



GT AND CGT CONSERVATION CASEWORK RESPONSES JULY 2022

The GT conservation team received 197 new cases and re-consultations for England in July. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 60 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Bristol Zoo Gardens	Avon	E22/0519	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Redevelopment of site to include 201 residential units (Class C3), the provision of community floorspace (Class E, F1 and F2), and open space with associated landscaping, play space, parking, accesses (pedestrian, cycle and vehicular), infrastructure, works to listed buildings, and selective demolition of buildings. (Major)</p> <p>Bristol Zoo Gardens, Guthrie Road, Clifton, Bristol BS8 3HA</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.07.2022</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such applications.</p> <p>The Trust refers to the above planning application. The site lies within Bristol City Council's Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area and abuts the Downs Conservation Area to the north. Paragraph 7.1.2b of the Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal & Management Proposals (2010) describe the Zoo Gardens: 'The combination of formal Victorian Gothic architecture and mature planting are an essential focus of this part of the conservation area.' Bristol Zoo Gardens are also designated as a Local Historic Park/Garden and an Important Open Space.</p> <p>The Trust understands the Zoo's objective to raise funds in order to relocate the Zoo to The Wild Place. Nevertheless, the Trust is concerned that the proposals represent overdevelopment of the site. The proposed extent and scale of development, and the site layout, would result in the Gardens being enclosed by extensive and overbearing blocks of development up to 6 storeys high. The essential character and quality of</p>

					<p>the Zoo Gardens would be lost, with resultant impact to the character of this part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Arboricultural Report describes the many important trees within Bristol Zoo Gardens. The development would result in the loss of 80 trees and 31 groups or part groups of trees. The translocation of 17 trees, 11 part groups and 2 hedges is proposed as part of the proposals, but the Trust is concerned as to whether such translocations would be successful. Whilst the Arboricultural Report includes a drainage plan overlay showing root protection areas, there will be a need for other below ground services and the location of these may result in further trees needing to be removed, and difficulty in accommodating new planting. The proximity of some trees to proposed buildings, and the need for working areas and construction compounds, may also result in difficulties during the construction period leading to the loss of further trees.</p> <p>The character and quality of the Gardens would also be eroded by the intrusion of residents' cars, and the likelihood of extensive on street parking, given the low parking provision planned.</p> <p>Summary:- The Trust objects to the proposed development as it considers that the proposed development would be in contravention of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy Policy BCS22. The proposed development would fail to 'safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance', namely the Local Historic Park / Garden of Bristol Zoo Gardens. .</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA</p>
Park Place, and Temple Combe	Berkshire	E22/0525	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full application for the proposed widening of the main and maintenance entrances, low level timber bollards, erection of 2No. pillars and 1No. double gate to the maintenance entrance following removal of existing sliding gate and replacement hedgerow planting.</p> <p>Woodlands House, Wargrave Road, Remenham, Wokingham, RG9 2LT</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have made a desk-based survey of the online documentation provided in support of the application affecting the Grade II registered park and garden of Park Place and liaised with our colleagues in Berkshire Gardens Trust. On this basis we do not wish to comment on the proposals at this stage. Our colleague in Berkshire who is familiar with the site is away until the middle of August, and upon her return, BGT may have additional comments to make. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E21/2139	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of part single / part two storey front /side extension, refurbishment of existing dwelling and restoration and relocation of existing gate piers with new gates.</p> <p>Oak Lodge, Dropmore Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NQ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting The Gardens Trust (GT) with regard to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We note the intention to create a new gate pier in brick to articulate it from the historic gate piers as well as the proposal to repair and restore the historic iron gates and to create new gates for the new opening to match the existing.</p> <p>It is not clear if the original access to Dropmore which passed through the historic gates is to be restored. We strongly suggest that your officers ensure that the scheme restores the original entrance to retain an evocation of this as one of the main entrances to the RPG.</p> <p>We are writing to confirm therefore that we welcome these revised proposals and offer our support to the planning application on this site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E22/0356	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of farm workshop building</p> <p>Parkfields Farm Silverstone Road Biddlesden Buckinghamshire MK18 5LQ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2022</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 response.</p> <p>We do not appear to have been consulted on any previous applications for this site, but assume that since it sits outside the Stowe Grade I registered park and garden (RPG), it may not have been flagged up. However, the site runs parallel with the Silverstone-Dadford road and Parkfields Farm sits opposite Blackpits Farm which my colleagues in the BGT have visited. The proposed application site is very visible from the north-western side of the RPG - see photo below taken from the Silverstone-Dadford Road. There appears to have been a previous application for this particular proposal which was refused due to its proximity to a helipad.</p> <p>The proposal is to build another substantial barn to the right of the large</p>

					<p>dark barn in the photo, thus creating visually a very long line of agricultural barns. Whilst we do not generally have an objection to farmers constructing new barns, we consider this to be in the wrong position due to its visual impact on the setting of the RPG.</p> <p>Whilst we have no objection in principle to a new agricultural barn, we object strongly to the proposed position which will create a long run of large structures which will be visible from the Stowe RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Nashdom Abbey	Buckinghamshire	E22/0492	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building consent for installation of conservation rooflight to rear facing roof elevation and replacement stair to existing mezzanine loft room.</p> <p>South Lodge, Nashdom, Nashdom Lane, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NJ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022</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>Nashdom was designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens for Prince Alexis Dolgorouki and his wife, on a previously undeveloped field surrounded by woodland. The house and surrounding formal garden were built c 1905-9. The property subject to this application site is detailed in the Grade II listing is as follows:</p> <p>‘A gatehouse (?Lutyens c 1912, listed grade II) lies at the north-east corner of the site where Nashdom Lane meets Rose Lane, 100m north-east of the house. It is built of whitewashed brick, consisting of a single block whose centre is a carriage entrance and whose outer wings lie at an angle of 45 degrees to it. Immediately behind it, to the south-west, blocking the view from the gatehouse to the garden to the south-west, is the single-storey, L-shaped stable (?Lutyens c 1912, listed grade II), in similar style to the gatehouse and also of whitewashed brick.’</p> <p>The application site is the south section of the gatehouse listed grade II. Whilst the proposed alteration may not be visible from the heart of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Nashdom, we conclude that the former gatehouse was included in the RPG because of its architectural value and their contribution to the historic setting designed by Lutyens. The existing structure and the adjacent stables building all feature small dormer windows. Furthermore, we responded to the application for alterations on the adjacent Stables property earlier this year (22/0070/FA)</p>

					<p>as follows “One aspect of this planning application is the introduction of a new dormer window in the rear elevation. The D&A statement says that this is thought to be more sympathetic than a rooflight and is in keeping with the existing dormer windows. The Gardens Trust support this aspect of the proposals.”</p> <p>We are writing now to confirm that the Gardens Trust offer no comment on the internal reconfiguration. However, due to the angle of their installation, rooflights create reflection and light emittance. Therefore, the Gardens Trust is writing now to object to the installation of a rooflight. However, we acknowledge that, due to the raised area of the roof in this position and the fact that the space is quite limited, it may not be possible or appropriate to insert a dormer window. Therefore, if the LPA are minded to grant consent for this aspect of the proposals and no alternative to a rooflight is available, we would ask that the rooflight is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · As small as possible – the drawings ‘as proposed’ show a rooflight 188cm in length which appears to fill most of the roof pitch on this elevation which, as noted above is quite limited in space. It is our opinion, that the proposed size is too long, will overwhelm the available space and will prove too intrusive. · A proper high-quality ‘conservation’ rooflight which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Features an integral central glazing bar (not a stuck-on glazing bar) o Is positioned flush to the roof. o Ideally with non-reflective glass o Minimal external framing <p>We do not support the installation of a Velux’ conservation rooflight’ which does not fulfil the criteria as listed above.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shardeloes	Buckinghamshire	E22/0540	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Extension to the existing Amersham National Grid substation, temporary laydown / welfare area and the upgrading of an access track around the north part of the substation Central Electricity Generating</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2022</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>Shardeloes is a Grade II* listed 18th century registered park and garden (RPG) and woodland with work by Nathaniel Richmond and Humphry</p>

				<p>Station, Mop End Lane, Mop End, Buckinghamshire</p>	<p>Repton, surrounding an C18 country house, with remains of a formal early C18 layout in park, possibly by Charles Bridgeman. The relevant part of the listing details the landscape as follows: “PARK. The extensive park is divided into north and south halves by High Wood west of the house and the main, east drive. The south park is largely arable with woodland plantations. The south corner, known as Rough Park, is largely woodland with the remains of the drive from Wycombe Lodge running through, and a large electricity substation set within. North of the woodland lies undulating open arable land with views north-east to High Wood and, in the distance, of the woodland on the hillside north of the River Misbourne.”</p> <p>The proposal is to extend the existing Amersham National Grid substation within the current land ownership of the National Grid along with creating a temporary laydown / welfare area whilst the works are undertaken and the upgrading of an access track around the north part of the substation. The application site is to the south-west of the main house in a wooded area that was historically known as the Rough Park and which contained the drive from Wycombe Lodge to the main house along with other woodland rides.</p> <p>It is regrettable that the electricity substation was ever constructed within the RPG, however the woodland does serve to obscure views of the substation from the main house and much of the pleasure grounds with the exception of the electricity pylon which is visible from a number of places.</p> <p>We note that the extension to the substation is to be positioned within the confines of the already developed land and that the access track already exists. The Gardens Trust therefore has no objection to the proposed extension or to the upgrading of the access track.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust will not object to the proposed extension or to the upgrading of the access track as long as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site remains invisible in the RPG outside the woodland 2. this is not the precursor to any more extensive development on this site or access routes to it 3. any increase in lighting is minimised with any such lighting designed to minimise and mitigate its impact on the RPG. <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E22/0557	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Removal of an existing LPG enclosure and tank and installation of a new below ground LPG tank</p> <p>Golf Course Stowe Historic Park</p> <p>And Garden Dadford Road Stowe</p> <p>Buckinghamshire</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the documentation and in principle we welcome installation of the LPG tank below ground. It will require digging down to some depth and no exact dimensions of this are given, which is a considerable omission. As the application site lies within an area acknowledged to be of archaeological sensitivity, we do not object as long as an archaeological watching brief is kept, and any finds are recorded.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Margie Hoffnung</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Arley Hall	Cheshire	E22/0441	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extension of hardstanding on area of existing car park and associated landscaping; Arley Hall, Arley Park, Cheshire CW9 6LZ. PARKING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022</p> <p>Further to the Gardens Trust's letter of 24th June concerning this application, Lord Ashbrook contacted the Cheshire Gardens Trust. Then, following communications with Rowland Flower, Ruth Benson, Ed Bennis and I met Rowland on site on Tuesday 12th July. It was a useful meeting which gave us a better understanding of the operational issues and enabled a sharing of concerns. As the consultation date for this application has passed and the target date for a decision is imminent, we thought it best to email you as we understand that you have been to Arley recently. We confirm that we have no objection in principle to the provision of additional parking in this area in order to support the operation of the historic estate. We acknowledge that the proposed surfaced area and choice of material would have little visual impact and lies within an area covered by an existing certificate of lawful use. We appreciate that this area is designated parkland, but the open character will mean that parked cars and other large vehicles will be highly visible particularly on the southern approach. An alternative favoured by the Trust would be to take the opportunity to positively embrace change by redefining the parkland edge with a new tree belt so that the parking area lies within woodland. This would in time substantially mitigate the visual impact of parked cars and larger vehicles. However we understand that this approach would not allow the flexibility required for different events and ease of overflow onto</p>

					<p>the adjacent grassland.</p> <p>We understand that there will be no definition of parking spaces, that the capacity is not defined, and that the intention is for the space to remain uncluttered by signage, fencing etc.. The proposed site plan lacks detail. The outline of the surfaced area appears to extend to the fence line. No depth of excavation is indicated or whether a geotextile would be used to separate the planings from the underlying soil (which in theory makes it easier to restore the parkland should the opportunity arise in future). We expressed concern that the surfaced parking area should be set back from the tree canopies and no excavation or surfacing take place within the Root Protection Area(RPA) along the woodland edge. It is particularly important that larger events vehicles are not allowed to park in the RPA because they would cause damaging compaction to the root zone. We acknowledge that the two proposed trees have been carefully sited but consider that a new parkland tree group and a few individual parkland trees planted near the drive on the southern approach would help soften views of parked vehicles and would be in keeping with the landscape character, without losing the flexibility of use that is important to Arley.</p> <p>We appreciate that Arley wish to progress work as soon as possible in order to accommodate planned activities and hope that these additional points are helpful in informing your decision.</p> <p>Kind regards, Barbara Moth</p>
Cadhay	Devon	E16/1666	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Extraction of up to 1.5 million tonnes of as raised sand and gravel, restoration to agricultural land together with temporary change of use of a residential dwelling to a quarry office/welfare facility at Straitgate Farm, Exeter Road, Ottery St Mary EX11 1LG.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2022</p> <p>Devon Gardens Trust has on several occasions since 2017 objected to the above application which affects Cadhay, an historic designed landscape included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. The designed landscape forms the designed setting of Cadhay House, which is Listed Grade I. From our consideration of the technical evidence brought forward and submitted for your consideration through this Inquiry, we conclude that the proposed development would have a significant and unacceptable impact upon the various nationally designated heritage assets at Cadhay.</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 statutory consultations in the County of Devon. Our</p>

					<p>responses to successive consultations therefore carry the weight and authority of the Statutory Consultee.</p> <p>We have reviewed the supplementary documents accompanying this application, and particularly the Report on the hydrogeology at Straitgate Farm for DCC on behalf of Mr Rupert Thistlethwayte (May 2020) prepared by the internationally respected expert, Prof Rick Brassington, which we commend to your attention in the strongest terms. This report supplements the findings of Prof Brassington’s previous report (2019) on the hydrogeology of this site. Both reports highlight the impact of the development on the springs which supply the mediaeval ponds at Cadhay, a significant and essential element of the nationally designated historic designed landscape and therefore the designed setting of the Grade I Listed house. We find the arguments advanced compelling, and the long-term threat to the ground water supply, the very raison d’etre for Cadhay, gravely worrying. Loss of the ground water supply and the consequent impact on the ponds and designed landscape would adversely impact the sustainability of Cadhay, and undermine its long-term future and that of its nationally designated heritage assets.</p> <p>We note with concern that the applicant does not appear previously to have responded to the fundamental issues raised by Prof Brassington in relation to the impact on Cadhay; and we must advise you that we consider the conclusions advanced in Environmental Impact Assessment chapter 7 and chapter 12 para 264 to be unsustainable. We further advise that, especially in the light of Prof Brassington’s most recent study, we find that the assessment of the impact of the proposed development on Cadhay set out in EIA chapter 12 paras 261-267 falls significantly short of the level of detail required by the National Planning Policy Framework (para 189).</p> <p>On the basis of the supplementary documents now provided, we conclude that, if implemented, the proposed scheme would cause more than substantial harm to the Grade II designed landscape at Cadhay, which forms the designed setting for the Grade I house. This level of harm to two, inter-related, nationally designated heritage assets, clearly conflicts with Government planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (especially paras 193-195), and with local and County planning policy.</p> <p>In these circumstances we respectfully urge you to dismiss the present appeal. Devon Gardens Trust is anxious to assist you in any way, and is happy to provide any further information, or to attend the Inquiry if you</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>feel our presence would assist its process.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E22/0468	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed extension to the existing visitor centre with associated public external space, new workshop building, a buried water treatment plant, and alterations to the public car park at Stover Country Park, Access To Stover Country Park, Stover, Devon, TQ12 6QG</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2022 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application 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. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website, and we conclude that the proposed development would have a less than substantial impact on the Grade II designed landscape of Stover Park, or the setting of any of its associated designated heritage assets. We consider that the proposed development would help to ensure a sustainable and beneficial future for the historic designed landscape. We therefore do not wish to raise any objection to the proposed development. Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Stover Park	Devon	E22/0474	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION The reinstatement of a section of the former 18th Century Serpentine Lake located in Stover Country Park, Newton Abbot, Devon, at the northern end of the playing fields associated with Stover School, at Stover School, Road From Stover Caravan Park To Forches Cross, Stover, Devon, TQ12 6QG</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2022 Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application 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. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Devon Gardens Trust is a member of The Gardens Trust and acts on its behalf in responding to consultations in the County of Devon. We have considered the information on your website, and we conclude</p>

					<p>that the proposed development would have a less than substantial impact on the Grade II designed landscape of Stover Park, or the setting of any of its associated designated heritage assets. We consider that the proposed development would be beneficial to the historic designed landscape. We therefore support the proposed development.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer Devon Gardens Trust</p>
Simmons Park	Devon	E22/0552	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Woodland Creation Land South East of Simmons Park RPG.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Devon Gardens Trust on the above application which affects an area adjoining, and lying within the setting of, the historic designed landscape of Simmons Park, Okehampton, which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites 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.</p> <p>We have examined the documents sent to us and, while we find them a little difficult to interpret, conclude that the proposed woodland development would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the designed landscape of Simmons Park. We therefore raise no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Jonathan Lovie Conservation Officer</p>
Wadhurst Castle	East Sussex	E22/0417	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION CONSTRUCTION OF 18 NO. NEW DWELLINGS (INCLUDING 6 NO. AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS) WITH ASSOCIATED HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING. LAND WEST OF STYLES LANE AND SOUTH OF HIGH STREET, WADHURST TN5 6DZ. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application and note that the development is</p>

					<p>immediately adjacent to Wadhust Park, which is designated as a Grade II Registered Park by Historic England. The documents submitted claim that the impact on the Registered Park is neutral. The image below (taken from Google Streetview) shows the view in Sept 2018 from the lawn in front of the Ha-Ha at Wadhust castle looking towards the site. Unfortunately, the Landscape and Visual appraisal document does not include a photomontage to show whether the new houses would be visible from this point after construction. Without such a photomontage it is unclear whether the proposals would cause any visual harm to the Registered Park and for this reason we suggest the Planning Authority should request such an image before determining the application.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell Trustee On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Sudeley Castle	Gloucestershire	E22/0452	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed oak framed and glazed doorway screen to be fitted between archway and internal courtyard. Sudeley Castle, Sudeley Road, Winchcombe BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might have an adverse impact on Listed or Registered parks gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust to respond on its behalf. What can one say. Within this fine historic setting, one hopes that this proposed draft excluding door will exhibit both sensitive design and craftsmanship. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Cirencester Park	Gloucestershire	E22/0493	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Variation of condition 18 (lighting) of permission 19/00853/FUL - (Change of use of land at Cirencester Park from horse paddocks, arena, and stables car park to form a new car park of 250 spaces) to allow for extended lighting hours at The Old Kennels Cirencester Park Cirencester Gloucestershire</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2022 The Garden Trust, as a Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have an adverse impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Your Landscape Advisor has set the legislative framework for this proposal; and I would suggest it will have to be an analysis of local opinion and management options that has to find a practical solution to controlling and safely accommodating parking needs during the evening. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>

Wimbledon Park	Greater London	E21/1002	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Cross boundary (Merton/Wandsworth) hybrid planning application comprising part full permission and part outline planning permission) for expansion of the All England Lawn Tennis Grounds onto Wimbledon Park Golf Course with the introduction of new tennis courts, tennis related infrastructure and new buildings. Full planning permission for the provision of 38 grass tennis courts and associated infrastructure, comprising of the re-profiling of the landscape and the removal, retention and replanting of trees; provision of 7 no satellite maintenance buildings; the provision of a boardwalk around the perimeter of and across Wimbledon Park Lake, lake alterations (including lake edge, de-silting and de-culverting), highway works to Church Road; new pedestrian access points at the northern and southern ends of the site; new vehicular access points; and the creation of a new area of parkland with permissive public access.</p> <p>Outline planning permission (with appearance, means of access, landscaping and scale reserved-layout only considered in detail) for the erection of an 8,000-seat parkland show court</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for alerting The Gardens Trust (GT) to amended documentation for the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the London Parks & Historic Gardens Trust (LPHGT) and their observations have contributed to this third response.</p> <p>We have read the addendum documents. Our comments relating to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) remain unchanged, and our greatest concern remains the erection of the new Parkland Stadium. We concur that the site chosen is the most suitable of the three possible options and its placement means that it will be read as part of the core group of large buildings with Centre Court and No 2 Court. The design, with its tree grove inspiration and external green-wall cladding will minimize the impact but is still from an environmental viewpoint, a detraction from the historic landscape which cannot be regained.</p> <p>We did not know that the Roehampton site is scheduled ultimately for development and had not fully appreciated the fragility of the condition of the grass court surfaces, hence the requirement for so many more courts to ensure they are of a suitable standard for Grand Slam tournaments and to maintain the pre-eminence of Wimbledon Championships internationally. We have concerns over the eventual redevelopment of the Roehampton site and would expect to see a commitment from Wandsworth to maintain and enhance public greenspace on the area being vacated to offset the carbon impacts of constructing a new stadium and enhance the public benefits.</p> <p>We remain concerned about the proposals, now expanded, relating to free public access in perpetuity. The Planning Statement Addendum (PSA) mentions in para 4.5.32 that 'Providing a facility within the parkland will allow opportunities for year-round use in ways the existing facilities cannot, for example : hosting local and regional tournaments, supporting Wimbledon Junior Tennis Initiative ... events'. This is a step back from AELTC's commitment to providing public amenity access during the non-Wimbledon championship months. We would like assurances that even if these events are held there will be no closing of areas for public access and a guarantee that for the majority of the year, ideally 9 months - we would suggest from mid-July to end of March - the public have free unimpeded access for recreational use at their leisure as an extension of the public park with minimal events. Should the local authority approve the application the GT/ LPHGT would recommend that the planning conditions</p>
----------------	----------------	----------	-----	--	--

				<p>incorporating a qualifying player hub, guest facilities and associated event operational facilities; a central grounds maintenance hub and 2 no. players hubs.</p> <p>An Environmental Statement has been submitted with the application under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Wimbledon Park Golf Club, Home Park Road, Wimbledon Park SW19 7HR</p>	<p>include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Clarity on dates of free public access in perpetuity · Guarantees of permanent maintenance funding · A covenant to ensure the public are never charged for access during the permitted season as set out in the application documents. Without this we would be concerned that over the years, public access could be gradually diminished as competition requirements increase, or fundraising opportunities, which would require occasional closures of part of the parkland, become more frequent. <p>Conversely, we recognize that the likelihood of finding an alternative viable financial mechanism to fund the heritage improvements and subsequent long-term maintenance and management of the newly created parkland and veteran trees, is vanishingly unlikely. The commitment by AELTC for maintenance of the parkland and lake in perpetuity is to be greatly welcomed, so that Merton and Wandsworth can focus their limited budgets elsewhere.</p> <p>We support the aim of removing the landscape from Historic England’s At Risk Register (HAR). The retention and propagation of all the veteran trees, accompanied by individual management plans, demonstrates a positive commitment by AELTC to management of the heritage of the site in the longer term. We also encouraged to see collaboration with neighbouring landowners to ensure a long-term management and maintenance regime for the entire area and hope this initial approach will be sustained – we suggest a S106 condition that builds in a long-term forum to oversee the management of the site. We are glad to note that a way has been found to reduce the extent of the concrete ring beams around the proposed new grass courts, significantly reducing the use of concrete.</p> <p>So long as the LPA can build in sufficient assurances that the AELTC will sustain the promised public benefits, although finely balanced, we accept that they could outweigh the disbenefits of the new Stadium and tennis courts and that this is an opportunity unlikely to recur. We would like to emphasise that this only holds true if the project achieves the promises of an increase of 106% of accessible open parkland, creation of the lake boardwalk, major parkland/lake restoration, retention and care of veteran trees, collaboration with neighbouring landowners to ensure a long-term management and maintenance regime for the entire area, combined with permanent maintenance funding to remove the Grade II* registered park and garden off the HAR.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Landscaping to Alton West Estate	Greater London	E22/0315	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed building consent for the installation of replacement windows and external stairwell fire doors, and associated external repairs and redecorations to the south-eastern and north-western elevations of Binley House, Charcot House, Denmead House, Dunbridge House and Winchfield House.	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2022 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 London Historic Parks & 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 https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) 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 Richmond Park, a Grade 1 Public Park on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England and on the LPG Inventory. LPG has now considered the information that you have provided and makes the following observations. From the documentation the proposed development will not encroach on the land provided for public use which we welcome. While the documentation (Application produced by Lawson Queay Chartered Surveyors on behalf of Alton Estates) states that the site can be seen from 'public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land', the visual impact of the changes to Richmond Park appears to be minimal. The Heritage Statement (produced by Lawson Queay Chartered Surveyors on behalf of Alton Estates) states: "[the] effect of these works is minimised as far as possible. The proposed windows have been designed to match existing as accurately as possible whilst conforming to the parameters of modern construction. They will remain as timber windows and the opening arrangements match the

					<p>present configuration. The appearance of the proposed vents within one of the window types has been carefully considered to reduce the visual impact on the building, by integrating the vents into the frames and coloured to match.”</p> <p>We welcome the considerations to maintain the existing façade, reducing the visual impact of the replacement windows.</p> <p>While the proposed design of the new fire doors does not match the existing exactly, we agree that the safety of residents and visitors takes precedence over the visual impact of these changes. However, we recommend that as close a match as possible to further minimise the visual impact of these changes.</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> <p>Yours sincerely, Catherine Warburton</p>
Wanstead Park	Greater London	E22/0428	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing structures and mixed-use redevelopment for 5,759.9 sqm retail floorspace (Use Class E) and 175 residential homes (Use Class C3) in a building ranging from two to ten storeys in height with a single storey basement; including vehicular accesses from Beachcroft Road and Howard Road, basement car parking and ground floor servicing areas, provision of hard and soft landscaping with a pedestrianised extension to Cobden Road, and other associated works. 444 High Road Leytonstone, Leytonstone, London, E11 3QL.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application and the potential impacts on Wanstead Park a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, located in LB Redbridge.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & 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 https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Having read the documentation and checked the position on the map, it is</p>

					<p>noted that the development site is not significantly close to Wanstead Park, Grade II*, located in the adjacent borough of Redbridge, and as such would not represent an obvious detractor from the Heritage Asset. We base this on the Planning Statement prepared by Rolfe Judd Planning Ltd (agent/architect), which includes a section on Heritage Considerations (Section 6.7 pp.49-51), with the following paragraph specifically on Wanstead Park:</p> <p>“6.7.9 : 400m east of the site is Wanstead Park, a Grade II* listed Park and Garden. The heritage value is tied to its evolving function as a recreational ground, from hunting in the 1500s, to a formal garden and house in the 1600s under Sir Josiah Child continued by his inheritors until the 1800s when the parkland was let for grazing. In 1882 the Corporation of London purchased part of the park and opened it to the public as Epping Forest. The remaining part became Wanstead Golf Club in 1920. Given the distance from the application site the highest part of the proposed development is unlikely to be discernible, particularly as the John Walsh and Fred Wigg apartment blocks on the south-western edge of the park would assist in obscuring the view from the centre of the parkland. The heritage value of the park is therefore not impacted by the proposal.”</p> <p>However, we note that there is one green space that is closer (but not adjacent) to the development site: Harrow Green, which although not a Registered Park and Garden features on the LPG Inventory and also contains a Grade II listed War Memorial:</p> <p>https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=WAL015.</p> <p>Rolfe Judd’s Planning Statement recognises the importance of the listed War Memorial situated in the centre of Harrow Green, but concludes that the architectural interest of the Memorial is not impacted by the development site (6.7.5 – 7). However, we note that the Greater London Authority pre-application report (2020/6898/PP21, 16 March 2021), includes the following paragraph on Heritage (69):</p> <p>“Although the application site is not located within a conservation area, it is noted that there are some listed heritage assets in the surrounding area. Any application should include verified views as part of a Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, to enable officers to fully assess the level of harm caused to heritage assets in accordance with the NPPF and London Plan policies. The applicant should agree views, including longer range views, with the Council. Proposals should represent a high-</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>quality development that would integrate well with the surrounding area, subject to an assessment of its heritage impacts and addressing design issues relating to the height of the proposed buildings.”</p> <p>In the absence of verified views for this heritage asset it is not possible to comment at this stage on the likely impact. We would suggest that a decision is deferred until the applicant supplies these views, given the height of the tallest structures in the development qualifies under the local plan as a tall building (10 storeys).</p> <p>As a result, 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 assets identified the Trust reserves the right to alter its comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Sally Williams</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Regent's Park	Greater London	E22/0442	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of cafe pavilion within university gardens for university staff and students only. Regent's University London, Inner Circle, Regents Park, London, NW1 4NS.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Gardens Trust (LGT). The LGT is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the HE Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. The LGT is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LGT's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see www.londongardensonline.org.uk) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Regent's Park is listed on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens at Grade 1. It is therefore regarded as of national importance and unique. The premise is for no additional development but any development within this important landscape must be undertaken with great care and tested against the principle of whether the public benefit of the proposal outweighs the harm to the listed landscape. The subject site lies within the park.</p>

					<p>Other than in exceptional circumstances, any additional development and loss of open space is harmful to this important listed park.</p> <p>I have visited the site and contrary to the suggestion in the Design and Access Statement that is attached to this application, the site of the proposal is visible from the footpath to the south west of the site, which provides secure access to the university campus.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site falls within the setting of the listed building, Reid Hall, although the location plan in Design and Access Statement fails to make this clear.</p> <p>There is no public benefit of the proposal as it is for university staff and students only. There are other cafes within the park. Therefore, the harm caused by this proposal is not justified by public benefit.</p> <p>We OBJECT to this application for the following reason: The proposal provides no public benefit and causes harm to this important listed park.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely Hazel Morris For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Carshalton House (St Philomena's School)	Greater London	E22/0456	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a new modular classroom building and new fenced bin store area St Philomenas School Pound Street Carshalton SM5 3PS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application and the potential impacts on the grade II listed historic landscape of Carshalton House (now St Philomena's School) which also lies in the Carshalton Conservation area.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & 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 https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). This site is included on our Inventory here:</p>

					<p>I have reviewed the documentation supplied on the planning portal associated with this application. I have also discussed the case and the issues it raises with the London Parks and Gardens Planning Conservation Working Group Committee.</p> <p>The gardens are Grade 2. Situated within the grounds are; the Grade 2 Water Tower, and the Grade 2 Chapel, as well as the Grade 2* Carshalton House. The gardens and landscape comprise the setting for these heritage assets (House, Chapel and Water Tower) and as such are protected within the NPPF guidance. They are a whole and should be considered together as a unique site.</p> <p>Although, the proposed classroom and bin store are a fairly modest development the Trust objects on the following grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modular classroom is out of character with the surrounding landscape. I note that impact section of the Heritage Statement submitted by the applicant does not say anything about the visual effect on the surrounding landscape or about the adjacent listed chapel. The same applies to the Design and Access Statement. • It is close to and intervisible with the grade II listed chapel a short distance to the south. • The proposed new bin store is in a very visible position on the edge of the open area which forms the northern part of the landscape and as such detracts from the public amenity value of passers-by. • The encroachment of the edge of the open area sets a precedent which may lead to creeping development. This issue ought to be addressed by the school developing a strategy as how any expansion can be appropriately fitted in to the listed landscape and conservation area. • There is an adjacent car park, less visible, where a classroom could be placed. <p>If the development does go ahead we strongly recommend that a special condition require both structures to be screened from the adjacent open space and that future development encroachment into the open area be resisted without an overwhelming demonstration of public benefit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, John Phillips For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Heathfield	Greater London	E22/0462	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Continued use of Heathfield House for educational purposes	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.07.2022 I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and

			<p>(Class F1) for Special Educational Needs School with part of the adjacent garden area to provide recreational space for students. Works include new internal doorway, other internal alterations, the erection of fencing around proposed external play areas and other ancillary outdoor space, signage, landscaping/tree works and improvements to existing public car park and pedestrian pathway. Heathfield Coombe Lane Croydon CRO 5RH</p>	<p>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 https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). We were notified of this application by a member of the public 2 days ago. Yesterday evening Croydon's planning register was out of action which has severely hampered our opportunity to comment. The property appears on our inventory as a locally listed historic park and garden – see entry here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=CRO035&sitename=Heathfield</p> <p>The Grade 2 house is statutorily protected as a heritage asset. The gardens and landscape comprise the setting for the house and the house is part of the landscape and gardens, they are a whole and should be managed together. The gardens and landscape, whilst not nationally listed, may have greater heritage value than the local list entry would suggest - from Google Earth, and in the absence of adequate consideration within the application documentation, this is a good ensemble of early 20th century landscape features within a cohesive design which is quite rare in the capital. The gardens and landscape may therefore be a candidate for national listing. Though there is no named designer the landscape and gardens were developed under the guidance of a single owner Raymond Riesco, a philatelist and collector who donated the site to Croydon Council on his death and bequeathed his Chinese ceramics to the Museum of Croydon. The landscape and the house should not be separated from one another, either physically (as is proposed) or in terms of their conservation management. The proposed development of a 3m high steel fence around the house at the core of the landscape will physically separate the heritage assets and put them on different management trajectories. The installation of the 3 m fencing, along the lines of the stonework terraces, will likely have a detrimental effect on these landscape features. It will be</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>difficult to get good concrete footings in without substantial excavation around these existing features. There are no construction details on the fence installation provided; there is not even a landscape plan provided with the application.</p> <p>In addition to the potential loss of the terraces there is the proposed removal of the planting and gardens themselves, which again will be detrimental to the setting of the grade 2 listed house and a loss to the locally listed landscape.</p> <p>Harm from these interventions is downplayed in the heritage statement. Whilst it notes that the mesh fencing is visually permeable, this only applies when close up to the fence. Long-distance views will see the fence become a solid mass. In any case, the proposed use of the house, as a school, will inevitably see the introduction of ever greater screening whether with hard or soft materials as safeguarding concerns increase. The proposed use of the house as a school is very likely, not the heritage assets' optimum viable use. There is no evidence that other uses have been considered or reviewed in this planning application.</p> <p>Introduction of the 3 m high fencing and removal of the terraced gardens to provide a wet pour (highly coloured hard standing surface) for the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) would have an unacceptable impact on the setting of the listed house, comprise intrinsic harm to the significance of the gardens and landscape and impact on protected views as set out in the local plan.</p> <p>Last, as well as concerns over the heritage issues set out above, there is the reduced public access to open space which is also a material consideration leading to a severe loss in amenity value with no strategy for how this will be compensated.</p> <p>The LPG therefore objects to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historic setting of the Grade 2 Heathfield House will be diminished by the installation of a 3m high fence and the creation of a MUGA. • The reduction in open space available to the public; and the unsightly new installations will diminish the amenity value of the landscape. <p>Yours sincerely, Helen Monger</p>
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	Greater London	E22/0522	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The proposed installation of 20m Orion pole (painted grey) supporting 6no antennas, 2 No</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2022</p> <p>We are surprised that Richmond failed to notify the Gardens Trust about the above application, as we regularly respond to planning applications which might affect the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) at Kew. It</p>

				<p>dishes, addition of proposed York cabinet (painted fir green) (1900 x 660 x 1750mm high) and proposed Shire cabinet (painted fir green) (1050 x 660 x 1750mm high) together with ancillary development thereto.</p> <p>Land South Of Pools On The Park (on Grass Verge North Side Of Twickenham Road, Adjacent To Footbridge) Twickenham Road</p>	<p>is a regrettable omission especially since this is one of the most important registered sites within Greater London. We have liaised with our colleagues in the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The online documentation is sparse and unclear. We believe that both the monopole and its accompanying box lie within the RPG, as the Historic England map entry for the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew appears to show the A316 near the https://historiceurope.org.uk/listing/thelist/listentry/1000830?section=officialist-entry overpass lying within the boundary of the deer park. We would have expected the applicant to provide clearer plans showing the exact location of the box in relation to the RPG boundary. The Site Location Plan's (SLP) photograph and the description on the top left of the SLP suggest it could lie just outside the boundary/on the boundary of the deer park. On the assumption that this lies within the Grade I site, there is no mention we could find acknowledging that the monopole lies within the RPG, or any apparent appreciation that this is an extremely sensitive location. We would have expected at the very least some sort of heritage impact assessment with views from within the RPG showing how visible the mast and its associated development would be. We would like to know what other sites were considered and why this spot was chosen. Whether the mast lies within the RPG or just on the boundary affecting the setting of the Grade I RPG, we remain concerned. We have looked at the application site on Streetview, and it is apparent that tree cover in this area is deciduous, thin and shorter than the proposed Orion pole, and will not provide any screening from within the RPG.</p> <p>We would request that the applicant considers other less sensitive sites for their installation and to put forward some mitigation proposals for us to consider. The accompanying cabinets and equipment are large and unsightly and will undoubtedly also negatively impact upon the setting of this Grade I landscape.</p> <p>The GT/LPTG object to the siting of the mast and other equipment in this location.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Rhinefield House	Hampshire	E22/0545	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey rear extension and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>

				<p>outbuilding (demolish existing); internal alterations (Application for Listed Building Consent) Rhinefield Lodge, Rhinefield Road, Brockenhurst, SO42 7QB</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 Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have consulted the online documentation and were surprised that neither the Heritage Statement or the Design & Access Statement mentions that the application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Rhinefield House. Consequently, the application fails to comply with Paras 194 and 195 of the NPPF as no reference is made of their setting or significance. We have not been able to make a site visit and our comments are based on a desk-based assessment.</p> <p>The attached plans for the single-storey rear extension has large windows facing southwards into the RPG, and we do have some concerns about light emittance. However, on Google Earth and the Historic England register map for Rhinefield House, the application site would appear to be completely screened by a belt of woodland which precludes views outwards from the garden of the Lodge. Currently the plans are only for a single storey extension, and if your officers are satisfied that it is sufficiently screened to prevent light pollution into the rest of the RPG, we confirm that on this basis we do not wish to make any further comments on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Should the applicant decide in future to add a second storey we would review our comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Amwell Grove and Amwell Pool	Hertfords hire	E22/0317	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a detached two-storey, three bedroom dwelling. Land Opposite Amwell Grove Cautherly Lane Great Amwell SG12 9SP</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The site of this application lies within the setting of the Grade II Registered Amwell Grove and Pool Historic Garden and also opposite the entrance to the Grade II listed Amwell Grove and the separately listed entrance structures. It is also within the setting for the Grade II* St John's church. We objected to a previous proposal (3/20/0733/FUL) for a very similar house here, in May 2020. The comments we made then on the harm a house of such modern, glass-walled design in such a prominent would have on the setting of all these designated heritage assets, contrary to EHDC</p>

					<p>Policy HA8 and the Great Amwell Conservation Area provisions still pertain. Due to its elevated position it would also be an intrusion on the deliberately designed rural nature of Amwell Pool, particularly in the winter when there is less tree cover. The house design does not reflect the character of the surrounding conservation area and would be an intrusion into an otherwise harmonious rural area which is part of the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is contrary both the NPPF and to EHDC Green Belt Policy.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed design would cause harm to the Designated heritage assets and their settings, the character of the Conservation Area and the Green belt. We therefore OBJECT to this proposal.</p>
Aldenham House	Hertfords hire	E22/0357	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of renewable led energy generating station comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and bio diversity enhancements. (Re-submission of 21/0050/FULEI) Land North Of Butterfly Lane, Land Surrounding Hilfield Farm And Land West Of, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham, Hertfordshire</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, of which HGT is a member. Our comments relating to the previous application, 21/0050/FULEI still pertain, viz: The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens works closely with Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, and has authorised HGT to respond to planning issues in Hertfordshire on its behalf. The proposed solar facility would affect the RPG of Aldenham House (Grade II) and the Grade II* buildings within it and its wider agricultural landscape which forms part of the setting of the RPG. The Aldenham RPG also contains the complex moated site of Pennes Place, now a Scheduled Monument. This is situated close to Butterfly Lane, adjacent to the main entrance drive to Aldenham House and was a feature of some importance in the design of the RPG. It would also affect Hilfield Castle (Grade II*). In 1799 Humphry Repton was consulted by the owners to lay out a landscape park around the Castle (as detailed in published research by the HGT). Although much of the wider estate has been converted to other uses, there are still remnants of the earlier designed parkland and the wider landscape is still largely agricultural. We have studied the desk-based report on Archaeology included and do not agree with their comments stating that there would be no harm to the significance of Hilfield Castle, Penne’s Place and Aldenham Park. We would expect to see a Heritage Impact Statement on the effect on the historic designed landscapes in the area, especially as they include an RPG. This would have demonstrated the adverse impact this solar farm would have</p>

					<p>on the landscapes themselves and on their settings and thus their significance, contrary to provisions in the NPPF (Chapter 1) and Historic England Guidance (GPA.3.2) the Setting of Heritage Assets.</p> <p>We note that this development does not accord with the provisions of Hertsmere BC Policy SADM29 on Heritage Assets, of Policy SADM10 on Biodiversity (We note that there is also a number of designated wildlife sites within the RPG, near Hilfield and in the wider landscape but no mention of Green Corridors), on Policy SADM14 on Green Belt. We note that Appendix E, Policy SADM24 lists Aldenham House (Haberdasher Aske's Boys School) as a Key site within the Green Belt (although it does not include the whole of the Registered parkland area) as requiring development proposals to take account of them. The evidence advanced in the proposal does not adequately fulfil that requirement.</p> <p>We have serious concerns regarding the heritage assets, both designated and undesignated, and their settings, within the application area.</p> <p>We trust that you will give due weight to the heritage assets and the requirements of the NPPF in determining this application</p>
Ashridge	Hertfords hire	E22/0371	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of temporary structure and construction of a permanent building.</p> <p>Ashridge Golf Club Golf Club Road Little Gaddesden Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1LY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The Golf Club lies with the Grade II* Ashridge Registered Park and Garden and forms part of the setting of the Grade I Listed Ashridge house. As such we would expect a Heritage Impact Statement , not only for the older park but for the golf course as laid out by Harry Colt. The site of the Golf Club buildings is close to the historic Ridings and to Old Park Lodge, a designed eyecatcher in the park.</p> <p>We consider that the new building may not have a significant impact on the long designed views across the northern park but will affect nearer views and it is new permanent development within the Registered landscape; more prominent than the building it is to replace. Harm to the landscape has already happened though previous development and the cumulative harm caused by further development as outlined in this proposal would be contrary to NPPF, (192) where the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets is outlined.</p> <p>We have concerns on heritage grounds, and would welcome a Heritage Assessment, as required by NPPF (189), including assessment of the impact this building will have on the surrounding historic landscape</p>
Ayot House	Hertfords hire	E22/0456	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Request for a scoping opinion in relation</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.</p>

				to a proposed solar development and associated infrastructure at land south-east of Ayot St. Lawrence. Land to the south east of Ayot St Lawrence SOLAR planning@welhat.gov.uk	The Scoping Report mentions locally listed parks and gardens as being included in the assessment. This should include locally important sites in the adjoining areas of St Albans DC, eg Lamer Park as well as those in the WHBC area, e.g. Bride Hall, Shaw's Corner. The impact on the setting of these parks and gardens, as well as that of the Registered Ayot House should be included, as laid out in GPA.3.2 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' by Historic England
14 Sherrardspark Road, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0458	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>T1 1 x Oak - reduce by 1.5m in height and width, remove major deadwood and epicormic growth from trunk, leaving Rose in situ to improve light in to garden area without compromising shape and amenity value of the tree</p> <p>T2 1 x Cherry - fell to ground level to create a lot more light in to garden late afternoon (crown is suppressed by other trees)</p> <p>T3 - 1 x Oak - reduce by 1.5m in height and width, remove major deadwood and remove epicormic growth from trunk, to improve light in to garden area without compromising shape and amenity value of the tree, whilst also maintaining size</p> <p>T4 1 x Silver birch - reduce by 2m height and 1.5m width- maintain crown size, improve light</p> <p>T5 1 x Cherry - to fell as the tree is in poor form and condition</p> <p>14 Sherrardspark Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JP</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies within the historic Sherrards Wood and the trees contribute significantly to the character of this part of Welwyn Garden City. We have no objections to the felling of the cherry trees , nor to the pruning of the oak and birch if necessary. We note there is no aboricultural assessment included with the application, so cannot comment in detail.</p>
Aldenham House	Hertfords hire	E22/0459	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Reconfiguration of existing car park, plus associated landscaping and demolition of an existing</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee, of which HGT is a member.</p> <p>Haberdasher Aske's Schools sit within the Registered parkland and garden</p>

				<p>outbuilding. Haberdashers Askes School For Girls, Aldenham Road, Elstree, Borehamwood, Hertfordshire, WD6 3BT</p>	<p>of Aldenham House which is of national importance, both for its design and for the arboricultural and horticultural excellence of the plants put in during the occupancy of Henry and Vicary Gibbs in the 19th and early 20th centuries as well as the older estates which were united to form this property. Further the landscape provides the setting, and part of the significance, for the listed mansion</p> <p>We have studied the Heritage Appraisal attached to this application and would consider that the significance of the landscape in this area is more than a minor general contribution. The contrast of ornamental woodland, more open parkland and areas of horticulture (either ornamental or productive) were carefully considered.</p> <p>Although the changes to the car park would not cause substantial harm to the landscape, there have been a number of changes to the whole landscape of Aldenham House (both Boys and Girls Schools sections and the Home Farm) which have resulted in a cumulative loss of significance. This proposal would add to that loss.</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E22/0463	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Garage conversion to form habitable space and alterations to openings 30 Azalea Close London Colney St Albans Hertfordshire AL2 1Ua</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information provided in this application we do not consider that the proposed alterations would cause harm to the Registered Landscape of Napsbury Park.</p>
Ponsbourne Manor Chestnut Cottage 4 The Ridings, Newgate	Hertfords hire	E22/0483	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a single storey side extension Ponsbourne Manor Chestnut Cottage 4 The Ridings Newgate Street Village Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8QX BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, Ponsbourne Park is a rural gentry estate on the HGT/WHBC Lists of Historic Parks and Gardens of Local Interest and The Ridings is built on a former greenfield site with extensive views across the landscape. We are concerned that the windows of the extension will contribute to light pollution across the landscape which sits in the Green Belt. There is no detail of any proposed mitigation through shrub or tree planting. We would propose that adequate screening between the extension on the side landscape to the east should be a condition if planning consent is given for this application</p>
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E22/0495	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a two storey side extension The Lodge 2 Northaw Place Coopers Lane Northaw</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 4.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies within the Locally Listed Northaw Place historic parkland and is part of the setting for the Grade II* listed mansion, with views east/west across the parkland between the two properties.</p>

				Potters Bar Hertfordshire EN6 4NQ	The proposed additions should be adequately screened from these views with the existing trees and shrubs but could be augmented if required.
Hatfield House	Hertfords hire	E22/0510	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full planning permission for erection of 97 dwellings (including affordable housing); public open space and amenity space (including Children’s Play); associated landscaping and ecological enhancements; internal highways, parking, footpaths, cycleways, drainage, utilities, and service infrastructure; new access arrangements via A1000, Hollybush Lane, Ascots Lane (pedestrian/cycle only) and Elliott Close (pedestrian/cycle only) and highway improvements along A1000</p> <p>Outline planning permission for up to 243 dwellings (including affordable housing); cricket pitches with ancillary pavilion (up to 230sqm) and parking; a civic square; up to 270sqm of Class E/F2 space; public open and amenity space (including Children’s Play); associated landscaping and ecological enhancement work; internal highways, parking, footpaths, cycleways, drainage, utilities and service infrastructure (with all matters reserved apart from access)."</p> <p>Land at Hollybush Lane, Creswick Welwyn Garden City</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. This site is within the Green Belt separating Hatfield and Welwyn Garden City. Designated WGC1 in the emerging WHBC Local Plan, the Inspector found there were sufficient circumstances to allow it as a housing allocation, and the LUC Green Belt review assessed its contribution to Green Belt Purposes as only Moderate, and Moderate-High. We recognize that some Green Belt land needs to be developed to fulfil the OAN and consider that this site is less harmful than some other proposed allocation sites.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the Green Corridor linking Stanborough to The Commons and further as an important wildlife/recreation link but trust that the reservation of the southern part of the site as green space, with the proposed augmentation of the woods and hedgerows, will not have a significant adverse impact on the corridor.</p> <p>There are two historic parks and gardens locally; Bush Hall and the Grade I Hatfield Park. The design of the development with areas of green space and low rise housing, as well as the screening from the Creswick Plantation and additional planting should provide sufficient screening for Bush Hall and Hatfield Park.</p> <p>We have no objections to this proposal.</p>

Balls Park	Hertfords hire	E22/0518	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Single storey rear extension and garage conversion. 9 Willis Grove Balls Park Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8FH	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies with the Registered Landscape of Balls Park, itself the setting for the Grade I mansion. The rear of this property has views eastward over the historic landscape toward the Listed Jenningsbury, with reciprocal views back to Willis Grove from Footpath 111. We are therefore disappointed that no Heritage Statement has been included in this application and no assessment of the impact which the proposed rear extension and the large amount of glazing would have on the heritage asset. We therefore object to this proposal as submitted . If a satisfactory heritage impact statement and details of any augmented screening in the form of hedges/trees necessary is submitted, we will consider the application again.
Welwyn Garden City Town Centre	Hertfords hire	E22/0529	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Prior approval for the erection of a 15m high "slim line" phase 9 telecoms monopole, 3no. additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works Area of existing grass verge off Birdcroft Road, off Parkway, Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire, AL8 6JU	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.07.2022
9 Codicote Road, Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E22/0532	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a first floor extension and alterations to ground floor layout 9 Codicote Road Welwyn AL6 9ND	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have objected to several previous applications for this site on the grounds that the overdevelopment proposed is not in keeping with the established character of the area, that it would adversely affect views and the setting of adjacent dwellings. It would also be inappropriate development in the Green Belt The present proposals do not address these concerns and we object to them.
Redbourn Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E22/0548	n/a	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REDOURN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2022 Regulation 16 Consultation	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2022 Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of The Gardens Trust, fully support the proposed policies on heritage, including that on non-designated heritage assets . However, we feel that as setting is a key part of the

				Redbourn Parish vCentre, The Park, Redbourn AL3 7LR	significance of heritage assets, this should be stressed in the policy workings and reference to Historic England's GPA3.2 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' made clear. We would also suggest including non-designated parks and gardens. Hertfordshire Gardens trust has included Cumberland Gardens on its list of historic gardens of local historic interest as an example of a former walled garden (with listed walls) which may still hold archaeological information as to former design and use.
31A Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0554	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Prior approval for conversion of vacant offices to residential use 31A Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AP	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We have no comments to make on the proposed conversion, but we note that there are no elevation drawings nor detail of any exterior changes. We would assume, therefore, that there are no alterations proposed to the fenestration and exterior door details on the Wigmores and Howardsgate frontages, about which we would have heritage concerns.
Old River Lane	Hertfords hire	E22/0666	n/a	LOCAL PLAN OLD RIVER LANE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) The draft Old River Lane SPD four-week consultation for the redevelopment of the Old River Lane Site, Bishops Stortford	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.07.2022 We agree that the views and setting of the Castle Gardens and the motte should be retained and enhanced and that the design, height and massing of any development should respect these heritage assets and if possible enhance them and their settings.
6 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0587	N	PLANNING APPLICATION T1- Oak in rear garden - Reduce crown by 3 metres to suitable points of growth. 6 Densley Close, Welwyn Garden City, AL8 7JX	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Densley Close is part of the historic Sherrardspark Wood and the mature oaks and other trees are a key part of the character of the area. We are aware that one oak has already been felled at this property and are concerned that no justification has been included with this application for the severe pruning of a mature oak tree.
Gobions (Gubbins)	Hertfords hire	E22/0590	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 32 solar photovoltaic panels to rear roof slope 6 Northaw Place Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NQ	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Northaw Place is on the List of historic parks of local interest with views northwards from the mansion and the new courtyard to the west. The solar panels on this recently built courtyard house are on the southern elevation facing in to the courtyard. We consider that there will be no harm to the wider landscape and the important views across the parkland from the installation of these solar panels. We have no objections to this proposal

Redleaf	Kent	E22/0380	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion and extension of existing potting shed to one 1-bed annexe.</p> <p>Redwood Penshurst Road Penshurst Tonbridge Kent TN11 8HY</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 04.07.2022</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 studied the online documentation and can see that this is yet another application for the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Redwood, which has already been subdivided into different residential plots.</p> <p>The application is described as an existing potting shed (no longer required as the maintenance is now contracted out), which will be converted to a one bed annexe to the main house, which is in excess of 100 metres to the south-east. However, the planning statement (PS) tends to suggest that the new dwelling is for the use of the gardener.</p> <p>The PS describes the proposal as including a small extension. The current structure is approximately 35sq m and it is proposed to increase this by approximately an extension of a further 30sq m, which is more than the permitted 50% increase within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Access to the proposed dwelling appears to be indicated through an adjacent property known as the Picturehouse which is the subject of a current planning application 22/01433.</p> <p>Conversion of an existing structure into a dwelling has to comply with Policy GB7 of the Allocations and Development Management Plan (ADMP) This requires “a detailed structural survey and method statement that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion.” No such documents have been provided.</p> <p>With the permitted increase in the planned building area being exceeded, and the omission of required documentation, we are unable to support this application.</p> <p>Should the planning officer be mindful to grant permission, then it would be our suggestion that as an annexe to Redleaf this dwelling should remain as part of Redleaf and could not be sold separately.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
---------	------	----------	----	---	--

					<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust about the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>These minor amendments do not alter our view that we are unable to support this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Leeds Abbey	Kent	E22/0447	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Phased development comprising the erection of a new self-build detached dwelling and conversion of cattle barn to a pool house, erection of 2no. detached residential gatehouses, restoration works to listed structures (slype and dovecotes), demolition of two modern barns, restoration of the former Capability Brown Landscape, access and other associated works (phasing plan submitted). Abbey Farm Lower Street Leeds Maidstone Kent ME17 1TL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.07.2022</p> <p>Our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) referred this application to us due to the Capability Brown connection.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and are approaching the proposals in the light of the opportunity they present to restore this unaltered though degraded example of Capability Brown's work. The importance of his involvement is clear from Dr Rutherford's statement of significance : 'The fee is the main indicator of his contribution. At £2,000, it was a considerable sum at the time, indicating that the work was carried out by his work force. If so, when compared with the existing site design and features, this indicates that the likely key features were extensive within the site and were typical of Brown's style. The main identifiable features were apparently the naturalistic lake and land form of the valley flanking it which survive largely unchanged, the south drive, and the remodelling of the Tudor Pigeon house as the Gothic Chapel eyecatcher.'</p> <p>KGT's research into Brown sites : Capability Brown in Kent (2016) examines his projects in Kent, and as all but Chilham Castle have had a chequered history, this application presents an unparalleled opportunity to redress the neglect at Leeds Abbey. Leeds Abbey is the only Brown landscape in Kent which has been little changed, due to its abandonment within 20 years of its completion. KGT have spoken to John Phibbs (the Brown expert) and in his opinion, it is also possibly Brown's smallest complete commission and thus unique in this way too. Therefore, its preservation is of great importance.</p> <p>We have looked at the options appraisal, and either doing nothing or just managing the site as it is, will almost certainly lead to what remains eventually becoming lost. We are also not supportive of more extensive development within the site leading to multiple ownership, and so the final option of a prestigious new house on site is the least worst option. We</p>

					<p>note the extant planning permission for the Long Barn and would hope that the individual units remain in their current single ownership to avoid splitting up the estate. We have noted the comments by Cllr Gill Fort and Etienne Greet with regard to the unsympathetic materials used in this work and would urge your officers to ensure that a more conservation-oriented approach is taken elsewhere should permission be granted. As long as this is guaranteed, we support the restoration of the Slype, the small/large Dovecotes, the listed walls and the culvert and dam.</p> <p>We do however, have concerns regarding the phasing sequence. The practicalities for removal of the extensive scrub and woodland on the valley sides to open up designed views, the dredging and restoration of the lake (Brown's key feature) and rectifying the cut and fill to the west of the lake which destroyed the original farm pond, constitutes a large, cumbersome undertaking. We strongly suggest that this should be moved forward to Phase 1, the enabling phase, as once the house has been built, it will become far more difficult to remove all debris and accommodate logging tracks etc. The opening up of views, as detailed in the Statement of Significance (SOS), is crucial to an understanding of Brown's intentions and consequently our support for the project, so we would ask your officers to legally secure all the works to restore the site with a detailed Section 106 Agreement to guarantee that this work is not sidelined.</p> <p>Dr Rutherford's SOS illustrates Brown views and sightlines. We would like to see provision for the restoration of at least the major ones in the proposals. We would also like to see some acknowledgement of the presence of the former south drive to the east of the lake due to its importance to Brown's design, and its views (SOS p12, 3a) and elevated views from the knoll to the SE of the lake 'to the north past the mansion of the parish church tower and distant North Downs'. (SOS p12, 3c). The views are described in detail in the SOS pp15-16 with an illustration on p17. From the landscape drawings submitted, it appears that the landscape restoration has been approached with a light hand which we support, but we would like more details of the proposals as the Landscape Masterplan only gives a very broad picture of what is planned. Without further details it is not possible to understand the thinking behind the creation of a second smaller pond above the lake, which seems historically inappropriate and an unnecessary expense given the sums required for restoration of the whole site and the building of the new house We concur with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust that a restoration and long-</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>term management plan for the whole site must be provided and secured by a Section 106 Agreement before the application is determined.</p> <p>We agree in principle that this proposal is pragmatically the least worst option for the site, but in view of the absence of details we would ask to be consulted on any revisions to the proposals and on the S106 agreement, to ensure that the issues we have raised above are satisfactorily resolved.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Waterloo Park	Norfolk	E22/0470	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Siting of two modular classroom buildings.</p> <p>Angel Road Infant School Angel Road Norwich NR3 3HR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this application. The Trust does not object to the two mobile classrooms.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely Keri Williams Planning Adviser Norfolk Gardens Trus</p>
Melton Constable Hall	Norfolk	E22/0489	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of detached double garage to replace existing shed</p> <p>Mission Hall, The Street, Briningham, Melton Constable, Norfolk, NR24 2PY</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this application. The Trust does not object to the proposed double garage</p>
Aynho Park	Northamptonshire	E22/0420	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent</p> <p>Physical works to site layout including reconfiguration and extension of car park and alterations to hard and soft landscaping.</p> <p>Aynhoe Park House Aynho Park, Aynho, Northamptonshire, OX17 3BQ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online information and most of the work would appear to be focussed to the west of the house where substantial alteration, including a car park (with hard surface overflow) has already taken place. As we understand it, expansion of the current car park takes in the area already assigned to overflow, and as a result it may become better screened from The Wilderness. Plans for the guest relaxing/eating areas appear to follow the footprint of the existing hard landscaping here too. Our main concern is with proposals for The Southern Terrace (as defined in the Design and Access Statement). One of the main reasons for this</p>

					<p>landscape being on the HE Register is because of Capability Brown's work, although most of the open parkland was probably compromised during The Second World War, or shortly afterwards. We think it desirable to maintain the simplicity of the garden to the south front, in line with Capability Brown's concept of the view southwards from the house (and also back to the house). It is Brown's curvaceous ha ha which frames this area and which would have provided uninterrupted views southwards across the south lawn and parkland. Whilst accepting that a largely uninterrupted view can still be had from the central and main focal point of the house, we do have some concerns about the impact that the proposed new clipped hedges are going to have on this. We welcome repairs to Brown's ha ha.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Constable Burton Hall	North Yorkshire	E21/1387	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission for Extension of Existing Touring Caravan Site and Siting of 45 no. Holiday Lodges, of Which 8 no have Annex Bedrooms, Welcome Building and Pavilion, with Associated Landscaping, Drainage and Wildlife Pond, and Parking at Constable Burton Hall Caravan Park, Constable Burton, Leyburn, North Yorkshire, DL8 5LJ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re- 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 Burton Constable Hall, 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>We refer you to our letter of 25th November 2021 in which we wrote of the significance of the registered park and garden at Constable Burton, and that we thought that the application is considered and well documented. The landscape scheme strengthens the planted boundaries whilst developing a sympathetic landscaping scheme that should deliver environmental and aesthetic benefits for all who visit the site. We note that the car parking and road surfaces are to be of compacted gravel with low level path downlighters and timers. Importantly the scheme should limit the impact on views from the registered park, and the setting of the other designated heritage assets.</p> <p>We did query the proposal to use Northumberland Meadow Seed Mix for the Meadow Areas, and suggested that Pennine Dales MG3 Anthoxanthemum odoratum – Geranium sylvaticum (Sweet Vernal Grass – Wood Cranesbill) could be more appropriate. (Rodwell, J S National</p>

					<p>Vegetation Classification, 1992).</p> <p>We are pleased to find that the proposal has been divided into two development phases. This will allow the main landscaping features to develop and mature ahead of constructing the 'field barns/lodges' across the full site. We agree that this will reduce the visual impact of the development ensuring that the large areas of screening, particularly to the south boundary, will have matured somewhat, before any lodges are in this area. The individual trees specified on the Landscape Strategy are appropriate currently, however in view of the changing weather patterns and climate we advise careful consideration is given to planting some other trees in appropriate locations that are suitable for the changing conditions maybe such as Holm Oak Quercus ilex, Tulip-Tree Liriodendron tulipifera etc. We do not know how the future climate and disease patterns are going to affect our usual tree species so it will be important to plant a varied mix of species.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposals will impact on the significance of Constable Burton Hall and Park, and we do not have any objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Sutton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0211	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Planning application for the siting of a marquee.</p> <p>Sutton Park Main Street Sutton On The Forest York</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We refer you to our letter of 6th June but note that this reconsultation is for the temporary siting of a marquee for two years from April to September. As we wrote a 27mx9m white marquee in this location will</p>

					<p>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. We have not made a site visit and advise that you should seek the view of your specialist conservation advisor and ensure that any granting of permission is reviewed after two years. After any consented period, the site should be returned to its previous condition.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Newby Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0472	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Fell circa 12 poplars from the avenue along the Carriage Drive during summer 2022: Proposal to fell 12 ‘bushy’ or ‘ragged’ overgrown poplars to leave final avenue of Hornbeam. Intermediate stage will leave the hornbeam and the TT32 fastigiata poplar after the 12 or so ‘incorrect’ trees are felled (the 12 bushy poplars were mistakenly planted to replace TT32 poplars that failed early in the planting scheme</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2022 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. In this case Newby Hall, 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. The park at Newby Hall probably has 17th Century origins and a map for landscaping the park was drawn by the notable designer Thomas White in 1766. This was partially executed. This is an application to fell circa 12 ‘bushy’ or ‘ragged’ overgrown Poplars from the avenue along the Carriage Drive during summer 2022 leaving final avenue of Hornbeam. The intermediate stage will leave the hornbeam and the TT32 fastigiata poplar after the 12 or so ‘incorrect’ trees are felled (the 12 bushy poplars were mistakenly planted to replace TT32 poplars that failed early in the planting scheme).” The carriage drive leads northwards away from Givendale Lodge (Listed Grade II) which marks the northern limit of the registered park and garden. We have tried to establish an idea of when planting took place to determine its significance in terms of the park layout and history through map regression and reading the register description, however no OS maps from 1828 onwards depict trees, including on the 25" scale between 1888 and 1913. The only reference within the register description close to the</p>

					<p>application area is to the north side of the park: "This area is not within the park shown by White, who prepared his plan before either of the lodges were built, but is shown as parkland on the 1856 OS map."</p> <p>The application note suggests that the avenue planting is relatively late, perhaps 20th century, and this is also suggested by our research. The Carriage Drive is the current way out for drivers from Newby, and as such the views are continually northward away from the park and do not connect the viewer with it. The current entrance is along the historic principal approach from Skelton with views towards the eastern front of the house, through the widest extent of the park and past the church and don't allow views northwards. So, the Carriage Drive avenue, is in a sense a new phase of the park's history taking account of the modern visitor's experience on departure.</p> <p>The proposal will improve this part of the historic Newby Estate and we support the work.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Forcett Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0496	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission for Extension of Existing Dwelling within Walled Garden and Reinstatement of Original Openings in Existing Structure at Gardeners Cottage, Forcett Hall Road, Forcett, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL11 7SB</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2022</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 Forcett Hall/Park that is registered at Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Shuttleworth family owned Forcett from the 1590's, and in the c.1740 Daniel Garrett substantially remodelled the earlier house for Richard Shuttleworth. (Hall Listed Grade I). The gardens and park are of a similar date possibly designed by the 'Durham Wizard', Thomas Wright. The kitchen gardens (walls, gates and Garden House Listed Grade II) lie c. 150m north-east of the Hall and consist of two walled enclosures with the western enclosure the subject of this planning application. Attached to the south-facing wall is a pavilion called the Garden House or Gardeners Cottage which was probably originally designed as a functional yet ornamental orangery and a focal point for this walled garden. As is usual in kitchen gardens the north side of the south-facing wall has a range of</p>

					<p>bothies and storage buildings.</p> <p>Although in principle we support the repair and restoration of the Garden House/Gardeners Cottage and bothies etc, for use as domestic accommodation, we are unable to do so from the documents lodged with this planning application.</p> <p>We seem to have only been notified of the Full Planning Application, but found the Listed Building Application, 22/00407/LBC and were pleased to read there the detailed Heritage Impact Assessment. However much of the remaining documents are difficult to assess, the drawings are small and there is little or no notation to help with our understanding of exactly what is proposed. Overall, there is insufficient detail of the proposed changes and in our view the documents are inadequate for such important heritage assets.</p> <p>We advise that your authority's conservation officer and the County Archaeologist should be consulted.</p> <p>With their present form of documentation, we object to these applications. In principle we support the restoration of this building. There is, however, insufficient detail of the proposed changes. It is not clear which new windows are to be of wood and which of Al. The Conservation officer and the County Archaeologist need to be involved.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
The Long Walk, Knaresborough	North Yorkshire	E22/0511	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Upper floor extension to existing single-storey dwelling and associated works</p> <p>Leonardos View 15A Waterside Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 9AZ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – The Long Walk, Knaresborough, 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>Leonardos View is located on Waterside adjacent to the over-spanning railway viaduct and just beyond part of the northern boundary of the registered The Long Walk. The building is located within the Knaresborough Conservation Area, the setting of the Nidd Gorge Special Landscape Area. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not consider that the proposed extension will harm the setting of The Long Walk in this location and have no objection.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Castle Howard	North Yorkshire	E22/0517	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use, alteration, partial rebuilding and extension of agricultural buildings to form 1no. five bedroom dwelling (Barn 1) to include excavation and formation of a lower ground floor level forming the main accommodation area and external courtyard area together with substantial rebuilding of a detached adjacent agricultural building (Barn 2) to form a plant/storage room and garaging and associated landscaping Land At Village Street Ganthorpe Malton</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.07.2022</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 Castle Howard that is registered at Grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The proposals are for two barns, one of which is in poor repair (Barn 1) and one would essentially be a rebuild (Barn 2), at a site known as The Paddocks accessed by a track from the Ganthorpe to Bulmer/Welburn road. The Paddocks is just to the west of a section of the registered boundary (at Paddocks Wood) of Castle Howard where the Yorkshire Arboretum is situated. It is also within the Howardian Hills AONB, in an area of open countryside. The Yorkshire Arboretum is run as a joint enterprise between Castle Howard Estates and Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Covering 128 acres it comprises more than 6,000 trees, including some that are rare or endangered.</p> <p>We have found the documents very difficult to read including the text on the Design and Access Statement. However, we understand that there is a stone wall and trees along the boundary to the registered park to the east apart from at one point next to the road. The proposed development will be visible from the public road although the proposals are for a partially buried/sunken house with rebuild of the existing barn to form a garage, which should help to minimise any impact on the landscape.</p> <p>However, we have not been able to discern any proposed landscaping. What is being proposed to mitigate extra car parking, bins and other facilities that will be expected by those living in the proposed house? Is there to be a garden area? This will require change of use permission for any of the agricultural land that is to become domestic garden land. We also query whether photovoltaic or solar panels are to be installed. These should not be on roof pitches. We expect that all above ground changes or structures will only be permitted by specific approval of your authority.</p> <p>Additionally, we have not noted any evidence of an ecological</p>

					<p>survey/proposals such as the inclusion of any barn owl, bird and bat boxes to enhance the site.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust consider that any harm to the registered park and garden and the Yorkshire Arboretum will be minimal if the concerns that we have outlined above are carefully addressed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Annesley Hall	Nottinghamshire	E21/1947	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of an office building (use class E (g)(i)) with car parking, landscaping and associated works. Access and drainage infrastructure including new highway from A611 signalised junction.</p> <p>Top Wighay Farm, Land east of A611, near Hucknal</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the above application.</p> <p>We have studied the revised landscape proposals, and as long as the woodland on the perimeter of Annesley Hall is well managed, we consider there will be sufficient density of tree cover to maintain the registered park and garden's sense of privacy and isolation from the application site. Looking at the detailed landscape drawings, we do however query the inclusion of <i>Ulmus glabra</i> (Wych Elm) which is very prone to Dutch Elm disease. The applicant could perhaps consider <i>Ulmus RESISTA®</i> New Horizon instead – a completely resistant cultivar which Hilliers has been testing/growing for around 20 years. In my previous career as a gardener, we had these at Highgrove and they are still strong and healthy even though they were amongst the first specimens planted in the UK. They did not have formative pruning and consequently have a poorly shaped outline. The trees that Hilliers now supply all have formative pruning and therefore grow into far better shaped trees.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Newark Castle Gardens	Nottinghamshire	E22/0344	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Engineering works to form new gatehouse approach, alterations to existing castle, creation of new pedestrian access, construction of new entrance pavilion and multi-functional events facility and landscaping works</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and whilst we are supportive of the aims of the proposed works, we consider that the</p>

				Newark Castle Castle Gate Newark On Trent	modern extension to the medieval fabric represents a significant change which will impact on the Grade II registered park and garden of Newark Castle. The 'romance' of the castle as a ruin is an important element of the character of the park. There are other examples of similar public parks where medieval ruins are incorporated, for instance the Museum Gardens in York. We therefore concur with your conservation case officer's suggestions that the new addition could be amended slightly to aid the sensitivity of the proposals. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Rufford Abbey	Nottinghamshire	E22/0450	-	PLANNING APPLICATION Application to determine if prior approval is required for proposed change of use of agricultural buildings to 5 dwellinghouses as Schedule 2 Part 3 Class Q. Kennels Farm May Lodge Drive Rufford.	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.07.2022 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 Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the documentation relating to the conversion of the agricultural buildings. From the perspective of the Grade II registered park and garden at Rufford, the function of the buildings is a secondary issue to their existing visual impact in the landscape. The changes to the buildings mostly relate to increased glazing and the addition of parking spaces, but in our opinion, the residential use proposal, albeit holiday/short term let, is likely to introduce light emittance and domestic elements that draw attention to the non-agrarian function and this 'domestication' could erode the landscape character. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Nynehead Court	Somerset	E20/0607	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of 11 No. close care (Class C2) units with sub-division of Court Gardens Farmhouse to form 2 No. further close care units with erection of an associated	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.07.2022 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. Since our original response dated 8th September 2020, the proposals have been considerably altered, and the close care units divided between two

				<p>community hub facility, landscaping of the walled garden and associated external works and access improvements at Nynehead Court, Chipley Road, Nynehead.</p>	<p>different sites, rather than all being accommodated in the western side within the walled kitchen garden. All the units are sited within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Nynehead Court.</p> <p>We have noted the site options appraisal and concur that the revised proposals with seven units in the eastern section and the remaining four in the original western walled garden area, are well conceived, and that considerable thought has been given to their siting and ultimate impact upon the RPG. Their designs are discreet and will barely be visible from outside their immediate vicinity, and are derived from other local examples (eg the Cowshed Spa at Babington House). The one existing house which we consider will adversely affected is the former Engine House, whose views will be compromised.</p> <p>The layout within the western site has been conceived so that it is reminiscent of its former use and can still be clearly read as a former kitchen garden. The layout within the eastern area is also recessive and discreet.</p> <p>Should your officers approve this application we would ask them to ensure that any lighting keeps light emissions to a bare minimum and that necessary repairs to the historic fabric are tied into the occupation of the various units, so that all repairs are concluded prior to the occupation of the final unit.</p> <p>There is a careful balance to be struck regarding the long-term maintenance and conservation of the Grade II* RPG and its Grade II* mansion house with new development. We consider that the proposals represent the least worst option to fulfil this delicate equilibrium without causing undue harm to the setting and significance of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Hilton Hall	Staffordshire	E21/2153	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of marquee to be used for hosting of events Hilton Hall Hilton Lane Hilton Staffordshire WV11 2BQ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for notifying The Gardens Trust (TGT) about the additional information relating to this proposed development affecting the setting of Hilton Hall, a grade I listed building. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) works in partnership with TGT and, as in our previous comments on this proposal dated 29 March 2022, is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts. We reiterate our previous view that as the marquee is not physically attached to a listed structure application 22/00088/LBC is unnecessary and invalid.</p>

					<p>The Trusts do not object in principle to the retention of the unauthorised marquee if the income it generates is hypothecated to the upkeep of the historic buildings and landscape. We are encouraged to see that the applicants are prepared to enter a binding legal agreement to this effect with your Council. We suggest this is linked to a conservation management plan setting out a fully detailed specification and timescale for implementing the repair works identified in the newly submitted survey. The Trusts do not have any further comments to add at this stage.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0431	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Full planning application for the erection of a new play space, including various new play structures within water and sand play zones, and associated landscaping. Land West Of Woodgate Cottage Stone Road Tittensor.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>Trentham Gardens is a nationally significant historic landscape the design of which has evolved and still contains elements from the Middle Ages onwards. The application site lies at the southern end of the Western Pleasure grounds at the point where the open wood pasture created by Lancelot Brown in the 1760s shades into a more densely wooded area. The adjacent track is the alignment of the former Stone to Newcastle highway before it was diverted to the east side of the River Trent in the later 18th century. In more recent times the site was part of a commercial coniferous plantation which has been largely cleared in the last decade.</p> <p>While the Trusts consider a new play area as proposed could be accommodated on this site it is an unfortunate encroachment of “structured” activity into a wilder and more informal part of the historic landscape. Nonetheless it is accepted that the low height, mainly unpainted timber equipment will be relatively inconspicuous tending to blend with the wooded background and not cause serious harm to the significance of the RPG or conservation area. Fuller information should be provided about the height and species of planting in the hedge alongside the roadway (ideally this should be of holly, yew or a mix of native species and at least 1.7m high). Additional informal screen planting of suitable</p>

					<p>species should be introduced along the north, south and west sides and beyond to better integrate the enclosure into the adjoining wooded landscape. The limited clumps of scots pine suggested in the application are not sufficient. Subject to provision of this additional information the Trusts do not object in principle to this application.</p> <p>It is regrettable that the application is not supported by a Heritage Statement acknowledging the conservation significance of the site or assessing the impact of the proposals on its setting. The Trusts concur with Historic England's concern at the lack of a Masterplan for the historic estate to provide a context within which this and other applications within the park can be set and assessed. We would suggest your Council encourage the owners to prepare such a plan: The Trusts would be willing to contribute to any discussions in this respect.</p> <p>Your sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0435	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective full planning permission for the erection of replacement play equipment, within existing play area and associated landscaping. Land To The South-west Of The Italian Gardens Tea Rooms Trentham Estate.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>Trentham Gardens is a nationally significant historic landscape the design of which has evolved and still contains elements from the Middle Ages onwards. The application site lies within the Western Pleasure Grounds between the rear of the modern café and the more open grassed area of the north park. In the Victorian period the site was used as an arboretum but in more recent times has been the longstanding location of a childrens' play area. Its presence is noted as low-key and unobtrusive in the Conservation Area Appraisal document.</p> <p>It is regrettable that the application is not supported by a Heritage Statement acknowledging the conservation significance of the site or assessing the impact of the proposals on its setting. Notwithstanding, the unauthorised replacement play equipment is low key in appearance and dimension and does not cause harm to the significance of the RPG or conservation area. The Trusts have no objection to the application.</p>

					Your sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT
Chantry Park	Suffolk	E22/0443	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning permission (some matters reserved, access to be considered) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 - Erection of up to 750No dwellings, and up to 3ha of primary education land, public open space, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), landscaping and highway improvements (accompanied by EIA Statement). Land North Of The A1071, Ipswich (Wolsey Grange).	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the extensive documentation accompanying this application and share Suffolk Preservation Society's disappointment that that this application has been submitted in advance of the Examination of the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan and the possible future allocation of the site for development. The register entry description for the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Chantry Park makes clear that there are views westwards from the elevated viewpoint of the RPG down over the Gipping Valley and the development site. The RPG was formerly surrounded entirely by agricultural land. Over the years this land has been eroded by housing on all sides except for the remaining western section, the final remnant area which allows the original context of its intended designed landscape setting to be appreciated. The loss of this would in our opinion, appreciably harm the significance of the RPG and its setting. Figure 21 (p13) of The Built Heritage Statement (BHS) by CgMs dated April 2020 shows a 'direct view of the boundary with Chantry Park with the site (which) illustrates the density of the tree and undergrowth lines between them' and the caption states that 'Chantry Parks (sic) landscape features ... are not appreciable from any part of the site.' The BHS's final paragraph (p19) continues to downplay the impact of the proposed development on Chantry Park : 'As no appreciable experience of the Chantry Park or its associated built heritage assets is possible from within site and no legible functional or historic association can be established, it is considered that the site does not make a contribution to the significance of Chantry Park group of heritage assets.' The GT/SGT disagree with these statements as nowhere within the documentation have we found any mention of what impact the large development may have upon the views from the higher land within the RPG, from which it will almost certainly be visible due to topography and gaps in the tree cover. Such impacts we feel invalidate the

					<p>comment in the final paragraph on p28 of the BHS, which concludes that ‘the proposed development is considered to represent a neutral impact on the significance of ... the parkland itself..’</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Part 2, Appendix 7.6, Viewpoint 6 shows a view from within the development site towards the RPG. However, nowhere in any of the viewpoint documents is there a corresponding view from within the RPG looking down towards the development area. We would ask that the applicant provide a couple of Wire Frame images taken from within the RPG looking down into allocation LA013, in particular the area which immediately adjoins the RPG, which we understand is zoned for approximately 160 units.</p> <p>The Design & Access statement, Part 4B, p69, point 5 relates to new tree planting ‘along the eastern development edge with Chantry Park to add to the well treed edge and provide further filtering where views of the development are possible.’ This statement contradicts assertions mentioned above which indicate that there is no intervisibility.</p> <p>Parcel 6 of the development area was formerly the site of an C18th mansion recorded in the Environmental Statement : a park, a mansion and an avenue leading up to it from the south, as recorded on Hodgkinson’s 1783 Map of Suffolk, with the legend ‘Sir Robt Harland’. The house was curiously never named, just referred to as ‘Sproughton’ – the parish name. In the 1790s the house was demolished and the Harland family moved to a new house at Wherstead Park before moving yet again to Orwell Park. For this reason, we suggest that an archaeological assessment should be carried out for remains of both the mansion and its surrounding park.</p> <p>The GT/SGT strongly object to this premature application for outline planning in a site immediately adjacent to the Grade II Chantry Park RPG. This irreplaceable heritage asset will be irrevocably compromised if the final remnant area which allows the original context of its intended designed landscape setting to be appreciated, is destroyed by this large development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
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	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.07.2022 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.

				<p>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 Plot 3, Ansty Aerodrome, Combe Fields Road, Combe Fields, Coventry, CV7 9JR</p>	<p>We have read the Prospero Ansty Built Heritage Statement regarding the site, and in relation to Para 4.12 regarding HE's comments: 'further investigation is required to consider whether [the thinning out of the northern boundary of Combe Park] was a deliberate design intention' of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown when he worked at Combe Abbey in the 1770s), we would like to add the following: The First Edition OS 25" map shows an avenue extending north of the lake and terminating at a tumulus encircled by trees; the latter is now in the industrial area, but undeveloped. The avenue had gone by the time of the Second Edition OS, but its existence does suggest that at some period (possibly pre-Brown?) there was intended to be a view or views out over the ground to the north - ie to where Jaguar etc are now located. This area is unfortunately not shown on the Kip view which stops just short, though it does show avenues to the south and other designed vistas which might suggest an earlier date for this avenue to the north. The c1861 plan/proposal for the pleasure grounds by the head gardener, William Miller in the RIBA drawings collection only goes as far as the south side of the NE part of the lake, but there is a walk indicated overlooking the water. Whether there was a view beyond the water is not clear.</p> <p>We understand that there is a Conservation Management Plan by Hazel Fryer and George Demidowicz for Coventry City Council although we have not seen it. We believe that the CMP looked at the area to the north/north-west of the house where there was an idea that Princess Elizabeth's early C17 "fairy farm" was located. If your officers can locate this CMP it might be helpful in the decision making process. I believe there may be a copy in the Parks & Gardens UK CMP collection at Hestercombe: https://www.parksandgardens.org/assets/uploads/pdf/Conservation-The GT/WGT cannot support the encroachment of the growing industrial complex upon the irreplaceable heritage assets contained with 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 Construction of a temporary</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.07.2022 Thank you for your e-mail dated 11 July notifying The Gardens Trust (TGT)</p>

				<p>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>and SGPT of the additional drawing C0002457-02-PL Rev C1 (dated 29.06.22) submitted by the applicants showing the proposed erection of a 2.8m high acoustic barrier within the application site.. As in our previous consultation responses to this application SGPT is responding on behalf of both Trusts.</p> <p>Although no information has been provided to show the design and material of the proposed fence the Trusts consider that the installation of this further tall structure within the site will only add to the intrusive visual clutter of the development. This will be at variance with its sensitive location within the Green Belt and aggravate the harm to the significance of the Great Barr Conservation Area and setting of the RPG to which we have drawn attention previously.</p> <p>The Trusts maintain their objection to the application and continue to recommend that your Council refuse planning permission for the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Leonardslee	West Sussex	E22/0509	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of permanent sculptures within the grounds of Leonardslee Lake and Gardens. Leonardslee Gardens Brighton Road Lower Beeding Horsham</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens includes some 1600 sites and Leonardslee is one of the very small number (approximately 9% of the total) with a Grade I designation as a site of exceptional interest. Hence it is re vital that all parties give meticulous attention to the justification for approval of the application.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application. We note these include a Heritage Statement as part of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>SGT neither support nor objects to the proposals, although we suggest it is made clear for visitors that all these sculptures are a modern intervention and not part of the original garden design.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell</p>

					Trustee On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust
Roundhay Park	West Yorkshire	E22/0475	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of building including remove floor slab and all utilities so the area can be returned back to the gardens Canal Gardens Roundhay Park Princes Avenue Roundhay	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.07.2022 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. In this case Roundhay Park, 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. Roundhay Park estate was purchased by Leeds City Council in the 1870's. The pleasure grounds called Canal Gardens are situated within part of the western boundary of Roundhay Park immediately south of the kitchen garden. The basic structure of this area with the canal and summerhouse is shown on the 1847 OS map. The building proposed for demolition is known as Canal Gardens Public Convenience and is located against the eastern wall of Canal Gardens that bounds Prince's Avenue. It is single storey of dressed stone construction with the remains of ornate barge boarding to the gable ends shown on photographs in the Bat Roost Suitability Assessment. The eastern gable end is a particular feature. The building is shown on the OS map sheet CCIII.SE published 1933, marked as 'Lav' and it is also marked on the OS map published in 1909. It appears to have been a building designed to not only provide lavatories but also an attractive feature of Canal Gardens. We have read the Supporting Statement for the demolition of Canal Gardens W/C which explains that: 'Over time the building has fallen into a state of disrepair and has had numerous break-ins which has caused it to be a H&S risk to the public it has also been a magnet for anti-social behaviour, result in complaints from local residents. A refurbishment was considered for the site, but keeping to LCC's values to refurbish the building wouldn't be value for money and returning the area back to park land is the better option. Demolition of this building is considered the most economical way forward for the Council, the proposal also contributes to the city's and council's ambitions through reducing the risk of crime and anti-social behaviour, also reducing the costs of securing and maintaining a building which is no longer required.' We understand that there is free access to the toilets within Tropical World

					<p>which is open seven days a week and that the Canal Gardens W/C has therefore been declared surplus to the Council's corporate operational requirements.</p> <p>We query whether all alternatives for this attractive building have been explored, such as building for the sale of refreshments and ice cream, for a small community hub, perhaps for a Friends group etc.</p> <p>In addition, could the area around the building be enhanced by new garden design to form a contemporary garden- feature for the community within the attractive Canal Gardens?</p> <p>It seems unfortunate that seemingly due to lack of up-keep this building is proposed for demolition, and we regret this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E22/0555	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Solar panels to rear of existing roof</p> <p>5 Norwood Avenue Menston Ilkley</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.07.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Listed Building, HE ref 1240191; and set within the grounds of High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469. 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>High Royds Hospital was built as a mental hospital by West Riding County Council, and it was opened in 1888. It had been designed by the County Surveyor, Vickers Edwards. Edwards adopted an "echelon" layout for the wards – only the second such building in England. Constructed around the centre of its 100ha site the Hospital enjoyed a generous boundary of fields and trees.</p> <p>The hospital closed in 2003 and it has been progressively converted to residential use since 2007 to the present day. The site now consists of a carefully managed mix of original hospital buildings, now converted to residential use, and groups of new dwellings. This application concerns one such house within a street of new detached dwellings. Whilst the roof of No 5 does not directly impact on either the original buildings, nor the parkland setting, it does play its part in the overall well-controlled architectural arrangement of the site.</p>

					<p>We note that the applicant roof already incorporates two, mutually dissimilar rooflights. The submitted drawings indicate that the photo voltaic, (pv), panels will be arranged to step around these – leading to a somewhat ragged arrangement. We also note that the application is for “approximately 11 panes” – suggesting that even this arrangement as drawn may not be adhered to.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the increasing importance of ‘green energy’, it is important that the applicant roof should uphold the design standard of the High Royds site – and the ragged layout, and imprecise specification, of the proposed pv panels as indicated do not fulfil this duty. Perhaps the panels could be limited to less than half the roof, and installed to achieve a simple rectangular group – perhaps at the expense of the smaller existing rooflight. As the application stands, we object.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--