton, Suffolk.</p>	<p>(JLP) which proposes to de-allocate the site from its current employment use and also, crucially, due to its heritage sensitivity. This assessment is backed up by the 2019 Strategic Housing &amp; Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), which considers the site under Ref SS0933. It concludes that the site lies 'within an area of high heritage sensitivity' which is why it has been discounted from any development in the emerging JLP.</p> <p>We also have concerns that as this is an outline application with the drawings and plans being illustrative and not for decision, once the principle of development is established on the site, the applicants can seek to change the layout, including developing the open space currently proposed.</p> <p>We wish to repeat our earlier comments that we concur with our colleagues in HE that if permitted, the proposal would 'fundamentally change the character of the site from open rural land to that of a large, built development. It would result in the loss of this field which currently provides a buffer between the northern edge of Sudbury and Chilton Hall. The loss of the field would mean the hall and its landscape were no longer encircled by a rural landscape as it has been throughout its existence.' We therefore disagree with the statement in the Updated Planning Statement Para 4.57 which says : 'the proposed application site does not materially contribute to the setting or significance of the heritage assets.' If permitted, we believe that this application would permanently erode the landscape surroundings, substantially damaging the setting of the suite of heritage assets affected.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT OBJECTS to the above application as it does not comply with the emerging local plan, nor does it meet the requirements of NPPF 192(c) &amp; 194, and if allowed, would seriously damage the setting of all the assets. The group of assets taken together will no longer be set in a rural landscape for the first time in their entire existence, and the experience of and significance of the RPG, will be significantly adversely affected by the development in the immediately adjoining field.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hampton Court	Surrey	E18/1384	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Development to provide 97 dwelling units, a hotel (84</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.06.2022 I confirm that I object strongly to the proposed developments and would draw your attention to my letter included on p. 40 (12 Appendix 5.</p>

				bedrooms) and retail units (within use classes A1, A2 and/or A3) together with access, station interchange, car parking, servicing, new public realm, landscaping and other associated works following demolition of some existing buildings and structures on site including Hampton Court Motors. Jolly Boatman and Hampton Court Station Redevelopment Area, Hampton Court Way, East Molesey, Surrey KT8 9AE.	Endorsement of Conclusions, Chris Sumner) of Dr Sarah Rutherford's 'Hampton Court Station, East Molesey Development Proposals. Historic Environment Impact Assessment including Hampton Court Palace and its Setting'. I quote briefly from my endorsement letter. '...it is clear from (Dr Rutherford's) assessment that the scheme currently under consideration would cause immense and wholly unjustifiable harm to the area and indicates an inappropriate scale and density of development'. I confirm that my objections apply to both applications, and further confirm that in writing to you I am also expressing the views of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust, which joins and supports me in respectfully requesting that the appeals should be dismissed. Yours faithfully Chris Sumner Dip. Arch; AA Grad. Dipl. Cons (Gardens)
Dunchurch Lodge	Warwicks hire	E22/0029	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Retrospective planning permission for ancillary accommodation comprising 40 cabins, a security portacabin, a security barrier and play equipment for a period of 18 months. DUNCHURCH PARK HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE, RUGBY ROAD, DUNCHURCH, RUGBY, CV22 6QW	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.06.2022 Further to my letter of 27th June, we have been contacted by a local resident who tells us that the security portacabin etc is still in situ. We would be glad of assurances that they will soon be removed by the applicant. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Combe Abbey	Warwicks hire	E22/0319	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of one commercial unit for flexible use within Use Classes B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and associated development including drainage, earthworks, highways, car parking, HGV parking, service yard and landscaping	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.06.2022 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 Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have considered the online documentation and in particular the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which is very helpful in appreciating the way in which the proposed development within the Prospero Ansty Employment Area on land owned by Rolls Royce affects the setting of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Combe Abbey to the south. We appreciate that the application area is identified as a

				Plot 3,Ansty Aerodrome,Combe Fields Road,Combe Fields,Coventry,CV7 9JR	<p>Strategically Significant Employment Site in the adopted Rugby Borough Council Local Plan 2011-2031 dated June 2019 and that 'The proposals for Plot 3 sit wholly within the development parameters that were approved as part of this wider outline application with regard to the levels, building heights and extent of built form.' (LVIA 1.6)</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is clear that the new building, whilst a very similar height to the Meggitt building to the north, will have a considerably greater built presence especially from Viewpoints 6 &amp; 7. Despite being somewhat camouflaged by its neutral grey colouring and eventual partial screening by the proposed 20m wide woodland belt, the GT/WGT cannot support the encroachment of the growing industrial complex upon the irreplaceable heritage assets contained within the Grade II* RPG.</p> <p>If your officers approve this application we would urge that conditions are imposed so that this marks the end of further encroachment upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Great Barr Hall	West Midlands	E21/1956	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a temporary 49.35MW battery storage facility to include 28 energy storage container units, associated controls, PCS inverters, cooling and fire safety system, 14 Transformer feeder pillars, two substations and compound, each with an open air transformer, dedicated access track, security fencing enclosing the site, 14 low voltage cabins each with an open air transformer and high voltage switchgear. Intended lifespan of 40 years.</p> <p>FIELD ADJACENT THE DUCKERY, CHAPEL LANE, GREAT BARR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) and SGPT on the additional information submitted by the applicants' agent to whit the Alternatives Sites Assessment (Barton Wilmore – May 2022) and a description of a typical BESS (Anesco - 8 June). As in our original consultation response of 17 February 2022 SGPT is responding on behalf of both Trusts.</p> <p>The Trusts have carefully considered the additional material. The Anesco paper confirms our previous concerns at the harm and unsuitability of siting these industrial style facilities at this sensitive location.</p> <p>The Alternative Sites Assessment amplifies the reasons cited in the original submission for the choice of the application site (e.g. willing landowner; ease of access to a road and the national power grid; lack of nearby dwellings; lack of alternative sites locally). It still does not address the fundamental question posed in our previous letter of why a site is required in Walsall or put forward any strategic justification which might warrant overriding any harm caused to Green Belt or heritage protections. The document is wholly incorrect and misleading with regard to the location of the site within the designated Great Barr Conservation Area abutting the boundary of the Great Barr Hall Registered Park and Garden when it states</p>

					<p>at paragraph 3.28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· There are limited views of the site from public receptors....</li> <li>· There are no statutory heritage assets on or near the site...(my italics)</li> </ul> <p>The Trusts see no reason to change their original objection to the application in the light of this additional information and continue to recommend that your Council refuse planning permission for the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Brockhurst	West Sussex	E22/0292	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed single storey side extension to garage to create a habitable bedroom with ensuite. Single storey rear extension to create utility room. Internal remodelling. Adaptations to detached outbuilding/rotunda to make summer house.</p> <p>Little Manor Lewes Road East Grinstead West Sussex</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.06.2022</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 Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. We have considered the online documentation and are surprised that despite the application site lying within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Brockhurst, we could see no reference to this crucial fact within the documentation. The suite of documents does not include either a Design &amp; Access statement, a Heritage Statement or as required by the NPPF, any assessment of significance (Paras 194 &amp; 195). Added to this, the Gardens Trust have been consulted very late in the day and the application response time has already passed.</p> <p>Due to the late consultation, our colleagues in the Sussex Gardens Trust have not been able to make a site visit. Fortunately, the proposals do not appear to be problematic, but we would like to stress, that in future any application which might affect a RPG should be accompanied by far more thorough documentation and sent to the Gardens Trust in a timely fashion. As the current information fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF we are surprised that your officers validated this application.</p> <p>I am attaching a copy of our guidance for Local Planning Authorities which although it still refers to the earlier NPPF paragraphs, is still entirely relevant as far as the responsibilities of the LPA are concerned.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Horton Park	West Yorkshire	E22/0242	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of 11 dwellings and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.06.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>



				<p>associated works Land Off Cousen Road Bradford West Yorkshire BD7 3JX</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens – Horton Park (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 planning application is located immediately to the south of Horton Park on land that was formerly the Joseph Nutter Orphanage built in 1888, ten years after Horton Park was opened. The historic link between the orphanage and the park was evident not only through the elaborate sunken design of the intervening path with its matching pedestrian entrances and matching walling materials and style, but also the creation of a generous green space achieved by the setting back of the orphanage buildings from the mutual boundary.</p> <p>Horton Park, opened in 1878, was designed by William Gay, one of the finest Victorian landscapers in the north. Gay is perhaps best known for his cemeteries, including Undercliffe Cemetery, (established 1854), and Toxteth Park Cemetery, Liverpool (opened 1856), but he also designed parks including Saltaire Park (Roberts Park). He was one of the most imaginative and gifted designers of the period, using "raised and sunken terraces to enhance the complexities of the landscape" such as the grand terrace at Peel Park.</p> <p>Map evidence (particularly OS 1893) shows the original layout of the grounds in front of the orphanage is in a simpler style but similar to that of Horton Park and it was also likely to have been designed by Gay. The sunken arrangement of the path between the orphanage and the park specifically enabled the two to “borrow each other’s landscapes” – similar in concept to a ha-ha. Originally it is most likely that metal railings would have topped the intervening walls to enable the reciprocal views to be appreciated.</p> <p>In principle we have no objection to this site being developed for housing. However, we do have concerns about aspects of this application.</p> <p>It appears to us that new development on this site needs to recognise its inevitable role as part of the setting of its neighbour Horton Park. In our opinion the new housing should be designed so that the green landscaping within its site should provide a soft and generous interface with the intervening boundary wall, and the design should provide a reasonable opportunity for successful future landscape maintenance. It appears to us</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>that the currently proposed arrangement for the new houses presents inappropriate massing of buildings hard up against this sensitive interface, and that this very arrangement squeezes and fragments the landscaping within the housing site so that successful future maintenance will be unrealistic.</p> <p>As the developed land adjacent to this north-east boundary of the site would be completely privately owned there would be no control over the landscaping of these plots and hence their contribution to the setting of Horton Park. We totally agree with the pre-application enquiry response, (p12, Supporting Statement) that the trees along the boundary should not be retained within domestic curtilage, but in areas of public or shared open space maintained through a management agreement.</p> <p>We note that in this proposal none of these large family houses would be built with a garage. The lack of any indoor storage space for bicycles, gardening equipment, power tools etc. is likely to be result in additional buildings erected, yet further marring the setting of the park.</p> <p>The blue palisade perimeter fence has been identified as being a "negative attribute" (Supporting Statement, p.12). We agree that this is partly due to its unsympathetic colour but equally its style is brutally inappropriate for a residential site. We advise that the original boundary wall should restored, topped with new metal railings reflecting the original period style. We note that original decorative metal railings were still extant in Horton Park in 2014. We recommend that railings are painted a very dark green colour, for example in the shade, "Invisible Green". (Black was not considered to be a good colour for metalwork during the Victorian period.)</p> <p>We have not seen a detailed landscaping proposal for this site – but on the Proposed Site Plan is indicated "Steps Concrete" for Plot 9. These appear to be a pre-existing flight of steps down to a pedestrian gateway to the park. If this gateway is to be closed, then we request that the closure is made by matching stonework, perhaps set back 50mm to help identify this historical change.</p> <p>In conclusion we consider that this planning application as submitted will harm the setting and significance of Horton Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Shrogg's Park	West Yorkshire	E22/0290	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Removal of the existing facades	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.06.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory

				<p>to the front elevation porte-cochere and replace with new iron railings/gates  Bankfield Museum Boothtown  Road Halifax Calderdale HX3 6HG</p>	<p>Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens – Shrogg’s Park (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>Bankfield Museum is a grade II listed building in Akroyd Park, some distance east of Shrogg’s Park across the valley. Akroyd Park is not on the register but it is in Akroyden Conservation Area. The Museum is a significant heritage asset for Calderdale and was built/altered in the style of a grand Italianate villa by Edward Akroyd who was owner of one of the largest worsted manufacturing businesses in the 19th century and a significant benefactor including working with Halifax Permanent Building Society to promote home ownership through his model village Akroyden. Akroyd Park, the grounds around the Museum, are rather neglected. The removal of the existing infill to the porte-cochere will be beneficial. The use of appropriately coloured ironwork to the facades and the repair of the external door and framework will similarly enhance the property. We assume that putting in the gates and associated ironwork will be a security benefit, but we have not noted any comment in the Heritage Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>We have no further comments except to encourage your Council to improve/restore Akroyd Park to become a fitting setting for Bankfield Museum. The YGT runs a Small Grant Scheme which may be helpful for work at Calderdale’s parks. Information is on our website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Val Hepworth  Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--