



GT AND CGT CONSERVATION CASEWORK RESPONSES AUGUST 2022

The GT conservation team received 192 new cases and re-consultations for England and three for Wales in August. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 37 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Bearwood College	Berkshire	E22/0646	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full application for the proposed erection of a sports hall and new pool building following demolition of existing ancillary buildings. Creation of new landscaped permeable parking area on the site of an existing car park. Reddam House, Bearwood Road, Sindlesham, Wokingham, RG41 5BG SPORT/LEISURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Bearwood Estate comprises Reddam House and the surrounding Registered Park and Garden both listed at GII*. The application is for demolition of parts of the college buildings with development of a new sports hall and swimming pool affecting both historic fabric of the main building and its setting. The proposed new buildings are inevitably large in size and bulk due to their functions. The RPG is on the HaR register and has become fragmented in ownership with lack of management for trees affecting the designed views to and from the House and lake. However the proposed new buildings will be located on the North side of Reddam House and whilst will be visible on

					<p>the closer approach to the college do not have a negative impact on the parkland setting itself. If approval is given for these proposals then it would be pertinent for a Condition to enhance tree screening on approach and also to restore the historic view from the House to the Lake.</p> <p>Conservation of the Terrace and Pulhamite Garden would also be welcomed.</p> <p>The Conservation Officer will have noted the significance of part of the buildings proposed for demolition include 19th century fabric and an eastern brick gate pier. It is considered that overall even though the large size and bulk of the new buildings will be impactful, their scale can be accommodated within the confines of the rear side courtyard of the large 19th century main building without harming the setting of the surrounding parkland. Therefore, we have no objection to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin</p>
Grendon Hall	Buckinghamshire	E22/0516	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building application for demolish existing boiler house. Proposed development of two new houseblocks, training centre, staff offices, kitchen storage building and associated car parking and landscaping, alternation and reinstating existing wall</p> <p>Hm Prison Grendon Springhill Road Grendon Underwood Buckinghamshire HP18 0TL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.08.2022</p> <p>Bucks Gardens Trust, in association with The Gardens Trust, submits a strong objection to the above application for the following reasons. The grounds at Grendon Hall are a highly locally significant designed landscape and we ask that your officers consider this application in the light of this significance. This application will damage the garden and parkland of Grendon Hall, its listed buildings and the wider historic setting of the landscape and other listed buildings.</p> <p>The Bucks Gardens Trust has conducted a rigorous research project on Grendon Hall to identify the significance as a designed landscape, as we have done with over 100 many as yet unregistered sites in the county. The result of our findings informs our comments. Our findings are available in our report https://bucksgardenstrust.org.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2022/01/Grendon-Hall-BGT-RR-Dossier-revision-Dec-2021.pdf</p> <p>BGT in this well-respected Research and Recording Project (endorsed by Bucks Council HER and Historic England) has identified that the key elements of the late C19 country house designed landscape and its associated structures survive to a high degree, and are of considerable significance to the county of Buckinghamshire. There is no adequate and objective recognition of this by the applicants nor a rigorous and appropriate historic impact assessment.</p> <p>We object to the scheme because of the high level of damage it will inflict</p>

					<p>both physically to the historic environment, particularly the South Parkland and walled garden, and its prominent and important immediate setting in the designed landscape including the North Park, Hall and gardens and the wider setting.</p> <p>We object further because it follows an earlier and similarly large scale scheme for an adjacent site, which has been refused by the Council. The applicants have stated their intent to appeal against the decision but no formal appeal has yet been made. It is invidious to have two such large scale applications and not to consider their cumulative effects on the historic environment together.</p> <p>This application is unacceptably damaging for the damage it causes to a locally significant designed landscape which is currently being assessed for inclusion on the Bucks Council Local List of Significant Heritage Assets and is a strong candidate.</p> <p>The application will damage to a high degree the fabric of this landscape, its character, designed views and the setting of associated listed buildings as well as unlisted structures which are integral to the design including the walled garden. See the views analysis below.</p> <p>The Significance of Grendon Hall and its Designed Landscape :</p> <p>Grendon Hall is an 1880s country house designed by Rev. Randolphe Henry Piggot, who, as well as the Hall, seemingly designed the stable block, stable yard crenelated walls, lodge (gone), and associated structures. The structures were united in the design using fashionable Jacobean style in red brick with stone dressings. Grendon Hall is listed Grade II, the Walled Garden is included under this listed as a curtilage structure. The gate piers, pedestrian gates and railings at the entrance to the site are separately listed Grade II. These historic assets are set within their contemporary and integral landscape which is of high local significance for its artistry, relationship with the built environment and level of survival. The house sits on an elevated site with the associated parkland and gardens which include a terrace, informal lawns with mature trees and shrubberies, and parkland. The layout of the site survives considerably intact, except for a 7ha. housing estate in the south park and HM Springhill Prison buildings in the pleasure grounds around the Hall to the east and south. The elevated areas of the site enjoy extensive views south and west. Whilst the site does not currently offer public access, we consider that the potential exists for former features related to the designed landscape since the 1880s to be uncovered, such as buildings, paths, beds, terraces, boundaries, and the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>lost north drive. The 1880s design incorporated hedgerow trees as specimens in the new park and a straight main drive was framed by an avenue. Some of the early specimen trees survive enclosing the informal lawns within the modest pleasure ground. The rural setting enjoys views over the Vale of Aylesbury to the south, south-east and west. Views remain from the house north-east towards Edgcott and from the pleasure grounds and park south-west towards Mill Hill, Doddershall Wood, and south to the village of Grendon Underwood and Waddesdon Hill in the distance. Unfortunately, the historic landscape and setting has been compromised to some degree due to the later developments including the 7ha. housing estate in the south park and prison buildings east and south of the Hall. In the 1960s Springhill housing estate was built in the area to the south of the approach road to house prison staff. These developments all took place prior to Grendon Hall being listed in 1985 (Grade II). It is highly unlikely that the two existing prisons, and the Springhill housing estate, would have been constructed if Grendon Hall had been listed prior to their development. We reiterate that a considerable degree of the designed landscape survives, particularly the key features such as the drive, parkland, pleasure grounds and principal buildings.</p> <p>There is also potential archaeological interest due to evidence of Roman occupation given the proximity to Akeman Street and archaeological evidence nearby along the route of HS2. The medieval Forest of Bernwood provides this area with a unique heritage, many of the features and place names being a direct legacy of the ancient royal forest. There is also the potential for evidence associated with the Forest particularly relates to banks, routes, boundaries and buildings. The park itself is rich in ridge and furrow.</p> <p>South Park and Walled Garden</p> <p>The South Park is the park destination for walks from the Hall, particularly the spectacular elevated views from the high point on Spring Hill (and possibly also from Mill Hill to the south) over the Vale of Aylesbury, including Waddesdon Hill, Brill Hill and the Chilterns beyond. These contrast with the views of Otmoor from the North Park.</p> <p>It is also the southern setting for the main drive and Listed Grade II gateway. The south park was not physically divided from the north by a fence line, and the drive deliberately was not fenced in order to promote the parkland character for visitors as a seamless whole. It is the frame for glimpsed views of the Hall from the public road between Grendon and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Edgcott villages south of the Listed gateway. Today this is obscured by the park development of houses and later vegetation.</p> <p>The South Park is the site of the walled garden, a key element of this country house estate.</p> <p>The South Park will be physically affected. It will sustain damage from part of the major development, which will be highly intrusive in views particularly from an ornamental park gateway, and the important panoramic park viewpoint on the high point of Spring Hill. While the present car park has damaged the historic character and fabric it is not irreversible and the area in this form is far less damaging than if it were developed in the manner proposed. Again, the walled garden is not irreversibly developed, and will sustain a high degree of physical damage and lose its historic character.</p> <p>In conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bucks Gardens Trust reiterates that these proposals will cause significant, irreversible and highly harmful damage to the fabric and character of Grendon Hall designed landscape and to the setting and views. The setting of the Grade II listed Hall and gate piers and metal fencing at the entrance to the prison site will also be damaged. • The sites of the proposals in the South Park and walled garden are in key parts of the historic park which comprise the immediate setting for Grendon Hall and would result in irreversible and highly damaging harm to the historic fabric and character. <p>Bucks Gardens Trust therefore strongly objects and urges the Planning Authority to reject this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Dr Sarah Rutherford</p> <p>On behalf of Bucks Gardens Trust Planning Group</p>
Langley Park	Buckinghamshire	E22/0698	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>A hybrid application to comprise:</p> <p>Part A - Full application for the change in use of 25.6 ha of land at Alderbourne Farm to form a nature reserve with footpaths, biodiversity enhancements, associated parking and infrastructure. Outline application with all matters</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2022</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 looked at the online documentation, and although the Heritage Statement does reference Heatherden Hall, it specifically states that it has excluded Langley Park as the proposed development will not be visible and</p>

				<p>reserved (except for principal points of access) for land at Alderbourn Farm for backlots and up to 35,000 sqft (3,252 sqm) of associated film production buildings (workshops) together with access roads and parking;</p> <p>Part B - Outline application for Pinewood South on 32.6 ha of land with all matters reserved (except for three principal points of access) for up to 1,415,000 sqft (131,458sqm) of film production buildings (to include sound stages, workshops, offices and ancillary uses), education and business hubs with associated ancillary structures together with backlot, multi storey car parks, accesses and green and blue infrastructure.</p> <p>Land South Of Pinewood Studios and Alderbourn Farm, Pinewood Road, Iver Heath, Buckinghamshire, SL0 0NH, LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>will 'not distract from, or undermine, the appreciation of the significance of the significance of Langley Park (and associated reciprocal relationships to the built heritage assets it contains) or materially reduce an understanding of its siting with a prevailing rural context.'</p> <p>The GT/BGT consider that it is totally inappropriate for the applicant to exclude heritage sites situated so closely, and it is essential that we are given the opportunity to understand how the above application relates to previous proposals for development at Pinewood.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 Part I – Settings and Views. (SHA). On p2 it states : ' The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.' It goes on to say (p2) : 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change' and (p5) 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary.'</p> <p>We ask that your officers request clarification from the applicants as to the relationship of this application to those previously made. Whilst this information may be contained in the documentation, our County Trusts are volunteers who have a large number of applications to consider so this information will be very helpful.</p> <p>In the interim we wish to submit an objection until we are able to fully assess the potential impact upon Langley Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Arley Hall	Cheshire	E22/0644	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Operation of Harry Potter themed event for a temporary period of five years ARLEY HALL, ARLEY PARK, ARLEY, CW9 6LZ MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Members of the CGT made a site visit in June this year when assessing the application to enlarge the car park (22/2081M). We do not have an objection in principle to the current application proposal but do have some concerns about potential impact on parkland trees within the proposed 'Magical Village' area. The area shown on the proposals plan (see extract below, overlaid onto an aerial photo) includes part of an avenue that runs directly north-south from the Hall to Big Wood where the Harry Potter trail is proposed. Both the avenue and the trees appear to be significant historic landscape features. The Heritage Statement says in para 5.37 : "The area where the Magical Village will be sited is open grassland with no impact on trees" but this cannot be ascertained from the evidence provided so far. We would appreciate more clarity on the detailed layout of the scheme in order to make an informed response. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Tatton Park	Cheshire	E22/0680	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for replacement copings to historic boundary wall on the perimeter of a registered parks and gardens. TATTON PARK, KNUTSFORD DRIVE, KNUTSFORD, WA16 6QN BOUNDARY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2022 Cheshire Gardens Trust has no objection to the proposal to replace the missing boundary wall copings with cast stone in the preferred colour choice given the history of theft and wall damage which is highly regrettable. It is likely that the cast stone will be visually prominent initially, which could attract further unwanted attention. Measures could be taken to 'weather' the cast stone making it less prominent. Yours faithfully Susan Bartlett
Windlestone Hall	County Durham	E22/0715	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing dwelling, outbuilding garage and greenhouse and replaced with	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.08.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Windlestone Hall, an historic designed landscape of national importance, which is included by

				<p>new dwelling and outbuilding garage with greenhouse, felling of 2no. Cypress, 1no. Whitebeam and 1no. Wellingtonia trees and pruning works to 1no. Poplar tree. The Tree House, Windlestone Park, Windlestone, Ferryhill DL17 0NF. DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, TREES</p>	<p>Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II (https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001407?section=official-list-entry). We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The following comments are therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>This site lies within the registered boundary of Windlestone Hall, despite the applicant's assertion that it does not – see Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement. These statements focus on the conservation area alone and ignore the landscape registration. This failure must be addressed by a further Heritage Statement that sets out the historical development of the 'Tree House' site, the impact of the current house and landscape on the registered area and the likely impact of the new proposals. Is there really no visibility of the development site from the public RoW which follows the eastern boundary of the RPG?</p> <p>Our initial thoughts are that the 'Tree House' site, lying outside the main parkland area and its enclosing tree plantations south of the Hall, does not impact on the setting of the Hall at all. The existing L-shaped lake (SW of the house) appears between the First Edition of the Ordnance Survey 6 Inch map [Durham XLIII, surveyed in 1856] and the Second Edition, revised 1896, which shows it as New Pond. The revision of 1913 to 1915 shows it as New Pond (fish). The development of the New Pond as a feature in the expanded parkland and proposals for its management as part of this development needs to be clearly set out, though we note that it 'appears' in visuals to be retained, or even restored from its partly dried out state, which we would obviously welcome. The proposals for this historic landscape feature need to be far more explicitly stated and described.</p> <p>The site sits within an existing woodland area, and some of the associated tree planting, may be part of the original woodland, The Breaks, part of the wider designed landscape. The Second Edition reflects the expansion eastwards of the parkland, indicated by the Ordnance Survey's parkland convention (recognised by the RPG boundary).</p> <p>The first building in the area was the present 'Tree House' house. Successive O.S. editions indicate it was built sometime between 1962 and 1989. This has no architectural merit, and the proposed new house is a great improvement, though it should be noted that the proposed palette of materials include 'timber effect' cladding and render in a cold dark grey, quite different from the visuals which show a more empathetic and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>warmer brown colour.</p> <p>In the absence of any appraisal that addresses the registered landscape, The Gardens Trust and the Northumbria Gardens Trust would jointly object to the current planning application as a holding position, anticipating that further information will hopefully be forthcoming from the developer on the development history of the designed landscape and the likely impact of the proposed development on the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
River Gardens	Derbyshire	E18/1184	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alteration, conversion and erection of buildings and associated change of use to buildings collectively known as Belper Mills, to include: East Mill- Conversion to form 117 residential apartments (C3), formation of an atrium through floors 1 to 6; alteration of loading bay; formation of public viewing platform to northwest tower (sui generis) and alteration to open-up ground floor pedestrian route adjacent to North Mill, one commercial unit (Classes A1, A3/A4) (total 190m2) at ground floor, with amended vehicular access to east elevation and 37 surface parking spaces on external deck. North Mill- Alteration, restoration, replacement and repair to windows, doors, external and internal walls and roof, alter 5 windows to door openings to south elevation, to retain as museum (Class D1) at ground and</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) about the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust (DGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Since our earlier response of 3rd December 2018, the recent amendments would appear to be confined to internal layouts within the buildings. These will not affect our earlier comments. We did read though, with some concern, a letter of objection which drew attention to the possible inaccurate costings for restoration which also brings into question the eventual viability of the proposals. We feel sure that your officers will bear this in mind when deciding this application.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

				<p>lower ground, and offices (Class B1) at first and upper floors, change of use ground floor unit to commercial (Classes A1, A3/A4), and ancillary uses.</p> <p>Workshops- alteration, restoration, replacement and repair of windows, walls and roof</p> <p>Strutt House - Alteration, restoration, replacement and repair of windows, external and internal walls and roof, alter 9 windows to doors on east elevation, to facilitate internal subdivision into 4 units for flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A3/A4, B1 and D2) at ground, first and mezzanine levels. At Archway Bridge/Gangway restoration and repair external and internal walls and roof, alteration to ground floor structure to retain in ancillary use to offices (Class B1); optional change of use first floor to ancillary use to venue (Class D2) associated with Strutt House (The proposal may affect the setting of a Listed Building) (The proposal represents a Departure from the Development Plan).</p> <p>Belper Mills Complex, Bridge Foot, Belper, Derbyshire. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E21/1812	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single and two storey extensions to provide accommodation associated with the existing</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding the applicant's agent's comments with regards to our earlier response to the above application.</p> <p>In our earlier letter we asked the applicants to send us a photograph from</p>

				<p>furniture restoration, manufacturing and education business; and the regularisation of 2 flats</p> <p>Wheathills Farm Brun Lane Mackworth Derby Derbyshire DE22 4NE</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Vicar Wood looking towards the proposed development site so that the visibility of the proposed development from Vicar Wood (and hence from the Grade I Registered Park & Garden) could be assessed.</p> <p>What they have sent us, some six months later, is a digital image of rather poor quality, principally of the back of the development which appears already to be in progress, looking towards another farm building, with some trees in the foreground.</p> <p>This is not what was requested. As we pointed out, the proposed development site is clearly visible from the nearby road, so we need to see if it is also visible from Vicar Wood.</p> <p>We would like therefore to repeat our request that in order for the GT and your officers to adequately establish whether or not this application causes harm to the setting of the RPG, your officers ask the applicant provide proper images from the south side of Vicar Wood towards the development site to demonstrate the existing degree of visibility & hence the likely impact.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Willersley Castle	Derbyshire	E22/0741	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Without planning permission the unauthorised erection of structures in the grounds of a listed building as shown on both aerial photographic views and individual photographs attached to the notice</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Octagonal structure 2. Three poles and tyres 3. Wired climb through 4. Rope and tub balance 5. Run over platform 6. Air rifle shooting range 7. Archery range 8. Assorted climbing/rope walking structures 9. Axe throwing range 10. Raised timber planter with 	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2022</p> <p>I write as a committee member of Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust looking into this case in conjunction with The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>It appears that the Enforcement Notice document available on your Planning Portal page for this case is incomplete.</p> <p>The 11 numbered individual photographs of the structures to be removed, listed below and in the Annexes to the Enforcement Notice, are absent from the portal.</p> <p>Whilst I hope to view the development site from the public realm in the near future, I presume that the change of ownership means that there is no longer public access to the Registered Historic Landscape. The individual photographs would be invaluable in assessing the full impact of the unauthorised development, so I hope that they can be made available to us as soon as possible.</p> <p>With grateful thanks, Stephan Green</p>

				seating around 11. 2 x timber river bank landing stages LOCATION : Willersley Castle Hotel Mill Road Cromford Matlock Derbyshire ENFORCEMENT NOTICE SERVED	
Heathfield Park	East Sussex	E22/0628	II	PLANNING APPLICATION ERECTION OF 11 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, INTERNAL ROADS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING, AND PUBLIC AMENITY SPACE. LAND AT PARKLANDS, BURWASH ROAD, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8QX RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The 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. We note that both the Heritage Statement and Planning Statement mention the development causing less than substantial harm to Heathfield Park, which is included on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II designation. The Trust agrees with this assessment and approval of the application should only be granted by the Planning Authority if offsetting public benefits can be demonstrated. If the application is approved, the planting to the south is essential to make a border with Heathfield Park especially as the footpath in the park runs close to this boundary. Likewise, the rest of the landscaping defines the site and will to some extent mitigate the impact of the 11 houses. It will be important to ensure the landscaping is controlled and it is suggested there should be a condition for this attached to any approval. SGT neither support nor objects to the proposals. Kind regards Jim Stockwell Trustee On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust
Preston Manor and Preston Park	East Sussex	E22/0648	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Woodland Creation/Planting 40 standard trees planted into grass	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2022 Representatives of Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) recently met Kerry Pickett (Friends of Preston Park, FoPP) at Preston Park and discussed the proposals in detail. SGT is now fully supportive of the proposals and welcomes the

				<p>Species: Tulip tree, Norway Maple, Black Walnut, Elm, Austrian Pine, Cedar of Lebanon, Turkey Oak, Hawthorn, Beech, Cherry, Horse Chestnut, Crab Apple, Davidia Involucrata, Foxglove, Paperbark Maple, Catalpa</p>	<p>planting of new trees within the Park, particularly the species that in the longer term will grow into large trees and help replace those that have been lost due to disease.</p> <p>SGT believes that further tree planting in the Park beyond that envisaged in this application would benefit the significance of the site. To help develop the case for such planting, SGT has agreed to collaborate with the FoPP using existing documents, in particular the Conservation Management Plan prepared by the consultancy ACTA some years ago.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell</p> <p>Further to our earlier letter, representatives of Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) recently met Kerry Pickett of the Friends of Preston Park (FoPP) in the Park and discussed the proposals in detail. SGT is fully content with the application and supports the planting of new trees, particularly the specimens that will in the longer term grow into large trees, thus helping to replace those lost in recent years.</p> <p>SGT considers that further tree planting beyond that envisaged in the present application would enhance the significance of the Park and has agreed to collaborate with the FoPP to develop the case for such planting.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell</p>
Wivenhoe Park	Essex	E22/0541	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of new marketing boards</p> <p>Land adj to Clingoe Hill, Boundary Road & Colchester Road, , Colchester CO4 3SQ</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust (EGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation, and it is apparent that two of the 3m square signs, those in locations 1 and 2, would be within the Grade II Wivenhoe Park registered park and garden and distant from the proposed development. This would be visual clutter in a sensitive location and we therefore object to these two sign boards.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Shortgrove Hall	Essex	E22/0709	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2no. semi-detached dwellings</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory</p>

				<p>(Use Class C3) on land to the rear of the existing public house (Sui Generis) utilising existing access off Cambridge Road, reconfiguration of public house car park, with associated hard and soft landscaping. Coach And Horses Inn Cambridge Road Newport. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>Consultee on the above application which affects Shortgrove Hall, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II. We have liaised with our colleagues in Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this response. The following comments are therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>We refer you to our responses to previous proposals for this site: UTT/20/0803/FUL 15 May 2020, UTT/20/3370/FUL 12 January 2021 and UTT/21/2674/FUL 31 August 2021, objecting on the grounds of harmful erosion to the wider setting of Shortgrove Hall RPG, originally laid out by Capability Brown situated adjacently on the other side of the River Cam. Whilst we accept that the scale of the housing has been further reduced and is more proportionate to the site, we still consider it would add to the suburbanisation of the surroundings of the RPG, which forms a green space at the edge of the town, and so our concern remains.</p> <p>Again, should your officers decide to approve this application, the Gardens Trust and Essex Gardens Trust would ask for a condition requiring sympathetic boundary treatments and a tree management plan to ensure effective screening of the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Mount House, Alderley	Gloucestershire	E22/0745	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of farm storage barn Land At Alderley Road Hillesley Gloucestershire AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2022</p> <p>We were notified of the above application by a member of the public, and it is regrettable that Stroud DC failed to consult the Gardens Trust, as a statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. We have reviewed the scant online information regarding the above application. The proposed barn is likely to be visible and prominent when seen from the elevated position of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of the Mount House in Alderley. It is also therefore likely to be conspicuous in views from within Grade II* Mount House itself especially from the upper floors. It is extremely visible from the Grade II Summer House on the promontory of Winner Hill which looks directly down onto the application site. Historic England's (HE) National Heritage List indicates that there are numerous heritage assets within both Alderley and Hillesley and the neighbouring hamlet of Killcott. No mention of any of these, or the</p>

					<p>impact of such a prominent new building on their setting and significance, is given in the application documentation.</p> <p>We would have expected the application to include at the very least a heritage statement and visual impact assessment showing a wire frame or photo montage of the proposed structure when seen from various sensitive viewpoints and public rights of way. The photograph contained within the Design & Access statement (D&A) gives no indication how the barn (18.4m long x 9.14m wide, rising to 4.475m at its apex) would appear from the RPG and other sensitive receptors.</p> <p>The D&A mentions that hedges will be grown to the south and west of the barn to hide the barn, but this will not mitigate the impact on the far more sensitive views from the major heritage assets to the north and north-east of the application site. This impact is compounded due to the fact that these are on considerably higher ground, and no hedges can disguise the barn from the Summer House on Winner Hill, built precisely to enjoy the panoramic views. These same views are also specifically mentioned in the listing for the RPG of Mount House : ‘The House stands at the top of a south-facing slope, at the west end of Winner Hill. The gardens lie on the moderate slope south of the House. South of the gardens, the ground falls away more steeply to a stream in the valley bottom. There are fine views south and south-west from the gardens, across the valley, to the fields beyond.’ The fine views explicitly mentioned in the listing, look directly down over the application site.</p> <p>The application fails to comply with the NPPF para 194 as the applicant has failed to describe the significance of any of the heritage assets affected, and as this means that your officers will be unable to identify and assess the impact of these proposals on the heritage assets, it also fails to comply with Para 195.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with Historic England’s The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). On p2 of the SHA, it states that ‘A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.’ It continues on p4 : ‘ Because the contribution of setting to significance does not depend on public rights or ability to access it, significance is not dependent on numbers of people visiting it; this</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting, constraints on access such as remoteness or challenging terrain, and the importance of the setting to a local community who may be few in number.’ Mount House, its associated Grade II RPG and in particular the Summer House, were purposely placed to take advantage of the spectacular views. Such a development would compromise the historic setting and significance of these heritage assets. This is also covered by SHA, p5 : ‘While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not ... necessarily (be) the same as the site’s visual boundary. It can include: land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it.’ Until the applicant provides the necessary documentation, and we have the opportunity to consider it, it is not possible for your officers or ourselves to fully assess the impact of the proposals upon the various heritage assets. Until such information is provided, the GT wishes to submit a holding objection to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed and Registered parks gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to also respond on this proposal.</p> <p>In considering the material now posted on the District Council's website, GGLT would fully support The Garden Trust's detailed submission regarding the potential adverse impact that this proposal would have on the setting of nearby heritage assets. In addition, the Council will need to have careful regard to the legal framework for this proposal as outlined in the submission by The Alderley Meeting.</p> <p>GGLT would wish to question and balance the scant "Statement of Need" used as the basis for justification for this proposal, against the substantial adverse heritage and landscape impact caused by its implementation. On</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					balance therefore, GGLT would wish to maintain an objection. Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).
St Mary's, Painswick	Gloucestershire	E22/0789	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Temporary permission request for 5 years for a timber structure to cover an existing deck terrace Court House, Hale Lane, Painswick, Stroud MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered gardens, parks and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. Over the past few years The Trust has considered a number of proposals at this location of greater or lesser significance. In this case the proposals are retrospective or minor; and in extremis are easily reversible. Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).
Trent Park	Greater London	E21/1662	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 of 16/04324/FUL (as varied under reference 20/03992/VAR) to allow 1) amendments to the Walled Garden comprising reduction in the number of homes from 32 to 22, revised housing mix, increase in build footprint, alterations to the design of the buildings, increase in the size of private gardens, removal of private terraces at first floor level, decrease in the size of the communal garden with changes in layout ; 2) amendments to the Gardeners Cottage comprising a new private garden and alterations to window and door openings ; 3) amendments to the Energy Statement and; 4) amendments to the Landscape Masterplan. Former Middlesex University	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application and the potential impacts on the historic walled garden within Trent Park. 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. Trent Park of is included on the HE Register as Grade 2 and the Walled Kitchen Garden is a key feature of this historic landscape. 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 also included on our Inventory here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=ENF048&sitename=Trent+Park+and+Trent+Country+Park+%2A As you know from our previous responses, in particular our letter of 18 January 2022, LPG was unhappy with the increase of building footprint and

				<p>Trent Park, Bramley Road, N14 4YZ. MISCELLANEOUS</p> <p>reduction in size of the communal gardens. LPG reiterated the importance of the Pergola restoration (renamed Wisteria Walk) in the hope that this is tightly conditioned to happen in an appropriate and timely manner. LPG asked that all retained trees and hedges be protected by planning condition and future fencing and buildings in gardens also be conditioned to avoid further loss of the garden character.</p> <p>Having reviewed the latest documentation supplied on the planning portal associated with this application, we note that in this latest reiteration of Berkeley Homes North London (BHNL)'s scheme for Trent Park's Walled Garden the issue of the new ratio of private to communal landscaping is listed in the applicant's response spreadsheet as 'resolved' but we remain concerned. Other important changes include BHNL accepting objection to the surfacing material of the perimeter roads; they now propose a resin bound solution. Some issues remain to be decided.</p> <p>In particular we are concerned that the increased height of houses vis-à-vis the gardener's cottage will have a detrimental effect on the historic wall which is a defining heritage feature and that the new dwellings height together with their raised ground levels could appear overbearing within the walled garden and on the gardener's cottage'.</p> <p>Previously Enfield conservation and planning officers had requested 'sound justification' for changing levels within the walled garden. LPG supports Enfield officers' concerns and questions the applicant's latest iteration that the change '...allows for a greater appreciation of the wall and improves the relationship with the houses and the wall and the communal garden with the wall and the houses'. The current figure proposed for lowering the houses' levels-450mm is determined by access roads and drainage levels. Given the historic importance of the wall (which is to be repaired and buttressed), the height and position should have been the determining factor from the outset.</p> <p>LPG notes the latest scheme also addresses the issue of the number of roofs onto which PVS panels can be fitted as part of the carbon emissions reduction requirements.</p> <p>BNHL's willingness to meet LBE's requests to conceal the metal fencing at the rear of the houses backing onto the communal garden with soft landscaping; drop the tongue and grove fencing on the southside of the site in favour of brick to match the houses, and agreement to add a mature tree and move access to plot number 9 is welcome. However, all these adjustments seem rather piecemeal, in comparison with the overall</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>strategy and LPG considers the piecemeal adjustments unsatisfactory if the essence of the heritage asset is to be maintained adequately.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>pp. Helen Langley</p>
Wanstead Park	Greater London	E22/0627	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Temporary change of land use for a construction compound to support fencing upgrades/works at Gas Transmission Station.</p> <p>(summary)</p> <p>Development At Wanstead Park Road Allotments And Land On The South West Side Of, Wanstead Park Road, Ilford</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.08.2022</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 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). Wanstead Park is a Grade 2* park on the National Register of Parks and Gardens and also included in our Inventory here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=RE_D042&sitename=Wanstead+Park+%2A Wanstead Park is also part of a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site proposed for the temporary construction compound lies adjacent to this heritage site and the setting is therefore a material consideration. We welcome the presence of a Heritage Statement and Ecological Appraisal with this application, however the documentation does not appear to fully address other factors of importance in this case.</p> <p>Whilst we agree the site itself is not of significant heritage merit we would like to draw your attention to a number of policies in the Redbridge Local Plan (RLP) where we have reservations about the current assessment presented.</p> <p>The project area lies within parcel GB02 (p138) and as such is protected as Green Belt. We disagree with the assessment for RLP policy LP35 which states:</p>

					<p>“The Council will protect, enhance the quality and improve access to existing green spaces by:</p> <p>A) Protecting all Open Space and Play Space in the borough, as identified on the Policies Map. Any development proposals on such space should:</p> <p>i) Be supportive of and ancillary to the purpose of that open space; and</p> <p>ii) Enhance the quality or accessibility of the open space.”</p> <p>The application does not explain why a site within the Green Belt has been selected for use as a compound albeit on a temporary basis, rather than a brownfield site elsewhere contrary to the protections implied by the Local Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the development site lies immediately adjacent to some Allotments where beehives are present. RLP policy LP36 for Allotments and Local Produce states:</p> <p>1 The Council will maintain and enhance and where possible increase the amount of land used for sustainable food growing and gardening by:</p> <p>(a) Resisting development on allotments unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>i) They are no longer needed to meet local demand; and</p> <p>ii Existing allotment users can be relocated to a new or existing allotment site within a reasonable distance of their homes.</p> <p>(b) Promoting investment and improvements to all existing allotments in the borough, particularly at reserve sites at Uplands and Wanstead Park Road to bring them back into use; (My emboldening)</p> <p>(c) Protecting agricultural land in the borough, in accordance with national planning policy;</p> <p>(d) Working with partners and local communities to identify sites with potential for local food growing and gardening projects; and</p> <p>(e) Supporting buildings and structures that support local food growing on allotment land which do not have an adverse visual impact on the locality.</p> <p>It is likely that the beehives will be disturbed. Whilst it is acknowledged that some improvements are proposed such as new toilets after the compound is closed, this does not negate the unnecessary removal of the beehives for 18 months with no alternative sites offered in recompense and supportive costs for transportation.</p> <p>It should not be overlooked that this site forms an important ‘green’ buffer between the heritage asset of Wanstead Park and the urban development</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>including the north circular road to the east. We acknowledge the temporary nature of the proposals, but question why the developer has not sought any suitable alternative compound sites – the evidence on this is lacking. They should be asked to do so before agreeing to this project. Therefore we object to the current proposals.</p> <p>If the Council is minded to approve the project, we suggest that penalties are built into any request for a time-extension; that on departure the land be reinstated by the promoter with enhancements including not only toilet facilities but further provision for extending the allotments; and that it be noted that no future permissions be granted for use of this land which is incompatible with its 'green' status adjacent to the River Roding.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Helen Monger</p>
Greenwich Park	Greater London	E22/0665	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Details of reserved Matters (Layout and Scale) pursuant to Outline Planning Permission reference PA/20/01421 dated 02/03/2022 relating to the following areas of the North Quay Masterplan: Development Zones NQ.A, NQ.B, NQ.E AND NQ.J</p> <p>Comprising construction of secant pile wall; capping beam construction; existing false quay deck demolition; and the installation of a temporary sheet pile cut off wall and other associated works. North Quay, Aspen Way, London</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application(s).</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). Regarding the wider development, as outlined in the Outline Planning Permission reference PA/20/01421, we note that the buildings envisaged may be visible from Greenwich Park, which is a Grade I listed park (which is why we have been notified). That said, the proposed building heights for this application appear to be in line with those of existing structures at Canary Wharf, and in any case the site is essentially hidden from Greenwich Park by the existing structures.</p> <p>We consider that the views have already been disturbed by the large</p>

					<p>number of tall background buildings in the Canary Wharf area and may be regarded by many as a something of a 'lost cause' from a planning perspective. Notwithstanding the foregoing, we would regard quite negatively any plans for taller structures on this site or in the wider Canary Wharf area, and we would make firm representations if any such planning permissions, or variation of existing permissions, were sought in future. For this planning application, the site does not appear to be adjacent to any other park or garden that is on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England or on the LPG Inventory. Based on the other information that you have provided, we have no comments on this particular proposal. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposal and should new information come to light that may have an impact on any heritage asset the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mark Davies Borough Planning Volunteer For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Dogmersfield Park	Hampshire	E22/0688	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Works to the Hunting Lodge grounds: replace failed fencing, installation of gates, lighting and security cameras and drainage and landscaping works; Hunting Lodge Bagwell Lane Odiham Hook Hampshire RG29 1JG MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2022</p> <p>The above application has been brought to the attention of the Gardens Trust (GT) and we have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust (HGT) whose local knowledge informs this joint response. The National Trust's 2020 Conservation Management Plan (CMP) makes it clear that the Hunting Lodge was formerly an integral part of the parkland at Dogmersfield, even though it currently falls outside the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG). The illustration below (CMP Fig 1, p36), indicates unambiguously that this was considered an important designed view, with the Hunting Lodge forming an eye catcher from the Belvedere. Figure 17 within the CMP indicates the major views and vistas, and several sightlines converge upon the gates leading to Wilk's Waters. Indeed, the CMP's title image is of this very view looking back through the gates towards the Hunting Lodge. The Heritage Statement (HS) (p14) also acknowledges the importance of this outlook, stating that 'Haslam's publications made an icon of the cottage's main facades: the vista of the gardens axial composition reflected on Wilk's Waters. ... accessible to the public through Odiham Common's paths.' All gates with pyramid tops are specifically mentioned as being of the highest significance within the CMP (p 24). The replacement gates all fall into this category.</p>

					<p>It is clear from the evidence above that any alteration to the gateways requires exceptional sensitivity. We have been sent photographs of the replacement gates, installed prior to the above application, and regrettably in our opinion, the new gates fail completely to capture the aesthetic of either Fowler or Haslam and are a jarring, insensitive intrusion upon the designed landscape and setting of the Hunting Lodge. We appreciate that deer are a problem within the gardens, but the very fact that the Hunting Lodge was originally precisely that, should have alerted the applicant to the perils of wildlife in an SSSI.</p> <p>We strongly disagree with the statement on p15 of the Impact Assessment that 'The proposed gates (which are already extant) recover John Fowler's gothic design. ... In the case of the metal gate behind the existing gate to the pond it is an acceptable compromise between not obstructing the main and iconic view of the house while stopping the entrance of deer.' The chosen gates are completely out of character in the setting of the Grade II Hunting Lodge, as are the close boarded replacement gates in the other openings. All would be more suited to an urban environment. Rather than impose the unsightly metal gates in the Wilk's Waters' vista, slightly taller reproductions could have been considered, and for the other entrances, there are many attractive wooden gates made of cleft chestnut (as seen for example at the Grade I RPG at Stowe) or similar, which would have been infinitely more suitable.</p> <p>We also question the need for such a plethora of security cameras. Fowler and Haslam, two of the most important interior designers of the C20 and C21st, did not require these, so we would question the necessity for them now. Their presence would be obvious from Odiham Common's public footpaths.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 Part I – Settings and Views. On p2, it states 'A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.' The Hunting Lodge is a rare survival of a cottage orné within a former Rococo landscape and as such we consider the negative impacts of the chosen gates to be an unacceptable detraction. The HS (p14) makes clear that 'This picturesque view (towards the hunting Lodge from Wilk's Waters) is for communal</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>enjoyment, accessible to the public through Odiham Common's paths, including its horse right access passing by the house.' It seems likely that to deter deer the metal gates will be closed for most of the time, therefore adversely affecting the experience of the setting of the Lodge and its designed gardens, for anyone passing. P5 continues : 'The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site.' We consider that the insensitive alterations to the Hunting Lodge fall into this category with regard to the Grade II RPG of Dogmersfield. We also feel that the proposals are contrary to the NPPG Para 202. 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.' We are unaware of any public benefits in this instance.</p> <p>The GT/HGT strongly objects to this application and urges your officers to require the gates to be removed and replaced by something more suitable.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Northaw House	Hertfords hire	E22/0913	-	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Re-construction of demolished Walled Garden lean-to store Northaw House, Coopers Lane, Northaw EN6 4NG</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Despite the gardener's store being unlisted it is still a key existing part of the historic fabric of the working part of the estate, one of the few walled garden structures to survive, and part of the locally listed historic park and garden of Northaw House.</p> <p>We welcome the reconstruction on the lean-to to the original design and using original or period-appropriate materials.</p>
Goldings	Hertfords hire	E22/0705	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of flat roof to proposed new roof terrace with glass balustrade and opening flat roof light window for access. 7 Goldings Hall Goldens Way Hertford Hertfordshire SG14 2WH. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We note that the heritage statement does not mention the Registered (Grade II) parkland, and therefore does not assess any impact the proposed development would have on it nor on the views across the parkland. We are concerned that the addition of glazing to the openings in the parapet would cause glare and adversely affect the historic designed views across the park and their focus on the main body of the house. We note that the application form does not specify the type of glass to be used. Measures to mitigate glare from the parapet glass, which would faces</p>

					south-west across the parkland's main views, should be a condition of any planning permission given.
22 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0704	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Extension of the existing carport roof. 22 Parkway Welwyn Garden City Hertfordshire AL8 6HG. MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. There are no proposed elevation drawings of the north elevation showing how the windows on the north face of No 22 Parkway would be affected by the extension of the roofline. In particular the window on the north elevation could be partially blocked. We would welcome clarification on this point.
North Mymms Park	Hertfords hire	E22/0743	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of shared staff overnight accommodation to self- contained staff accommodation comprising 2 No. 1 bed units and 2 No. studio units and alterations to fenestrations. North Mymms Park Crosbys Cottage Tollgate Road North Mymms Hatfield AL9 7TR CHANGE OF USE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application we do not have any objections to the work.
14 Roundwood Drive, Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/0767	N	PLANNING APPLICATION To remove the ivy from 1 x oak tree that has a tree preservation (TPO) order. TPO299 T1. To also remove stem epicormic growth to 5m to aid ivy removal. 14 Roundwood Drive Welwyn Garden City AL8 7JZ TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We support the removal of invasive ivy from this oak tree, in line with advice from a qualified arboriculturalist.
Land adjacent to Coach and Horses Newgate Street Village Hertford	Hertfords hire	E22/0782	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2no. 5 bed and 1no. 4 bed 2.5 storey residential dwellings, accessed from Ponsbourne Road. Each plot has a front and rear garden, associated parking and garage. Land adjacent to Coach and Horses Newgate Street Village	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Ponsbourne Estate is on the HGT List of Local Sites of Historic Interest due to its design, it's long history and the significance of the estate within the settlement of Negate Street The proposals in this application would further harm the approach to the mansion and core pleasure grounds and render the parkland unreadable. There has already been considerable harm to the historic landscape by development permitted to the east of the drive and further north along the

				Hertford SG13 8RA RESIDENTIAL	west die of the drive. The addition of substantial houses would give the historic rural approach the appearance of a suburban street. Newgate Street is within the Green Belt and the proposed developments do not fulfil the requirements in NPPF 145, and are thus inappropriate and are Harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved. In the WHBC emerging Local Plan no development of any kind was allocated to this site We therefore object to this development.
Swaylands	Kent	E22/0681	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Refurbishment of two outbuildings, erection of open storage space, replacement of conservatory glazing, erection of loggia, addition of uncovered tennis court, Landscaping. Hurst House Poundsbridge Lane Poundsbridge Penshurst Tonbridge Kent REPAIR/RESTORATION,	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2022 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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the online documentation and provided the recommendations contained within the Design and Access statements are followed, in particular that the North Barn is not used as a separate residence, we confirm we do not wish to comment 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. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Swaylands	Kent	E22/0689	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and extension of existing buildings to form 1 no. residential dwelling with ancillary gym, home office and studio with associated landscaping, car parking and works. Glazed link fill-in extension. Alterations to roof, fenestration, external materials. Barn alterations and conversion to gym and storage. New openings to garage with a lean to demolished. Former Swaylands School Farm Poundsbridge Lane Poundsbridge	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2022 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 Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. This application is very similar to a previous application (21/03447) where we submitted a no comment response. The points raised by the Conservation Officer on this application are fully supported by the GT/KGT. There have been so many applications for both Swaylands and Redleaf that one of our colleagues in the KGT has requested a site visit. However, your Conservation Officer is on leave till 28th August when comments are due back. Should the situation change if we are able to gain access, we will update the comments. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung

				Penshurst Kent TN11 8AG BUILDING ALTERATION	Conservation Officer
Ayscoughfee Hall	Lincolnshire	E22/0582	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of historic stone drinking fountain together with protective railings and surround base etc within Ayscoughfee Hall Gardens - re-submission of H16-0387-22 Ayscoughfee Hall Museum & Gardens MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with GT in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. LGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. LGT trustees welcome the re-installation of the town's heritage asset In Ayscoughfee Hall Gardens, HE Grade II , the historic Mary Ann Johnson drinking fountain, originally erected in Hall Place (1874) by The Spalding Water Works Company as a memorial to Miss Mary Ann Johnson (1794-1878), who had given the Spalding Water Works Company £1,500 (possibly £200,000 today) to lay water mains along Winsover Road, Holbeach Road and along London Road. The ornamental water fountain in the proposed location in Ayscoughfee Hall gardens together with the protective iron railing is considered wholly appropriate and smart. This Victorian fountain will once again add significant heritage interest, in addition to educational and aesthetic ornament to the historic gardens for visitors. LGT supports this application. Yours sincerely, Steffie Shields Lincolnshire Gardens Trust
The Plantation Garden, Norwich	Norfolk	E22/0564	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Replacement tool shed and renovation of store The Plantation Garden Earlham Road Norwich MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.08.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on this application. The application is for a replacement tool shed and renovation of a store. This minor development will assist with the maintenance of Plantation Gardens and is supported by both the Gardens Trust and the Norfolk Gardens Trust. Yours Sincerely Keri Williams Planning Adviser Norfolk Gardens Trust.
Blickling Hall	Norfolk	E22/0596	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Reconstruction of low level brick retaining wall in south east corner of the parterre garden	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.08.2022 Thank you for your consultation. The Gardens Trust and the Norfolk Gardens Trust support this application. The reconstruction of this section of parterre wall with appropriate materials as proposed will help restore an

				<p>following dismantling due to poor structural condition (Listed Building)</p> <p>Blickling Hall, Blickling Road, Blickling, NR11 6NF</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>important feature of the hall's gardens.</p> <p>Comments made by Mr Keri Williams of Norfolk Gardens Trust</p>
Ditchingham Hall	Norfolk	E22/0632	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Internal alterations, external fenestration revisions, new terrace and all associated works.</p> <p>Ditchingham Hall Norwich Road Ditchingham Norfolk NR35 2JX</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the proposed internal and external alterations at Ditchingham Hall, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden (List entry 1000225). The Norfolk Gardens Trust submits this response on behalf of The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Ditchingham Hall, a Queen Anne country house built c. 1715, is set in an 18th-century landscape park which includes a lake and woodland covering 48 hectares. It has been considered that the landscape was designed by 'Capability' Brown; though no documentary evidence has been found to support this theory, it is a quintessential Brownian composition. This fact is overlooked in the heritage statement. It is believed that the design for the subsequent park was by Joseph Rumball, a local surveyor, based on a map of 1764; at the time Brown was working at Melton Constable Hall and Langley Hall.</p> <p>It is proposed to remove a garden gate within the twentieth century garden wall on the western side of the terrace. By doing so, the point of access to the terrace would be widened, providing a view into the estate that does not currently exist. We consider that this will not be to the detriment of the park and gardens as whole.</p> <p>The proposed new terrace on the eastern side of the hall, adjacent to the kitchen, study and utility areas, is in keeping with the substantial balustraded south terrace with projecting apses which was constructed in 1910, and the materials proposed would make it a good quality addition. We draw your attention to an earlier formal garden on the eastern side of the house, running down to the lake, which is shown on a 1713 map held in the NRO (MC166/203 632X5). We recommend that steps be taken to ensure that the proposed works do not destroy any remaining underground archaeological evidence.</p> <p>In summary, The Gardens Trust does not object to the proposed alterations, which it considers in keeping with this important eighteenth century landscape park and gardens. However, we urge that special care is</p>

					<p>taken during construction of the new terrace to ensure preservation of any archaeological remains of earlier formal gardens on the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Susan Grice Planning Officer Norfolk Gardens Trust</p>
Kirkharle Hall Wallington	Northumb erland	E22/0549	II II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed extraction of 4 million tonnes of dolerite, importation of inert infill material and associated highway and landscape works. Land At Northside Harle Kirkwhelpington MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.08.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) has recently been made aware of the above application and wishes to express its concerns on not being consulted directly in its role as Statutory Consultee for historic designed landscapes of national importance which are included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest. Both Kirkharle Hall Grade II and Wallington Grade II* RPGs lie within 2.5km of the eastern boundary of this major extraction proposal.</p> <p>We have studied the documentation submitted and consulted with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust. Both our organisations concur with the concerns expressed in the National Trust Letter of 6 July 2022 that insufficient information has been submitted to assess the full environmental and heritage impacts on the two RPGs.</p> <p>In particular, we have concerns that no Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) nor Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) of Grade II* Wallington RPG has been undertaken and would advise that these should be carried out to assess any potential impact on the RPG and its setting. We would also advise that the 2km radius assessment zone used in the LVA should be applied to the HIA.</p> <p>With regard to Noise Assessment, no receptors appear to have been located at Kirkharle Hall or Wallington in this exercise. With increased noise to be generated by both the extraction procedures themselves and the movement of heavy goods traffic along the transport network we consider that it is important that these impacts are assessed fully for both RPGs.</p> <p>We note that Northumberland County Council Local Plan (March 2022) allocates this site (Northside) for the extraction of crushed rock for aggregate use</p> <p>Policy MIN 9 Aggregate mineral site allocations - Crushed rock (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>1. Proposals for the extraction of crushed rock for aggregate uses will be supported within the areas detailed in this policy and as such we would not</p>

					<p>wish to lodge an outright objection to this application. However, Policy MIN 1 Environmental criteria for assessing minerals proposals (Strategic Policy) states that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposals for mineral extraction will be supported where the applicant can demonstrate that any adverse effects on local communities and the environment are acceptable. 2. In considering applications, appropriate weight will be given to potential effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Cultural heritage, including known and unknown archaeological features, designated and undesignated heritage assets and their settings – applicants will be required to demonstrate that the proposals will not result in unacceptable harm to heritage assets. <p>On this basis we would not wish to lodge an outright objection to the application, however the application in its current form fails to demonstrate there will be no unacceptable harm to the designated heritage assets of Kirkharle Hall and Wallington and we consider it contrary to Policy MIN 1. The Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust can only advise that the additional information outlined above is sought from the applicant before this application is determined.</p> <p>Lastly, we would be grateful to be included in any further consultations on this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Seaton Delaval	Northumb erland	E22/0697	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of new school buildings, sports centre, external sports pitches, landscaping, parking and access at Land North of The Avenue, Seaton Delaval and parking and access at former Whytrig Middle School Site, Western Avenue, Seaton Delaval Land East Of Allenheads/Former Whytrig Middle School The Avenue Seaton Delaval Northumberland</p> <p>EDUCATION, SPORT/LEISURE,</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Seaton Delaval, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens (RPG) of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The following comments are therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>We can see from the documentation submitted that considerable pre-application discussions have taken place between the applicant, Northumberland County Council, and Historic England and the National Trust. This has resulted in an improved design with reduced impact on Seaton Delaval RPG and we agree with the conclusion of the Heritage</p>

				<p>PARKING</p> <p>Statement that the proposed development site is of low/moderate significance to the setting of Seaton Delaval RPG and thus the level of harm caused will be less than substantial, in line with the Historic England Good Practice Advice Note 3 (HEAG180) "The Setting of Heritage Assets". Clearly the provision of a new school has considerable public benefit which can be taken into consideration in the level of harm caused - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 202.</p> <p>However, we do still have some concerns about the proposal and consider that other mitigation measures could reduce this impact further. The Avenue is the historic 2km approach to Seaton Delaval Hall. Whilst the school immediately north-west of the Avenue entrance, will be passed quickly by traffic heading down the avenue towards the hall, it will appear more visible to pedestrians and cyclists passing at Avenue Head and in long-distance views from the former estate land. We consider that additional mitigation in the form of strengthened tree planting is needed along the north-east boundary of the proposed school site. Much of the surviving Avenue planting is deciduous; so any screening effect will be much reduced over the winter months.</p> <p>We also consider that an opportunity has been lost in the application to enhance the Seaton Delaval designed landscape in the area of the new school. We appreciate that the proposed new service access off the avenue will require appropriate sight lines, but rather than a generic screen planting as the drawings appear to suggest, we would hope that consideration could be given to restoring the Avenue's historic structure and planting towards Avenue Head, where it is now mainly lost. We understand that the avenue was a double Lime avenue originally and that sufficient old trees remain further towards the hall to gain an idea of the original spacings. In addition, we would welcome a move to make more of the head of the avenue, where the truncated wing walls survive and could perhaps be visually strengthened as a feature, though recognising that the replacement of gate piers on the scale of the original would be inappropriate given the increased width of the modern road.</p> <p>To summarise, while the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust do not wish to object outright to the proposal we would hope that the impact on the RPG and long-distance views could be mitigated by additional tree planting along the north-east boundary of the school site and that consideration should be given to the partial restoration of the historic Avenue plantings at Avenue Head and perhaps more made of the entrance</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					to the avenue as originally intended Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0051	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of agricultural building to B8 (Storage or distribution) use. 22/01257/FUL Allerton Park Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0SE CHANGE OF USE	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, 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 above Change of Use is for the most southerly of the range of 'agricultural buildings'; the one used by the road contractors. We wrote a strongly object response on 5th Dec 2021 to the predecessor application: DCCONLEG 6.95.2.AE.FUL 21/04832/FUL Change of use of agricultural building to B2 (General Industrial) & B8 (Storage or distribution) use. Allerton Grange Farm Allerton Park Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0SE. This Change of Use application was refused.</p> <p>Hence for 22/01257/FUL the B8 use has already been refused. This is a free application, and it has no convincing new evidence. The site should be returned to the agreed agricultural use.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have very strong objections to this application, the continuing development by the applicant on land within the setting of Allerton's highly designated heritage assets and Registered Historic Park and Garden. We are not convinced that the proposals comply with NPPF July 2021 paragraphs 199, 200 and 202. We append below our strongly object response of 5th December 2021.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT)</p>

					<p>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 GT and YGT thank you for drawing our attention to the additional Heritage Statement (file date 6 July 2022) but stand by our original objections to this on- going unfortunate change of use situation and the most unfortunate circumstances that are developing by the ever- changing approach from the landowner.</p> <p>The application form appears to have half the building as B8 storage or distribution and half as B2 industrial, but all the other documents refer to just B8. We also think that the site outline should include the area up to the A168 as the application states that no hedges or trees are involved. We are concerned that they could be removed at a later date.</p> <p>Whilst noting the able Heritage Statement we observe that it deals with this one building in isolation and only considers the impact on a limited number of the nearest heritage assets-</p> <p>The Park and Garden Temple of Victory West Lodge plus gates and piers Walled Garden</p> <p>It is only responding to the basic static visual impact and not the other undesirable impacts that often ensue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · initially the coming and going activity to the surrounding area / historic park and garden that goes with a storage and distribution centre · external storage and parked vehicles etc that totally change the rural setting · unfortunate bold signage that is often applied to this kind of use <p>For these reasons and the numerous objections raised in our original letters – dated 5th December 2021, 25th April 2022 - we maintain our objection and firmly recommend this application is refused and a rural countryside strategy be adopted by the planning authority.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0538	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Reserved matters application (appearance, landscaping, layout	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.08.2022 Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with the reserved matters application, with regard to proposed

			<p>and scale) for Phase 2 of Class E (Commercial, business and service), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) development, associated infrastructure and engineering works, approved in outline under hybrid planning permission 21/01238/EIAMAJ</p> <p>Land At Flaxby South West Of The Junction Of The A59 And A1M</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, 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>In March 2021, Flaxby Investment LLP ('the Applicant') submitted a new hybrid planning application to Harrogate Borough Council 21/01238/EIAMAJ (Hybrid planning application for proposed employment park seeking: a) Detailed (full) planning permission for erection of two warehouse buildings for B2 (General industrial), B8 (Storage and distribution) and/or Class E (Commercial, business and service E (g) (i)(ii) (iii)) uses, with ancillary offices, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works; and b) outline planning (all matters reserved with the exception of access) for Class E (Commercial, business and service), B2 (General industrial) and B8 (Storage and distribution) uses, associated access; car parking; servicing areas; drainage infrastructure; landscaping; and associated works, to be implemented in phases. Land Comprising Field At 440633 457078 Allerton Park North Yorkshire). The Gardens Trust submitted responses on 24th April 2021, 29th August 2021 and 15th November 2021.</p> <p>As we noted in our previous letters, the land for this employment park is within the wider setting of Allerton Park and especially the views from the two elevated buildings within the registered park and garden; Allerton Castle at grade I and the Temple of Victory at grade II*. We have been very concerned that the massing, scale and landscape scheme proposed in this hybrid application will be damaging to the significance of the heritage assets in what has been until recent times a largely rural setting where the reciprocal views can be widely enjoyed.</p> <p>However, after some revisions that addressed some concerns re height, green corridor (swale east-west) and the primary viewing corridor (avenue north-south) connected with Allerton Castle, 21/01238/FU was approved by Harrogate Borough Council on 7th March 2022.</p> <p>We have looked at all the documents, submitted with this reserved matters application, but have not found any individual site plans and elevations showing the landscaping. The buildings have a large mass, but the planting is small scale and as a result the buildings will be very dominant. The landscape information appears to be restricted to the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>master plan, DWG GL 138217.</p> <p>The master plan has a list of the tree species and their planting sizes, some of which are quite large, but we cannot find any reference to numbers or planting distances. Are the avenue and swale planting spaced 9/10m apart, which is usual for formal planting? But there is no indication how the species are allocated, are they alternate or several of the same in each run? In a position like this, we think that extra tree planting behind the formal avenue and along the Swale is needed to give a woodland feel to the development when viewed from outside the site.</p> <p>While the north-south view can be left fairly open as a contrast, there are some places where more trees could be planted, such as the northern end of unit 6 and the north- east corner of unit 5.</p> <p>The hedge planting to the offices are privet and beech. These will need regular maintenance although if left to nature will give the forest effect that we consider would be preferable. Smaller mixed planting would be better for wildlife and be less formal. Under the section on hedges <i>Carpinus betulus</i> (Hornbeam) is mentioned to be planted on a single row etc but we are unsure where this is proposed.</p> <p>Generally, we note that the landscape treatment is formal although this site is in a country setting, next to existing woodland. In our view the planting needs to be considerably strengthened. This would not only link the development into the surrounding rural landscape but would also improve biodiversity and the cooling effect that trees would have on the development's environment.</p> <p>We would like to see details of the landscaping as we consider that the planting is insufficient to have the necessary impact, but lack of a schedule makes it difficult to judge. Overall, we regret finding that the landscaping of this development in a rural setting is insufficient.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0586	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of existing Greenhouse to Annex.</p> <p>Gardeners Cottage Allerton Lane Allerton Park North Yorkshire HG5 0SE</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, 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</p>

					<p>authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The area for this proposal lies in the south-west corner of the estate within the registered boundary and close to Allerton Grange which is immediately outside the registered boundary. The c.3ha rectangular brick-walled kitchen garden is of c. 1770 and Listed Grade II with the accompanying Gardeners Cottage on the north-western boundary of a triangular section of the walled garden immediately north of the main kitchen garden. The existing greenhouse that is the subject of this application lies opposite the Gardeners Cottage on the north-eastern wall. The truncated photograph indicates the traditional glazed roof of a lean-to greenhouse in reasonable order with an opening casement visible, the back wall lime-washed and a chimney connected with the heating arrangements, presumably indicating that the greenhouse has been used as a hot house for tender plants. The top of a brick-arched opening is visible in the bottom right-hand corner of the front brick wall, possibly for a vine.</p> <p>The greenhouse is part of the significance, design and function of the historic kitchen garden of Allerton Park.</p> <p>We would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>The greenhouse is completely separate, and a distance away from the Gardeners Cottage. It is not an annex. The proposal is for a totally self-contained dwelling.</p> <p>It is not a conversion – only the base wall remains and that has two new double door openings formed and two end doors infilled. The slope of the roof is radically altered in gradient and the glazing removed to form a natural slate roof with two rooflights. The elevations are completely altered to form what is in essence a new bungalow.</p> <p>The proposal in appearance totally destroys that of a greenhouse in a walled garden.</p> <p>There is no indication of access, egress and parking.</p> <p>There is no heritage statement and we are unaware of any application for listed building consent.</p> <p>In our view the application does not address the requirements of NPPF (July 2021) paragraphs 194, 195, 199 and 200.</p> <p>We object to this application and advocate refusal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Studley Royal	North Yorkshire	E22/0586	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alterations to the Devils Chimney include reinstatement of 4 pinnacles to roof, new lime wash finish to interior and external fence</p> <p>The Devils Chimney Cocked Hat To Well Walk Studley Park North Yorkshire HG4 3DY</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens; Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey, at grade I as per the above application. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey was designated as a World Heritage Site (WHS) in 1986 due to its world importance, combining the ruins of a monastic site with an early water garden and designed ornamental pleasure grounds.</p> <p>The Roman Monument, more recently called the Devil's Chimney, Listed Grade II, mid- 18th century, is located at Grid Reference SE28482 69236, to the east of 'The Lake' and just above the Seven Bridges Valley within the registered historic park and garden. It tops a rocky eminence c.500m east of the dam. The Roman Monument is an important feature of the 18th century designed landscape however the precise date of construction is unclear as there are no known references to the building's construction or maintenance in the surviving estate records.</p> <p>The proposed work is part of the delivery of the World Heritage Site Management Plan 2015-2021 and the Conservation Management Plan commissioned as part of the Skell Valley Project in 2019 for Seven Bridges Valley and Chinese Wood. Priorities in both plans include the conservation, enhancement and interpretation of the 18th century gardens and parkland at Studley Royal.</p> <p>The Roman Monument is of stone construction with a domed brickwork interior. The building is in a poor condition and repairs are needed to the stonework and the brick interior which needs further investigation and recording. The building has also lost its roof pinnacles or 'cippi' which made it clear to contemporary visitors that they were looking at a replica of the monument to the Horatii and Curiatii on the Appian Way near Albano in Italy. The original monument was frequently visited as part of the Grand Tour from the end of the 17th century onwards. Since the 20th century the building has been known as the Devil's Chimney as all that remains of the original monument is the small stone square base of the building.</p> <p>We are very pleased to receive this application and read the excellent</p>
---------------	-----------------	----------	---	--	---

					research and documentation. It has our full support. Yours sincerely Val Hepworth
Scampston Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0619	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION EIA Scoping request for the retention of previously developed land and its existing vehicular access onto the B1258 Malton Road to accommodate the installation of a below ground verticle shaft, an above ground modular plant building and other development ancillary to gravitational energy generation and storage Third Energy UK Gas Ltd Malton Road West Knapton Malton North Yorkshire YO17 8JF MISCELLANEOUS, ENERGY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.08.2022 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 Scampston Hall and 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. The site for this Scoping Request is previously developed land located at Knapton Energy Park. It is screened in all views by mature tree belts of deciduous and evergreen trees and is c. 3km to the east of Scampston Hall and Park. The installation should not have any impact on Scampston Hall and Park or its setting and we have no objection. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E22/0661	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission for Erection of Reception Building at Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 6NJ MISCELLANEOUS	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Middleton Lodge at Grade II, (list entry number: 1001699). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Middleton Lodge, (Listed Grade II*, list entry number 1317085), was designed by John Carr of York and built between 1777 and 1780 for the barrister George Hartley with the grounds being laid out at a similar time. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and walled kitchen garden. The site for this planning application lies within the RPG, in the woodland area used for car parking, c.85m north of the Coach House/Stable Block (Listed Grade II, list entry number: 1180037) and south of The Farmhouse. We understand that the car parking was given permission via

					<p>14/00716/FULL although the Gardens Trust, formerly the Garden History Society does not seem to have been consulted at that time.</p> <p>The woodland is part of the north/north-west boundary plantation of the historic designed landscape shown on OS maps 6":1mile starting with the 1st edition surveyed 1854 and published 1857, and also on subsequent maps surveyed 1892, published 1905, and surveyed 1912, published 1919 (Yorkshire Sheet XXV.SE) and later. It is shown as mixed woodland ie deciduous and coniferous, with a track/walk passing through from south-west to north-east. The present woodland is probably largely a replant during the 20th century, but some trees may remain from the 18th century planting when the designed landscape was laid out.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement at Section 5.2 notes that when the parking area approved via 14/00716/FULL it was considered to be acceptable and generate minimal impact on the tree group and its integrity, although it did not specifically mention impact on the Park and Garden itself.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement 5.2.3 'Overall, despite the car park at the site, the wooded area is considered to be of high significance due to the Grade II listed status of the designation, as well as features that reflect the reason for designation, such as sufficient original landscaping being retained, comprises a variety of planting, and contributes towards the setting of other assets in the surrounding area.'</p> <p>The erection of a reception building is proposed within an area of the existing car parking and would be located on an existing gravel area. The building has been designed in a modern log- cabin style, with a sloping, single-gabled roof, and brick chimney. The roof would be constructed of locally sourced slate with the walls constructed of locally sourced stone and timber. Windows and doors would also be timber framed.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement 3.1.7 The existing area of parking bays would be expanded to accommodate the building and new parking spaces. The proposed development would not result in the removal of any trees and to ensure the protection of trees and their roots, the foundations of the building would be supported by concrete piles and steel beams.</p> <p>We have not noted whether the walls, doors and windows are to be of a natural finish or stained/painted. We trust that the bin storage area to the north of the building will be integrated into the surroundings by shrubs and overall, the reception building with its seating area will fit sympathetically into the woodland.</p> <p>It is regrettable that the woodland is to be the site of further changes and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust hope that this will not be a continuing situation. In view of the existing use of the woodland we do not object to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Hackfall	North Yorkshire	E22/0772	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>PROWNY LOCATION: Hackfall Farm Grewelthorpe, Ripon, North Yorkshire HD4 3DE</p> <p>Application for Modification</p> <p>Order 5 May 1984</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2022</p> <p>We understand from the Woodland Trust that current permissive paths at the Historic England Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden, Hackfall, are being proposed to become Public Rights of Way (PROW).</p> <p>We note from the Harrogate Borough Council Document (Case Officer Katie Lois) that it is proposed that path 1 commence at Grid Reference 42308 47670 at Point A on the plan and runs generally north east via Grid Reference 42345 47713 Point B to a junction with path no 15.52/7 at Grid Reference 42360 47718 Point C. Path 2 will commence at Grid Reference 42345 47713 Point B on the plan and runs in a northerly direction to a junction with path no 15.52/7 at Grid Reference 42353 47754 Point D.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the Statutory Consultee with regard to proposals affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens and the Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is authorised by the GT to respond on the GT's behalf. YGT is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites.</p> <p>We are writing in support of the Woodland Trust's submission on this matter of PROW and to express our own concern at the proposal.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden at Hackfall has exceptional heritage significance as an internationally important historic designed landscape. The Hackfall pleasure grounds laid out c. 1749 to 1760's by William Aislabie is strongly linked with the World Heritage Site and grade I registered historic park and garden, Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey. It should also be noted that Hackfall is one of only nine historic park and gardens in the whole of Yorkshire at grade I. In addition, Hackfall is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>Although we of course support public access and enjoyment of this very special place, we are concerned that it also needs careful management so that the special significance is not damaged and it is sustained for future generations to also enjoy. Currently the permissive access works very well and enables essential works to be carried out by occasional limited closure</p>

					<p>of certain sections and careful management to prevent excessive wear and tear on the site and to protect the habitat. It is important that the paths are maintained in a historically sensitive manner and we understand that the Woodland Trust have some footpath repairs in sympathetic materials in hand. The width of paths in a lot of places is not wide enough for PROWs and any alterations to gain width would cause damage to the historic landscape and SSSI.</p> <p>Making the paths a PROW will make all this management more difficult and is unnecessary.</p> <p>Since William Aislabie laid out the exceptional pleasure grounds at Hackfall, it has frequently been opened for visitors to enjoy. We understand that there was always a charge for entry at least until 1933. A later owner introduced passes for the locals. The Woodland Trust have followed their normal format of permissive paths.</p> <p>We strongly propose that in order to maintain Hackfall as a highly designated heritage asset, the permissive access remains and a PROW is not implemented.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning</p>
Kingston Hall	Nottinghamshire	E22/0605	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed Local Development Order for development at Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station, Ratcliffe on Soar, Nottingham, NG11 0EE MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.08.2022</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>When assessing the online documentation, in particular the Environmental Impact Statement, Vol 2, Chapter 8 relating to Archaeology & Built Heritage, we have concerns regarding the statement on p34: 'The Proposed Development lies in a topographical low point relative to the Kingston Park and Pleasure Gardens and the Kingston estate with extremely limited potential visibility between the two areas. This is further diminished by the presence of extensive planting. There may be some very limited glimpsed views of a new industrial element, in the form of the Plot I development within the Southern Area; as a result there is considered to be a negligible magnitude of change on Kingston Park and Pleasure Gardens and all additional assets within the Kingston Estate. ...This results</p>

					<p>in a slight adverse effect which is considered not significant.' In our opinion, this underplays the possible impact upon the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Kingston Park Pleasure Grounds. In order to ascertain the impact upon the setting and significance of the heritage assets, we would ask that the applicant provides additional wire frame and photo montage visualisations from within the RPG and adjacent to heritage receptors within the RPG.</p> <p>The GT/NGT would like to submit an objection to the proposals until further information is provided and we are able to fully assess the impact upon the RPG and its associated heritage assets.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Hawkstone	Shropshire	E22/0675	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey extension to east elevation Rakepark Lodge Weston Under Redcastle Shrewsbury Shropshire SY4 5JY BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT), formerly the Garden History Society, in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens (RPG), as per the above application. The GT has studied the deposited documents online.</p> <p>The proposal involves the erection of a single storey, flat roofed extension to the east elevation of the existing Grade II Listed Rake Park Lodge, which development will be clearly visible from the Grade I Registered Park & Garden at Hawkstone.</p> <p>We consider the proposed addition to what is presently an attractive stone-built mid-19th century Lodge building to be a wholly inappropriate addition to the building, which will negatively impact upon its appearance and detract from the Setting of the adjacent Grade I Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>We therefore strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer The Gardens Trust</p>
Quarry Park, and Dingle Gardens Shrewsbury	Shropshire	E22/0770	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of replacement two storey boat house following demolition Boat House, Water Lane, Shrewsbury, Shropshire</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Shropshire Parks & Gardens Trust (SPGT) which with the Gardens Trust (GT) is a Statutory Consultee on matters relating to proposed developments affecting the Quarry Park and Dingle Gardens. This is a site listed at Grade II by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p>

				<p>MISCELLANEOUS</p> <p>The proposal is for a 'replacement boat house' at the southern end of Water Lane, Shrewsbury, on the north side of the river Severn, immediately opposite the northern approach from Welsh Bridge to the Quarry Park, which approach is also included within its Registered Area. The area also sits within the wider Shrewsbury Conservation Area. The proposal involves the demolition of an existing single storey brick building with corrugated asbestos roofing materials which appears to have been constructed around the late-1960's or early 1970's (it is first shown on the Ordnance Survey (OS) 1" to 1 mile Edition of 1971).</p> <p>The application refers to this building as a former boathouse, and it is further described by local residents as having previously been used by members of the former Priory Boys Grammar School immediately opposite to it on the south side of the river. However, no evidence for this former use is presented by the applicant, beyond the simple description of it as a 'boat house'. Staff at the former Priory School (now incorporated as part of Shrewsbury Colleges) similarly have no knowledge of links between the boat house and the school. Historical photographs of this stretch of the river held by Shropshire Archives do not include any with views of the building.</p> <p>It is proposed to replace this existing modest and 'visually neutral' building with a two-storey 'statement' building on the same footprint, topped with a large and visually imposing roof structure, incorporating a number of raised triangular glazed sections facing onto the river.</p> <p>We concur with remarks made in Shropshire Council's pre-app response that elevations of the proposed replacement building as submitted by the applicant "...show a taller and potentially more visually-dominant form with contemporary elements including large glazed areas facing the river and angular-sectioned roof lines/roofscapes...". It is clear that this will be visible from the Quarry Park, even if the existing trees along the west boundary of the site (not shown on submitted drawings) are retained. Given the proposed design however, it seems likely that these trees will either have to be removed or radically pruned in the course of development of the site, or that they will succumb thereafter due to alterations to the local water table caused by the development itself. This will further expose the building to wider views from the west, including from the Quarry Park itself and from the nearby Porthill Bridge.</p> <p>We note also that no reference is made within the application to the end-users of this proposed building, or how it will be accessed by these users,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>or how the structure itself will be serviced. Vehicular access to the site is limited to the very narrow Water Lane along the west side of the development area. Currently, two vehicles only are shown parked next to the proposed building in 'visualisations' accompanying the application, although one of these seems to be parked against the south main entrance to of the building – thereby blocking access to it from the river, while the other is similarly shown as blocking access to its east side. Given the incorporation of a gym, changing rooms, w/c, showers and 'briefing area' on the upper floor, no description is given of how the users of these facilities will arrive at &/or use the building in practice.</p> <p>Given the above unknowns and the substantial potential visual intrusion from the proposed building as seen from the Quarry Park, we presently object to the application as it stands.</p>
Hilton Hall	Staffordshire	E21/2153	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of marquee to be used for hosting of events</p> <p>Hilton Hall Hilton Lane Hilton</p> <p>Staffordshire WV11 2BQ</p> <p>MARQUEE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.03.2022</p> <p>le in the shrubberies and pleasure grounds which immediately adjoin the Hall, the surviving shelter belts and park wall around the perimeter, and various ornamental garden buildings such as the grade II listed Portobello Tower and the grade I Forcing House. Unfortunately the construction of two motorways, a service area, and gravel working have seriously compromised the integrity of the landscape. Nonetheless the core area around the grade I listed hall remains visually intact and is of historic significance.</p> <p>The Trusts do not object in principle to the retention of the unauthorised marquee if the income it generates is hypothecated to the upkeep of the historic buildings and landscape. Its location on a site previously used as a base for an earlier marquee is just outside the core historic part of the park, is not readily intervisible with the hall and primarily overlooks degraded paddocks to the east. The Trusts do not consider that retention of the marquee will cause harm to the significance of the heritage assets or their setting.</p> <p>The Trust do suggest that, if your Council is minded to grant planning permission to retain the marquee, the consent should be time limited to a period of say five years. By emphasising the temporary nature of the facility it would help avert the risk of a future proposal to substitute a permanent building on the site. The Trusts also suggest that your Council considers imposing a condition requiring the income from the marquee to be allocated to the upkeep of the listed buildings, the historic parkland and other related heritage assets and a mechanism whereby it has enforceable</p>

					oversight of this process. Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0636	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use of a vacant building to a cafe (class E) with food hatch and external seating, replacement of existing casement windows with bi-folding window and paving Woodgate Cottage, Stone Road Tittensor CHANGE OF USE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.08.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications. 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 adjacent to 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. Woodgate Cottage itself is a small colour washed lodge constructed of brick (not concrete as erroneously stated in the applicants' Design Statement) in the later 1920s. Its principal features are the distinctive bow fronted west elevation with symmetrical ground and first floor fenestration and its oversailing flat roof. It is the only survivor of a suite of architecturally progressive Art Deco style buildings designed for the Trentham Estate by Wood and Goldstraw, architects of Tunstall between 1925 and 1936. The building is of significance as part of the development of the landscape park in the inter-war period in an architecturally adventurous modern design. The cottage is currently disused. The Trusts have no objection to the proposed change of use as a café to serve park visitors. While the Trusts do not object to the principle of adapting parts of the prominent curved ground floor window to function as a serving hatch we are strongly opposed to extending the glazed area around the complete sweep of the bay by removing the two intermediate masonry panels. This will cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset in which the ground and first floor fenestration was designed to be identical. It is, moreover, difficult to see how the upper part of the facade would be supported if these load bearing piers were to be removed: there is no

					<p>evidence this issue has been considered in the application.</p> <p>The Trusts suggest that the design be amended to retain the existing intervening piers and limit the serving areas to the existing glazed openings. The design of the new window frames and glazing will need careful consideration to harmonise with the design of the building; any advertising of the use should be discrete to suit its context within the RPG. It is regrettable that this application, like other recently submitted by the same applicant, 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 restate their 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 again 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>
Merevale Hall	Warwicks hire	E22/0565	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single storey art studio building</p> <p>Merevale Hall, Merevale Lane, Merevale, Atherstone, CV9 2HG</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation and the site for the proposed art studio building on the old hard tennis court in the centre of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Merevale is well screened on all sides by woodland. The large new building is utilitarian in aspect from the outside and the largest of the doors/windows (which we presume will be on the west façade, although this is unclear from the site plan and elevations drawing) can be screened by sliding doors. The Planning Statement (Para 3.4) indicates that the building can ‘be accessed via the existing track through the woodland’. There is no mention of hardstanding for vehicles or exterior lighting that might be required. We would suggest that should this application be permitted, there is no additional hard surfacing around the building, and any external light sources should be carefully designed to avoid as much light emittance as possible. The Heritage Statement illustrates (Fig 12) a view of the wooden Swimming Pool façade from the south, which presents a stylistically less utilitarian</p>

					<p>appearance. It would be welcomed if the new art studio, if permitted, could echo this more sympathetic design code.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Kenilworth Castle	Warwicks hire	E22/0684	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for Prior Approval under Part 3, Class Q (a) and (b) for proposed change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling house (Use Class C3) and associated external alterations High House Farm, Purlieu Lane, Kenilworth, CV8 1PQ</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The applications site directly abuts the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Kenilworth Castle to the west and south. As such we would expect any application relating to this sensitive site to be accompanied by a Heritage Statement, Design & Access statement and a description of the significance of the site, plus any impact the proposed changes might have upon the setting and significance of the RPG. Without this material, the application does not comply with the NPPF Paras 195 and 195 and we do not consider that the application should have been validated.</p> <p>Please reconsult us when the correct information has been provided. In the absence of this, we object to the application in its present form.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E22/0742	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for employment related development (including B2/B8 use class and E g) iii) use class) together with associated development.</p> <p>Land to the east of Stratford Road, Longbridge, Warwick, CV34 6XU</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2022</p> <p>We are surprised and disappointed that the Gardens Trust were not consulted about the above application, as we have regularly responded to applications affecting the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Warwick Castle. We would be grateful if you could please ensure that we are not omitted from future consultations regarding this significant and important heritage asset. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust (WGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation and are concerned at the proposed height of the warehouses, especially Unit 3, with a maximum height indicated of 18.5m. The application site is flat and low lying and therefore these tall buildings are likely to be very visible in the foreground when approaching Warwick from the west and southern directions, impinging on the setting and views of the Grade I RPG and the Grade I</p>

					<p>Castle itself. In addition, the LVIA assumes that due to the wooded boundary of the RPG to the east of the application site, there will not be any inter-visibility. Most of the trees are deciduous so we have concerns that these extremely tall buildings will be visible from Warwick Castle itself, Leafield Bridge and the southern part of the southern end of the Grade I RPG. We would like the applicant to provide views with wire frame and/or photomontages, showing the site from Leafield Bridge.</p> <p>Until we are satisfied that these enormous structures will not adversely affect the setting and significance of Warwick Castle RPG, we would like to submit a holding objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung</p>
Wakehurst Place	West Sussex	E22/0494	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing agricultural buildings (with those of heritage value to be retained), formerly known as Havelock Farm, and the development of a new conservation and research nursery consisting of four glasshouses of varying size, polytunnels, shade structures, standout area, mechanical plant building, and associated hard and soft landscape works.</p> <p>Havelock Farm Wakehurst Place Selsfield Road Ardingly</p> <p>DEMOLITION, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.08.2022</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 site has been well known to SGT for many decades and experienced representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with the application and visited the site earlier this week. The Trust welcomes the vision for the project, ie for Wakehurst "to become a national centre of excellence in conservation science and practice, seed research and landscape ecology".</p> <p>The documentation is comprehensive and includes an assessment of significance and the impact of the proposals on that significance. The Trust agrees the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park will be neutral, particularly because of the decision to retain some of the farm buildings, some of which provide a pleasing backdrop from areas of the Registered Park – for instance the view looking north from within the old walled garden. When viewed from within the Registered Park, the new structures will generally be well screened, although new evergreen planting in some areas would help screen the new buildings as well as some less attractive parts of the retained buildings – e.g. to the rear of the public toilets.</p> <p>Facilitating the Hortus Conclusus</p> <p>At page 27 of the Design and Access Statement there is a section describing</p>

					<p>the longer-term benefit for restoring the walled garden to its original purpose once the current proposals are completed. Depending on how and when such restoration is undertaken, such a development could provide a very great public benefit. Sussex Gardens Trust considers this potential benefit has not been fully drawn out in the application and if this were better described, it would further strengthen an already strong case for approval.</p> <p>Conclusion Sussex Gardens Trust supports the application. Kind regards Jim Stockwell Trustee On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E19/1487	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION REVISED PLANS Application for Listed Building Consent for works of restoration, conversion and development to the Mansion House, Stables and Coach House, Camellia House, curtilage and associated buildings within the Bretton Hall Estate and relates works of demolition, new construction, car parking infrastructure and landscaping for hotel, conferencing exhibition uses, offices, non-residential institutions and associated uses. Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton. HYBRID</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for again reconsulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This letter follows our earlier correspondence this year dated 1st April and 16th May 2022.</p> <p>We have looked at the following documents: 1267-101_Landscape Masterplan (Phase 1)_RevT • M1 & M2 marquee positions labelled. • Car Park Provision table added. 20417_P109_Landscape Masterplan_All phases (coloured)_Rev J • Car Park Provision table added. • Base plan updated to latest layout. • Marquee location A1 added. • Blue key amended to say 'New Buildings'. 20417_P116_Site Wide Phasing Plan_Rev J • Base plan updated to latest layout.</p> <p>Scope of Works PMD3-01-0</p> <p>Our comments below relate to the notation on our letters of 1st April and 16th May: a. Camellia House:</p>

					<p>We noted in our letter 16th May: Windows and doors: following further survey, these are seen to be capable of restoration and works of repair have now been completed. Pathways: We are pleased to see that both the All Phase and Phase 1 Landscape Masterplans have been updated to show the new curved footpath between the mansion house and camelia house.</p> <p>f. Trees to the south of the Mansion: We have not noted anything further to our comment: There should be a survey of the trees, and a plan in advance, of which ones are to be retained and which should be relocated. We advise that the survey and plan should be done by your advisor, The Landscape Agency. Suitable areas for the relocated trees should also be identified in advance. This is not something to be left to the contractor 'on the day' to decide. We understand from 16/01095/S7301 PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 of approved application 16/016095/FUL dated 16th May 2017 that the Wakefield TPO officer also has concerns about trees in general across the site and has lodged a holding Arboricultural objection.</p> <p>g. Marquees We remain dismayed about the marquee in location A1. We have two concerns: the length of time that the marquee will be in place. Will the marquee be in situ virtually permanently or erected on an as and when needed basis? Secondly the colour. White will be at odds with this sensitive location. The outer shell needs to be more muted to try and blend in with the house.</p> <p>Looking at the 20417_P116_Site Wide Phasing Plan_Rev J we presume that the Temporary Marquees M1, M2 are to become the site for permanent buildings/offices O and Q in a future phase following the demolition of the Victor Passmore building.</p> <p>h. Office locations We understand this, but our concerns remain that these buildings will be very evident from the New Hotel Guest Approach Drive 01.</p> <p>We find that the Landscape Masterplans remain very general and pictorial. We have not seen anything detailing species or planting. It is important that the planting schemes relate well to all the buildings both historic and new build, the car parking, the access and other infrastructure. The detailed landscape proposals should form a fine interface between the Bretton Hall development and the wider designed landscape that incorporates the Yorkshire Sculpture Park. In addition to the views within the development, distant views – both to the development as well as from the development - are very important and should be carefully considered.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We trust that there will be a landscape management plan at some point in this process.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E21/2186	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 2 of approved application 16/016095/FUL dated 16th May 2017 (relating to approved application 12/01524/HYB dated 18th April 2013) (part detailed, part outline application for the re-development of former Bretton Hall campus. Detailed application: the conversion of the Mansion House to form a 120 bed hotel with ancillary restaurants, bar, spa, conference, wedding facilities and temporary marquee locations (C1) including erection of 3-storey extensions to the north and east wings and the partial demolition of later addition extensions to the Mansion and full demolition of Ezra Taylor, Alec Clegg, Victor Pasmore (including Music School and Dance Studio) buildings, Refectory, Student Services bungalow and hostel/ancillary buildings; conversion of the Camellia House to ancillary hotel use; conversion of the Stables, Coach House, Theatre, Gym, Library and link block to 7 office units (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1);</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for again reconsulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This letter follows our earlier correspondence this year dated 1st April and 16th May 2022 for 19/02294/LBC .</p> <p>We have looked at the following documents:</p> <p>1267-101_Landscape Masterplan (Phase 1)_RevT • M1 & M2 marquee positions labelled. • Car Park Provision table added.</p> <p>20417_P109_Landscape Masterplan_All phases (coloured)_Rev J • Car Park Provision table added. • Base plan updated to latest layout. • Marquee location A1 added. • Blue key amended to say 'New Buildings'.</p> <p>20417_P116_Site Wide Phasing Plan_Rev J • Base plan updated to latest layout.</p> <p>Scope of Works PMD3-01-0</p> <p>Our comments below relate to the notation on our letters of 1st April and 16th May:</p> <p>a. Camellia House:</p> <p>We noted in our letter 16th May: Windows and doors: following further survey, these are seen to be capable of restoration and works of repair have now been completed. Pathways: We are pleased to see that both the All Phase and Phase 1 Landscape Masterplans have been updated to show the new curved footpath between the mansion house and camelia house.</p> <p>f. Trees to the south of the Mansion:</p> <p>We have not noted anything further to our comment:</p> <p>There should be a survey of the trees, and a plan in advance, of which ones are to be retained and which should be relocated. We advise that the</p>

				erection of two 2-3 storey office pavilions (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1); and associated new access roads, car parking infrastructure and landscape works. Outline application: Erection of six 2 storey office pavilions (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1)). Application to amend some of the detailed drawings to which the application and approval relates Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton MISCELLANEOUS	<p>survey and plan should be done by your advisor, The Landscape Agency. Suitable areas for the relocated trees should also be identified in advance. This is not something to be left to the contractor 'on the day' to decide. We have noted that the Wakefield TPO officer also has concerns about trees in general across the site in his letter of 21st July. We concur with his comments and his holding of an Arboricultural objection.</p> <p>g. Marquees We remain dismayed about the marquee in location A1. We have two concerns: the length of time that the marquee will be in place. Will the marquee be in situ virtually permanently or erected on an as and when needed basis? Secondly the colour. White will be at odds with this sensitive location. The outer shell needs to be more muted to try and blend in with the house.</p> <p>Looking at the 20417_P116_Site Wide Phasing Plan_Rev J we presume that the Temporary Marquees M1, M2 are to become the site for permanent buildings/offices O and Q in a future phase following the demolition of the Victor Passmore building.</p> <p>h. Office locations We understand this, but our concerns remain that these buildings will be very evident from the New Hotel Guest Approach Drive 01.</p> <p>We find that the Landscape Masterplans remain very general and pictorial. We have not seen anything detailing species or planting. It is important that the planting schemes relate well to all the buildings both historic and new build, the car parking, the access and other infrastructure. The detailed landscape proposals should form a fine interface between the Bretton Hall development and the wider designed landscape that incorporates the Yorkshire Sculpture Park. In addition to the views within the development, distant views – both to the development as well as from the development - are very important and should be carefully considered. We trust that there will be a landscape management plan at some point in this process.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E22/0600	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Take down and rebuild defective garden wall linked to listed building due to wind damage and safety risks	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.08.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall</p>

				1 Park Lane, Bretton, Wakefield REPAIR/RESTORATION	<p>listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>1 Park Lane, Bretton lies within the eastern part of the northern boundary of the registered site although we have not noticed this mentioned in the documents. The wall itself is not listed but abuts the Grade II lodge to the west and has been standing since the mid - 18th century. It developed an alarming bulge earlier this year following storms Dudley and Eunice and has therefore been deemed unsafe. Much of the wall is visible from the road (on StreetView).</p> <p>The proposal is to demolish and rebuild, like-for-like in appearance, including the three former arched openings, using reclaimed brickwork and coping as far as possible. The main difference will be that the wall will have a reinforced concrete core to prevent any further movement which will obviously make it substantially thicker. If the wall is thicker then it may be that the existing sandstone copings will not be wide enough. We would oppose concrete copings. We suggest that advice on the proposed construction could be sought from your Conservation Officer, the Georgian Group, and/or Historic England. However, from a landscape point of view there is unlikely to be any impact.</p> <p>Also, the planning application refers to 'Proposed materials and finishes: Reclaimed handmade brick wall and stone copings and V/B painted timber doors/gates'. We are unsure what V/B means and we can't see on the drawings where the timber doors and gates are to be located.</p> <p>If the rebuild follows our advice above, we would have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E22/0631	I	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land West of A61 and South of Sandy Gate	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.08.2022</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 Harewood House, which is registered 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</p>

					<p>authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>YGT was consulted on the Harewood PA2 Feasibility Study and we understand that the felling plans are inspired by the Study but not following every single aspiration of the historic advisors or Historic England. Thank you, Ms Martignoni, for the further information after my queries about this and reminding the Gardens Trust/YGT about the Forestry Commission's duty of care over biodiversity and priority habitats. And also confirming that no felling operations will be detrimental to historic features. We very much hope that the future of the Harewood designed landscape is in safe hands as it is registered at Grade I, meaning, as you will know, that it is a site of exceptional interest and one of only c. 9% of registered sites.</p> <p>A few days ago, we responded to the EIA-2022-0304 Woodland Creation 12.8ha of sparsely dense woodland (woodland pasture), composed of broadleaf trees and mostly deciduous shrubs with a very small conifer (yew) component. Land West of A61 and South of Sandy Gate, at the Harewood Estate, near Leeds (Grid Ref: SE 317 443), Stakeholder Consultation.</p> <p>Peter Goodchild spent a good deal of time on this.</p> <p>We have both looked at the Felling Licence consultation documents that have been sent to the YGT. At present we feel unable to offer much comment on the felling proposals. This FLA is very extensive, and we are somewhat at loss to understand the detail of what is proposed. We are volunteers who are not so experienced in the ways of the Forestry Commission. In cases like this one it would be very helpful to have a resume of the salient rationale/principles. We trust that the work at Harewood has been fully co-ordinated with the overall proposals, and we again underline the significance of Harewood's historic designed landscape.</p> <p>We understand from your e-mail of 22nd August that the felling is 'independent' from the restocking i.e. Harewood are proposing to fell mature trees on one site on historic grounds. It has been decided that this does not require compensatory planting. At the same time, Harewood are proposing planting across the parkland. These two operations are not connected from a business process point of view.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust is very pleased to be consulted by the Forestry Commission and to advise on matters relating to the conservation of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>historical character of the Harewood landscape and others. We are, however, a voluntary organisation, and anything that would help us to deal quickly and efficiently with casework, is very welcome.</p> <p>Thank you, Ms Martignoni, for our telephone conversation this afternoon and Peter Goodchild and I look forward to receiving more information. I will be away for a time, but we hope that we will be able to comment further in due course.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E22/0638	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Rear elevation flat roof dormer including roof lights to the front elevation.</p> <p>32 Norwood Avenue Menston Ilkley</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2022</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 dwellings. The south front of No 32 faces onto the street, and the north front looks out over remaining open parkland. As the proposed work affects both the south and the north sides of the house both settings are affected.</p> <p>The north facing dormer, both by its detail design and its massing, adversely changes the appearance and proportions of the existing house as it addresses the registered parkland. The south facing rooflights have not been carefully considered and they adversely affect the street frontage.</p>

					<p>We note that no Heritage Statement nor a Design Statement have been submitted leaving us concerned that the heritage of this sensitive location has not been considered.</p> <p>We object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Oulton Hall	West Yorkshire	E22/0653	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building application for Internal refurbishment, structural repairs to stabilize external walls and roof including new engineered roof truss rafter roof. New double door to rear elevation, reposition window to rear elevation, Replacement windows ground and first floor rear elevation. Conservation roof windows installed to rear elevation, new oak staircases, Internal partitions and plastering</p> <p>4 Wakefield Road Oulton Leeds</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.08.2022</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 dwelling which is the subject of this application has been formed from part of Oulton Farmhouse, a late C17, Grade II listed building (HE reference 1300024) which is set on the eastern boundary of Oulton Hall Grade II Registered Park (HE ref 1000413). The Park surrounds Grade II listed Oulton Hall itself (HE ref 1184583). 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>Commissioned by John Calverley (later Blayd) Oulton Park was laid out to a design by Humphry Repton in 1809 and altered/completed later by W A Nesfield. Repton (1752-1818) was the leading English landscape designer following the death of 'Capability' Brown and Repton produced one of his attractive Red Books for Blayd in 1810. The Park remained in private ownership, and intact, until the mid/late C20. Leeds City Council became the owners in 1984, and the Park was adapted for use as a golf course 1993.</p> <p>It appears that Repton had acknowledged that the farmhouse and adjacent cottages could be seen from the Hall, and he specifically arranged the insertion of a stretch of water and a belt of woodland in order to mask the view! Whilst not precisely to Repton's details, the water and a belt of trees remain achieving much the same effect today. We note the three conservation roof windows to the rear however the works proposed in this application overall do not appear to adversely affect the setting, nor the significance of the relationship between the Park and the Farmhouse. Indeed, the prospect of a historically responsible refurbishment of the Farmhouse appears to benefit both parties.</p> <p>We have no further comments to make.</p>

					Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
--	--	--	--	--	---