



GT AND CGT CONSERVATION CASEWORK RESPONSES OCTOBER 2022

The GT conservation team received 223 new cases and re-consultations for England and one for Wales in September. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 47 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Swallowfield Park	Berkshire	E22/0965	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full application for the installation of gates and a postbox between the pillars of the existing wall. The Red Lodge, Church Road, Swallowfield, Wokingham, RG7 1TH	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2022 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. The site where these solid timber gates have been retrospectively erected are next to grade II listed decorative low brick walls and gate piers for the grade II listed Victorian former lodge house which leads to grade II listed Swallowfield Park. Although the historic entrance is now dissociated from the House the view through to its parkland remains significant. Solid timber gates are inappropriate for this historic setting. Ideally, as there is photographic evidence of a former simple rustik single hung gate this could be replicated. However, being pragmatic and cognisant that security is an issue today, simple black metal railing type double hung gates would

					<p>give the transparency required so that views are restored through to the parkland (albeit that in reality there will sometimes be parked vehicles behind the gates).</p> <p>As these gates have a direct blocking and solid effect on the registered setting next to pierced brickwork and a highly decorative brick Victorian Lodge, an objection is raised to their proposed retention. It is hoped that encouragement can be given to the applicant to re-design the gates so that translucent views through to the parkland beyond can be experienced.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin Planning Advisor of the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan	Berkshire	E22/1064	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission of Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the Twyford NDP. 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 historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>The key aims of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) are to identify, understand, appreciate, and promote the conservation of historically significant designed landscapes in Berkshire whilst enjoying and caring for our park and garden heritage, now and for future generations.</p> <p>We fully support the principles set out in the NDP to protect the historic environment and green spaces. We have noted that Parish does not have any of Historic England's Registered Parks and Gardens nor does it include any parks or gardens within our Gazetteer. Notwithstanding this, the Parish does have landscaped open spaces which form the setting to some of the listed buildings in the Parish.</p> <p>We are pleased to see the landscape setting of the Conservation Areas is recognised but the NDP is silent on the immediate landscape setting of the listed buildings, except for in regard to guidelines for Gateway and Access Features. NPPF paras 189, 190, 194 and 200 require that development plans consider the setting of an historic asset, defined as:</p> <p>The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.</p>

					<p>We would suggest that a short description of the key features on the landscape setting that provides a positive contribution to the significance of the Parish's historic assets is included, where such landscapes/open spaces are important to the listed buildings (as for example the churchyard to the Church of St Mary), and the Parish's non-listed heritage assets. We also suggest adding the following additional bullet point into DC01.2 Heritage, views and landmarks as shown in italics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · New development and changes of use should conserve the landscape setting of historic assets and the contribution the landscape setting makes to the significance of the asset. The setting may include open space, boundary treatment, trees, water features, views, and historic structures. I hope that this will be helpful in completing your NDP. <p>Yours faithfully Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI (Rt) Chair and Planning Advisor for the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Dropmore RECONSULTATION	Buckinghamshire	E22/0006	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of house and outbuildings, temporary road for construction, proposed new dwelling, garaging, enhancement of adjoining parkland setting including altered driveway, 1.2 metre deep ha-ha and estate railings Burwood House , Taplow Common Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) again in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The GT/BGT previously objected to an earlier application (PL/19/4100/FA) in April 2020. Various revised proposals have been drafted, the BGT have made two site visits on behalf of the Gardens Trust and the GT/BGT submitted comments on April 25th 2022 and again on June 6th 2022. We now note that revised proposals were uploaded to the site dated 23rd September 2022 which relocate the proposed new house to the same position as seen on drawings dated March 2022. You have asked us to review these proposals with a view to submitting further comments. We are writing now to confirm that we maintain the same response as to all previous applications that the proposed new house should NOT be positioned within the RPG. A site within the RPG is not appropriate for such a landmark building, or indeed any new structures/development other than refurbishment of the Walled Garden to bring in back into horticultural use, within this little damaged parkland valley, and so our objections to the revised site remain.</p> <p>We uphold our comments that the revised site would still be prominent</p>

					<p>from the parkland and particularly in dynamic views along the south drive. We have suggested to the applicant to consider alternative options in the area to the west, in the current garden but outside the RPG, to include visual mitigation in the views particularly from the south drive with proposed and future ancillary structures positioned on the site of the existing house.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Dullingham House	Cambridgeshire	E22/0920	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Improvements to existing stud farming facilities, provision and erection of additional stud farming facilities and associated works, erection of two replacement stud dwellings, demolition of a workshop and partial demolition of a utilities barn</p> <p>Dullingham Park 10 Eagle Lane Dullingham Newmarket Suffolk</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Dullingham House, 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.</p> <p>We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and in general agree with the conclusions of the Heritage Statement that this proposal will result in less than substantial harm to Dullingham House RPG.</p> <p>However, as outlined in our letter of 21 September in response to application 22/00991/FUL, the Gardens Trust does have on-going concerns about the number of small-scale developments taking place in the northern parkland of Dullingham House in association with the stud farm. Whilst each is a fairly minor, high-quality development in its own right resulting in less than substantial harm, collectively if these continue, there is the potential for the gradual erosion and loss of character of the parkland.</p> <p>We accept that the stud farm currently makes a positive contribution to both the parkland and Dullingham Conservation Area and needs to expand to remain viable. We do not agree however with the view of this application that, due to separate ownership, the park, stables and garden have all been severed. Collectively they remain part of the historic designed landscape, a heritage asset and the setting of Dullingham House. Whilst not wishing to object to this application we would ask that East Cambridgeshire District Council assures itself that the proposal complies with:</p> <p>a) East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) Policy EN15 which requires developments within a historic park not to impact on the character,</p>

					<p>amenity or setting.</p> <p>b) National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Alison Allighan</p> <p>Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Radbroke Hall	Cheshire	E22/0990	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of lighting and the construction of woodland cabins</p> <p>RADBROKE HALL, STOCKS LANE, OVER PEOVER, CHESHIRE, WA16 9EU</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) with regard to proposed development affecting Radbroke Hall, listed Grade II and the associated Rose garden wall and pavilions, also listed Grade II.</p> <p>For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org. This document (p5) makes clear the distinction between designated and non designated heritage assets in the planning system, and the importance of non designated heritage assets in local plans.</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on proposals which potentially have a material impact on the significance of Radbroke Hall listed Grade II, the associated Rose garden wall and pavilions also listed Grade II, and the wider parkland, a non designated heritage asset.</p> <p>We do not object to this application which seeks to provide improved facilities requested by staff but are concerned that the proliferation of such structures be controlled so as not to clutter and degrade the parkland landscape which provides the setting for the historic hall and gardens.</p> <p>Significance</p> <p>The significance of Radbroke Hall lies in its architectural and artistic interest, one of the last country houses designed by Percy Worthington, and possibly the only one of this period built in a neo Georgian classical style. A measure of its significance is its listing Grade II. The associated garden with garden wall and pavilions is also by Percy Worthington, with the structures listed Grade II. Both elements remain substantially intact complemented by retention of part of their parkland setting and tree lined approach from the west. The garden is limited in extent but the carefully detailed, high quality hard landscaping is a little gem of Arts and Crafts style. It is the only portion of the original more extensive series of garden</p>

					<p>spaces to survive, offering fine westerly views of the Hall. The layout and pavilions reflect the development of a design undertaken at Kerfield House near Knutsford by Percy Worthington in 1912 where an axial path connects two summer houses or alcoves with arched entrances.</p> <p>The significance of Radbroke Hall also lies in its historic interest as an early 20th century country house continuing the tradition of classical country house building begun in the 18th century. It is an addition to the classical halls around Knutsford, Tatton and Tabley but built with money from trade, not by gentry. Like them it takes advantage of its setting with probable views towards the sandstone ridge and Welsh hills prior to the growth of boundary tree planting. It contributes to the rich diversity of country houses in East Cheshire. Gardens are more often subject to change through time as well as by design, but here a garden space survives intact, in Arts and Crafts style, reflecting the pre war garden of the 'golden afternoon'. Though limited in extent, it too adds to the richness and diversity of Cheshire's heritage, a historic garden standing alongside gardens of the same period at Tirley Garth (C E Mallows and T. H Mawson) and Thornton Manor (Lord Leverhulme and T. H. Mawson), both registered Grade II*.</p> <p>The property changed from private to corporate ownership in 1956, the very nadir of interest or awareness of built heritage. Each decade has added an undistinguished layer of buildings, associated clutter and car parking, largely turning its back on the historic core of the site. With proposals for reimagining the Barclays Campus now approved there is the opportunity to redress the situation, provide design clarity and an improved environment for Barclays' business and employees in what has become a business park in the North Cheshire Green Belt.</p> <p>Impacts on Significance</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed cabins and footpath will have a minimal impact on the significance of the listed hall and associated rose garden walls and that any impact will be outweighed by the opportunity that the facilities provide for users to appreciate these historic assets in their parkland setting.</p> <p>Additional information</p> <p>We request that details be provided to ensure that the construction of the path lies outside the root protection area of the boundary tree belt, and also that details are provided of the proposed lighting and times of usage.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Susan Bartlett</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust
Radbroke Hall	Cheshire	E22/0991	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of Photovoltaic cells above existing car parking spaces. Barclays Bank Plc, Radbroke Hall, Stocks Lane, Over Peover WA16 9EU	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Cheshire Gardens Trust (CGT) with regard to proposed development affecting Radbroke Hall, listed Grade II and the associated Rose garden wall and pavilions, also listed Grade II.</p> <p>For further information, we refer you to the Gardens Trust publication The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens (2019), which is available online at www.thegardenstrust.org. This document (p5) makes clear the distinction between designated and non designated heritage assets in the planning system, and the importance of non designated heritage assets in local plans.</p> <p>We are grateful for the opportunity to comment on proposals which potentially have a material impact on the significance of Radbroke Hall listed Grade II, the associated Rose garden wall and pavilions also listed Grade II, and the wider parkland, a non designated heritage asset.</p> <p>We have no objections to that part of the application concerned with installing photovoltaic cells above existing car park spaces in the south car park but strongly object to that part of the application concerned with installing photovoltaic cells in the west car park.</p> <p>Significance</p> <p>The significance of Radbroke Hall lies in its architectural and artistic interest, one of the last country houses designed by Percy Worthington, and possibly the only one of this period built in a neo Georgian classical style. A measure of its significance is its listing Grade II. The associated garden with garden wall and pavilions is also by Percy Worthington, with the structures listed Grade II. Both elements remain substantially intact complemented by retention of part of their parkland setting and tree lined approach from the west. The garden is limited in extent but the carefully detailed, high quality hard landscaping is a little gem of Arts and Crafts style. It is the only portion of the original more extensive series of garden spaces to survive, offering fine westerly views of the Hall. The layout and pavilions reflect the development of a design undertaken at Kerfield House near Knutsford by Percy Worthington in 1912 where an axial path connects two summer houses or alcoves with arched entrances.</p> <p>The significance of Radbroke Hall also lies in its historic interest as an early 20th century country house continuing the tradition of classical country house building begun in the 18th century. It is an addition to the classical</p>

					<p>halls around Knutsford, Tatton and Tabley but built with money from trade, not by gentry. Like them it takes advantage of its setting with probable views towards the sandstone ridge and Welsh hills prior to the growth of boundary tree planting. It contributes to the rich diversity of country houses in East Cheshire. Gardens are more often subject to change through time as well as by design, but here a garden space survives intact, in Arts and Crafts style, reflecting the pre war garden of the 'golden afternoon'. Though limited in extent, it too adds to the richness and diversity of Cheshire's heritage, a historic garden standing alongside gardens of the same period at Tirley Garth (C E Mallows and T. H Mawson) and Thornton Manor (Lord Leverhulme and T. H. Mawson), both registered Grade II*.</p> <p>The property changed from private to corporate ownership in 1956, the very nadir of interest or awareness of built heritage. Each decade has added an undistinguished layer of buildings, associated clutter and car parking, largely turning its back on the historic core of the site. With proposals for reimagining the Barclays Campus now approved there is the opportunity to redress the situation, provide design clarity and an improved environment for Barclays' business and employees in what has become a business park in the North Cheshire Green Belt.</p> <p>Impacts on Significance</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed installation of photovoltaic cells above existing car park spaces in the south car park would have little or no impact on the significance of the designated and non designated heritage assets, as the car park is some distance from the heritage assets, the space defined, enclosed, and screened by vegetation and buildings.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed installation of photovoltaic cells above existing car park spaces in the west car park would have a significant impact on the Grade II listed hall and its setting, particularly the two rows of cells nearest the building. The west car park occupies part of the parkland and forms part of the parkland space, defined by designed tree plantations to the site boundary and avenues along the original entrance drive. The cars are an ephemeral presence and though unlikely, the space could, in theory, revert to parkland. The canopies for the photovoltaic cells are visually prominent permanent structures which will have a negative impact on the designed landscape setting of the hall and the hall itself. This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 130 which states that "planning decisions should ensure that developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>appropriate and effective landscaping;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting ... · Establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;” <p>And contrary to NPPF paragraph 194:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · “Where a development proposal may impact a heritage asset, LPAs should require applicants to describe the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting)” <p>And contrary to NPPF paragraph 200, “any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset will require clear and convincing justification.”</p> <p>We do not consider that the proposed intervention is justified given the negative impact on the heritage assets at the heart of this Green Belt development. While we are supportive of measures supporting Cheshire East’s plan to become carbon neutral, we question whether this cannot be achieved in alternative ways at Radbroke Hall as part of Barclay’s re-imagining of the site?</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Susan Bartlett Planning Responses Coordinator Cheshire Gardens Trust</p>
Windlestone Hall	County Durham	E22/0715	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing dwelling, outbuilding garage and greenhouse and replaced with 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.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-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 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>We welcome the updated Heritage Statement but remain disappointed there still appears to be no recognition by the applicant that the site lies within the boundary of a Grade II registered park and garden. It appears surprising that reference is made in the document to information on the Parks and Gardens website</p>

					<p>https://www.parksandgardens.org/places/windlestone-hall and not the official Historic England List entry above. There is also little analysis of the role of this area in the historic development of the park. However, given the location on the eastern margins of the RPG and largely screened by established tree plantations from much of the historic landscape, plus the fact that this site has already been developed and one house will be replacing another, we do not consider that there will be a significant impact on the RPG.</p> <p>We agree with and welcome the comments made by your Landscape Officer and would advise that restoration works to the New Pond and The Breaks be considered as conditions, should the development be permitted. On this basis the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust lift their objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Upper, Central and Lower Pleasure Gardens, and Coy Pond Gardens	Dorset	E22/0946	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed 2 storey extension to the side elevation</p> <p>2 Havelock Road, Poole, BH12 1LA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We commented on the previous application and can see that it was refused for several reasons. This was partly due to the lack of screening between the application site and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of the Upper, Central & Lower Pleasure Gardens, and Coy Pond Gardens, as 2 Havelock Road immediately adjoins the Coy Pond Gardens beneath and there would have been loss of tree cover. In addition, the proposed extension would have been overly dominant in the street scene and stylistically at odds with other properties locally. We note that in the new application only one poor quality tree is to be removed and the new structure is slightly smaller (although not appreciably lower) and will match the existing house. The garage which lies nearer to the Coy Pond Gardens is to be removed and the extension will fill in the area between the former garage and existing house.</p> <p>We would repeat our earlier comments that a 5-year landscape maintenance brief be conditioned, to ensure that the disturbance to the rootzone of the remaining tree next to the garage does not cause this tree to die back or fail, and that if this the case, that a suitable replacement is</p>

					<p>planted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Margie Hoffnung</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Danbury Park	Essex	E22/0918	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a ground-mounted photovoltaic solar array together with underground cabling and other associated ancillary infrastructure and equipment.</p> <p>Danbury Outdoors, Well Lane, Danbury, Chelmsford, Essex, CM3 4AB</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.10.2022</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. Danbury Park is a grade II registered landscape, which has evolved through a succession of ownerships and management regimes since the Middle Ages. Its relationship with the house, Danbury Palace, a 19th century rebuild on the site of a Tudor original, has been largely severed now that this is in private ownership and houses have been built in its grounds. The land was designated a country park by the County Council in 1974. The northern part of the park, which contains some of the better-preserved parkland, is managed by the County Council as Danbury Outdoors, a recreational centre for young people. The centre has ten cabins and a dining hall, as well as various adventure playground installations, to which an amenity block was added in 2017, and 11 bunk blocks or chalets in 2019.</p> <p>This application is for photovoltaic panels on a site measuring 60 x 25m to the west of the Outdoors centre. They would be enclosed by a deer fence and there would be a large transformer. No landscaping is proposed. This is currently an area of open parkland appearance. It would be transformed by another expansion of the plant at the Outdoors centre which is leading to cumulative harm to the Registered Park, which has already been identified by Historic England as being at risk. The National Planning Policy Framework requires harm to be balanced by benefit. In this case, any benefit from the generation of electricity would be more than negated by the damage to the character of the landscape as experienced by those using the Outdoors centre or enjoying the country park. Provision has already been made for electricity generation by the installation of photovoltaic panels on the roof of the amenity building. The GT/EGT strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
New Hall, Boreham	Essex	E22/0959	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Construction of a two-way bus link and pedestrian and cycle paths to connect the Beaulieu Park Railway Station to White Hart Lane with utility, landscape and infrastructure works, together with associated and ancillary development The Avenue Springfield And Land Forming Part Of Beaulieu Parks Sports Ground Springfield Chelmsford Essex	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the online documentation and consider that the new bus link does have a minor effect on the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of New Hall, Boreham as it crosses the avenue of the house at its southern end. However, there is a thorough heritage statement which outlines the harm and flags that as part of the proposal, portions of the land to each side are being returned to parkland. We acknowledge the impact on the historic avenue but the proposed enhancements to the setting and wider/former parkland are to be welcomed despite the additional cumulative impact on the Avenue. On this basis, we confirm we do not wish to comment further on the proposals at this stage. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Abbotswood	Gloucestershire	E22/0877	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Application for Reinforcement of meadow to form helicopter landing area and approach track, with associated drainage and flush ground lighting (part retrospective) Abbotswood House Tewkesbury Road Stow-On-The-Wold Cheltenham Gloucestershire	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2022 The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for proposals that impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. It is noted that this application was registered in May of 2019 and that some of the proposal is in retrospect. Having also noted the response of CDC's Landscape Officer and Conservation Consultant, the purist policy view is one to resist change within this notable heritage asset. GGLT can fully understand this approach where impacts are measurably significant. However, in this instance, the landscape intervention in the parkland is at a very low key, the noise pollution should be sporadic at most, and the seriousness of the visual intrusion of an occasional helicopter on the landing pad would be a matter of some spirited debate. GGLT considers that subject to some thoughtful conditioning of the management of this facility regarding the parking/ storage of

					<p>helicopters, and the use of lighting, this proposal becomes an adjunct to the beneficial use of this estate. In extremis, the proposal is reversible; consequently, GGLT has no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
St Mary's, Painswick	Gloucestershire	E22/0988	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of artificial Cotswold stone slates on nave and chancel roofs to natural Cotswold stone slates.</p> <p>St Marys Church, Stroud Road, Painswick, Stroud</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscape has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>This proposal by David Newton for the Parochial Church Council of St Mary's in Painswick, is to be welcomed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Frampton Court	Gloucestershire	E22/1017	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Section 73 Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of Application Reference Number: S21/0465/FUL (The construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning for a renewable energy scheme of up to a 49.9 megawatt (MW) solar farm and up to a 49.9MW battery storage facility). Variation to consist of two point-of-contact masts required to connect solar farm to electricity grid</p> <p>Supersede the approved Landscape Strategy Plan with amended version illustrating the location of proposed masts</p> <p>Land Parcel A, Moreton Valence, Gloucester, Gloucestershire.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for proposals that might adversely impact Listed or Registered parks, gardens or landscapes, has consulted The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>You will recall that GGLT did comment on the original Application to try and achieve more robust areas of tree planting in this sector of this proposal. However, it also seems possible that this specialist applicant might have anticipated this additional infrastructure at the time of the original submission, that would further intrude on this sensitive part of the layout. At this late stage, the introduction of additional visually intrusive masts grouped with a pylon does little to improve the impact of this scheme.</p> <p>At this point in the approval process one assumed that the District Council would be hard pressed to ameliorate this situation as you have issued an Approval. Massed plantings of ivy will not help either.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Cowley Manor	Gloucestershire	E22/1098	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building Consent for New build pavilion for 4 new family</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that may impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes has notified</p>

				<p>guest bedrooms set within the unused NW Courtyard Terrace (Former Swimming Pool) (revised scheme) at Cowley Manor Cowley Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 9NL</p>	<p>The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to this amendment on its behalf.</p> <p>GGLT considers that this amendment to the approved proposal, subject to your Conservation and Design Officer's observations, raises no adverse comment from GGLT.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball.</p>
Ravenscourt Park	Greater London	E22/0868	N	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION</p> <p>Tree Planting</p> <p>13 standard trees to be planted on grass. Species: Italian alder, sweet chestnut, scots pine and common oak</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above 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). Ravenscourt Park is included on our inventory: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=HAF046&sitename=Ravenscourt+Park</p> <p>As you will see from this record Ravenscourt Park opened as a public park in 1888, laid out on the former grounds of the Ravenscourt estate, formerly known as Pallenswick. The moated manor house passed through numerous. In 1887 the house and remaining grounds were acquired by the MBW and Hammersmith Vestry, and opened to the public in 1888. The former stables were converted into the park's Refreshment Rooms, with public toilets added on at the north side. The mansion was used as a public library, until it was destroyed by WWII bombing. The park contains remnants of the earlier planting, and the lake was once part of the moat. There are several grade 2 listed structures contained within the park including Walls and wrought-iron gates of Walled Garden, the Lodge at</p>

					<p>Paddenswick Road Gate, the Tea Room (former stables). Following notification, we have received further details on the proposals from Mr Tom Bach, Parks Tree Officer at Hammersmith & Fulham Council; please see the attached document titled 'Ravenscourt Park Map 2.pdf'. Having reviewed the information provided, we have some concerns regarding the proposals and the impact they may have on the character, original planting aspirations and archaeological potential of the park. We are concerned by the proposals affecting the areas demarcated in the north-east of the park, within the Archaeological Priority Area, and those in the south of the park.</p> <p>Further Details</p> <p>We note that the proposed planting areas in the screenshot below correspond with a designated Archaeological Priority Area covering the vicinity of Ravenscourt Manor House. The APA map for Hammersmith & Fulham can be accessed online here. The proposed planting areas marked up below are in the same area/vicinity in which an archaeological evaluation undertaken in 2015 (report attached) 'successfully [identified] masonry remains of the former manor house', the basement level of which 'survives relatively intact.' The report published by Archaeology South-East recommended a 'more detailed examination' of the site to further inform the findings.</p> <p>We note that the Local Plan Policy DC1 Built Environment, as quoted in LBHF's Planning Guidance SPD states that 'the council will aim to protect, restore or enhance the [...] borough's conservation areas and its historic environment, including listed buildings, historic parks and gardens, buildings and artefacts of local importance and interest, archaeological priority areas and the scheduled ancient monument.' It is therefore our suggestion that further planting within this area of the park be very carefully considered, to ensure it does not damage the archaeology or frustrate the ability to carry out further archaeological investigations in the future.</p> <p>Planting proposals – north-east of the park</p> <p>Site of Archaeology South East's archaeological evaluation in 2015</p> <p>We would also like to register concerns with the planting proposals in the south of the park, particularly the trees on the path which runs diagonally across the centre of the park from south-west to north-east, pictured below:</p> <p>The schedule of maps on pages 14 to 20 of the draft Maintenance and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Management Plan for the park (attached) shows that until 1951 at the earliest the path was not bordered by trees, save for a small cluster just below the centre of the path, which is not evident in the map of the site provided from 1830.</p> <p>Having carried out a site visit prior responding to this consultation, we feel confident that to plant additional trees at the south end of the path would further impede views across the park, altering its character and setting. The same can be said for the proposed planting on the north side of the shorter path intersecting the south end of the park (from south-west to south-east). The canopy in this area is already dense and means that views across the park from this path are limited, especially in the south-west corner. The historic maps provided in the latest MMP show that the north side of this path was also planted sparsely for most of its history.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>We acknowledge that the range of trees in the park contributes to the significance of the site and that the planting of some additional trees will help to plug some of the gaps that will inevitably appear in the coming years as some older trees reach the end of their lives, thereby ensuring the continuity of the planting is maintained for future generations.</p> <p>In accordance with the above, we would advise that careful consideration be given to the historic planting aspirations and that any new trees are planted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. in established areas of the park already given over to 'woodland' b. with careful consideration of the potential impact of planting on important archaeological remains and c. with a focus on replacing trees within the existing (and where possible historic) design scheme, rather than adapting and changing the scheme by planting in areas originally left open. <p>Additionally, we would like to see evidence of consultation and feedback from the Friends of Ravenscourt Park whom we are copying into this response.</p> <p>Fulfilling the above would allow the Local Authority to pursue its commitment outlined in the draft Maintenance and Management Plan to 'maintain replacement planting and diversify the canopy portfolio' whilst respecting the historic significance and planting aspirations of the park as designed first by Humphry Repton and later by J.J. Sexby.</p> <p>As pointed out in previous correspondence relating to Victoria Park (ref. UTCF-657009-22-23) London Parks and Gardens suggests that the Urban</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Tree Challenge Fund would have far greater environmental and social impact by planting in urban areas such as street and public squares where there is much hard standing – turning ‘grey to green’. As such, we would advise limiting the acceptance of applications to plant in public parks and gardens, especially where this may have a detrimental effect on historic landscapes.</p> <p>We would be grateful to be advised of your decision, or if further information is submitted.</p> <p>Martha Bailey</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Greenwich Park	Greater London	E22/0880	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for minor material amendments under s73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) by varying Condition 31 (approved plans) of Planning Permission ref: PA/16/01612, dated 25/03/2019 (as amended by non-material amendments PA/20/00395, PA/21/01340, PA/21/02187, PA/22/00086/NC, PA/22/00517 and PA/22/01486). Amendments include: Overall increase of residential units from 643 to 710 units; Increase in affordable unit provision from 200 to 211 units; Change in tenure from private sale to Build to Rent (with the exception of Block A which will contain private sale and shared ownership units); Increase in height of Blocks J, K and L by one storey; Reconfiguration of commercial and retail provision; Amended energy strategy; Additional amenity and playspace and associated works. This</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.10.2022</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 above application, we note that the original planning permission was for buildings up to a maximum AOD height of 88m. Based upon the information provided by the applicants, an increase in height of some blocks by one storey is proposed. 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 well below those of existing structures at Canary Wharf.</p> <p>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.</p>

				<p>application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Chrisp Street Market, Chrisp Street, London</p>	<p>Based on the other information that you have provided, we neither support nor object to these proposals. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of these proposals 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>We consider that the views have already been disturbed by the large 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 in the wider Poplar & Canary Wharf area, and we would make firm representations if any such planning permissions, or variation of existing permissions, were sought in future.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mark Davies</p>
Carshalton House (St Philomena's School)	Greater London	E22/0932	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing refuse store, erection of a new modular temporary classroom building (for no less than 7 years) and erection of a fenced refuse store area</p> <p>St Philomenas School Pound Street Carshalton SM5 3PS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application and the potential impacts on the grade II listed historic landscape of Carshalton House (now St Philomena's School) which also lies in the Carshalton Conservation Area.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and Gardens LPG). LPG is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the Historic England (HE) Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. LPG is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). This site is included on our Inventory here:</p> <p>I have reviewed the documentation supplied on the planning portal associated with this application. I have also discussed the case and the issues it raises with the London Parks and Gardens Planning Conservation Working Group Committee.</p>

					<p>The gardens are Grade 2. Situated within the grounds are; the Grade 2 Water Tower, and the Grade 2 Chapel, as well as the Grade 2* Carshalton House. The gardens and landscape comprise the setting for these heritage assets (House, Chapel and Water Tower) and as such are protected within the NPPF guidance. They are a whole and should be considered together as a unique site.</p> <p>The application is a modified version of application DM2022/00729 which was refused. The Trust notes that the present application is for a temporary structure (unlike the previous one for a permanent structure) for at least seven years. No specific end date has been provided. Seven years is a substantial period of time, and with no end date it seems questionable whether this should be treated as a temporary structure. The new application includes a landscaping statement which proposes new planting “with a view to addressing visual impact of the bin store upon entry to the school grounds”. This fails to address the objections that the Trust made to the previous application namely that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modular classroom is out of character with the surrounding landscape. I note that impact section of the Heritage Statement submitted by the applicant does not say anything about the visual effect on the surrounding landscape or about the adjacent listed chapel. The same applies to the Design and Access Statement. • It is close to and intervisible with the grade II listed chapel a short distance to the south. • The proposed new bin store is in a very visible position on the edge of the open area which forms the northern part of the landscape and as such detracts from the public amenity value of passers-by. • The encroachment of the edge of the open area sets a precedent which may lead to creeping development. This issue ought to be addressed by the school developing a strategy as how any expansion can be appropriately fitted in to the listed landscape and conservation area. • There is an adjacent car park, less visible, where a classroom could be placed. <p>The Trust therefore objects to the present application which continues to ignore the landscape value of the site. The Trust recommends that the applicant seek a revisit of the whole application with a view to selecting a different location for a structure (temporary or otherwise).</p> <p>If the development does go ahead we strongly recommend that a special condition requires the bin store to be returned to its previous position</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>when the temporary classroom is removed. The Trusts thinks development encroaching into the open area be resisted without an overwhelming demonstration of public benefit.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, John Phillips</p>
Lambeth Palace	Greater London	E22/1049	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of the majority of existing buildings on Plots A, B, C & D including Canterbury House, Stangate House, 10 Royal Street and 20 Carlisle Lane; part retention of existing buildings on Plots E and conversion of the railway arches (Plot F); comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed use development of buildings 12-16 storeys in height containing commercial floorspace (including lab enabled floorspace), residential, retail and community floorspace; enhanced public realm and pedestrian routes; re-location of listed sculpture; servicing, ancillary plant and storage, cycle parking and other associated and ancillary works. REASON FOR RECONSULTATION: - Financial viability assessment submitted - Amendments made to Plot B dwelling layout, mix and lift cores</p> <p>This application is a DEPARTURE APPLICATION: The proposed development is a departure from Policy Q26 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021). The proposed development to which the</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022</p> <p>The above application affecting the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Lambeth Palace has come to our attention via a Petition. The application was validated on 1st April 2022 so it is most unfortunate that you omitted to consult us. The Gardens Trust (GT), as you are no doubt aware, is a Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We would therefore have expected to have been informed as a matter of course. Our colleagues in the London Parks & Gardens Trust who are familiar with the application site, will be dealing with this on our behalf.</p> <p>I am attaching a copy of our Planning Leaflet with guidance for Local Authorities. It has not been updated since the most recent NPPF but the main points are still entirely relevant. I would be very grateful if you could please make sure that in future all applications affecting any grade of registered park and garden are sent to the GT as a matter of course as per your statutory requirements.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

				<p>application relates is situated within 10 metres of relevant railway land.</p> <p>Royal Street Site, South Bank</p> <p>London SE1 7LW</p>	
<p>Leigh Park (Staunton Country Park)</p> <p>RECONSULTATION</p>	Hampshire	E20/1151	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Hybrid application seeking: 1) Full Planning permission for Development of a reservoir for raw water storage, A pumped storage reservoir, with the minimum required total storage capacity of 8,700 million litres (MI), to support the planned bulk supply transfer of at least 21MI/d in extreme (currently defined as 1:200 year) drought conditions; Construction of an earth embankment adjacent to Staunton Country Park ; Construction of an overflow discharge/spillway at the south-western side of the reservoir and associated works; Construction of a new junction on the B2149 Manor Lodge Road and a new junction on Swanmore Road. Provision of viewing areas on the southern embankment and western edge of the reservoir.</p> <p>2) Outline application for (matters to be considered outlined in Table 2.2 in the submitted Development Specification) control house partially incorporated within landscaped earth mounding adjacent to the south west</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint 2nd response. Further to our original response of 22nd December 2021, we note that in the planning conditions contained within the revised documentation there is no mention we could see of either the historic landscape or our suggestions of discreet interpretation. We would like to reiterate our earlier request that the damage to ancient woodland is minimized as far as possible, and that discreet signage is erected to enable visitors to appreciate what remains.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

				<p>embankment; together with provision of other earth embankments. Construction of a visitor centre / cafe, with storage areas and welfare facilities to the northwest of the reservoir to be used for recreational and education purposes; Provision of picnic area(s) and children's play area(s). Access routes from both junctions to the visitor car park; visitor car park comprising 193 car parking spaces and between 70 and 75 overflow spaces plus spaces for staff, coach/minibus and disabled drivers sited to the north west of the reservoir. Creation of a permanent wetland on the northern side of the reservoir and construction of bird watching hide/screen(s); recreational facilities for public amenity. Provision of perimeter tracks and a network of bridleways, cycle paths and footpaths; Construction of a slipway on the western bank of the reservoir for operational use only and a small section of the proposed pipeline (210m). Havant Thicket, adjacent to Sir George Staunton Country Park, Middle Park Way, Havant.</p>	
Hertfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan	Hertfords hire	E22/0602	N/A	<p>LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/mwlp</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens, of which Hertfordshire Gardens Trust is a member and authorised by them to respond of their behalf on planning issue in Hertfordshire.</p>

					<p>We have the following comments on the draft which concern Policy 18 Historic Environment and site MAS01 The Briggens estate.</p> <p>Policy 18 rightly considers the effect of any development on the setting of heritage assets. However, this does not appear to have been applied to consideration of MAS01 as a suitable site. Setting includes visual intrusion, such as light pollution, traffic and inappropriate buildings/excavation. It also includes noise and air pollution.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to two Registered Parks which contain listed buildings. Briggens Park, Registered at Grade II, contains six listed buildings and the site is on the Heritage at Risk Register. Stanstead Bury, where the parkland is also Registered at Grade II, contains eleven listed buildings. These sites are already threatened with harm to their setting from Village 7 of the Gilston development and the excavation of this site would considerably contribute to that harm. This is contrary to the NPPF section16 which encourages conservation and enhancement appropriate to their significance, which is in part formed by the setting. It is also contrary to Policy 18 in this document. The NPPF stresses that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and if excavated the many heritage assets would either be lost or suffered irreversible harm</p> <p>In addition to the harm to the setting, and therefore significance of these two sites, there are a number of other nationally listed sites, including Grade II* listed Olives Farm and three other listed buildings immediately adjacent to the site. Included in the Olives Farm complex is a moat fed by springs on the area to be excavated, which feeds Hunsdon Brook which contains the Listed SM of the Hunsdon Ponds and the early 18th century canal at Briggens of considerable national historic importance, as designed by Charles Bridgeman. The possible effects of the disturbance of the water table and supply to these important heritage assets should be assessed before the site can be allocated.</p> <p>The MAS 01 site also has considerable archaeological deposits as evidenced in the Historic Environment Record, including Roman artefacts and buildings.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust considers that this site is wholly unsuitable for gravel extraction given the heritage value of the site itself and its important contribution to the significance of Briggens and Stanstead Bury parklands. We have grave concerns over the plans and raised our concerns over the allocation of this site in January 2019.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

The Hoo, Kimpton	Hertfords hire	E22/0886	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Insertion of dormer window and enlarged dormer to rear. Insertion of rooflight to existing rear roofslope. Alterations to fenestration.</p> <p>Latimer House, The Hoo, Codicote Road, Whitwell, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG4 8HN</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2022</p> <p>OBJECT</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member, and which is a statutory consultee for HE Listed historic landscapes. The Hoo is Registered at grade II in recognition of its design in the 1760s by 'Capability' Brown and Sir William Chambers. Much of the design still exists, and although the broadwater formed from the Mimram river has shrunk, Chambers' bridge over it remains. The extensive parkland views are focussed on the old house site, mainly to the front of the property, The houses erected after the main house was demolished form a coherent group taking the focal place in the landscape. To maintain this coherence, any additions should be in keeping stylistically and aesthetically. We consider that the proposed additions are out of scale and not sympathetic to the existing architecture. We also consider that black window frames and excessive glazing would harm this coherence and the significance of the housing complex within this historic landscape, and thus harm the Registered landscape.</p>
Kingsmead Neighbourhood Plan	Hertfords hire	E22/0919	N/A	<p>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</p> <p>Submission consultation http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/kingsmeadnp</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2022</p> <p>Policies HKBE1 and HKBE2</p> <p>We support these policies but note that Historic England now refers to 'Scheduled' Monuments, not 'Ancient' Monuments as included in policy HEBK1</p> <p>The list of local undesignated heritage assets does not include the landscapes of the New River and the canal, merely a few buildings and structures. We suggest that the landscapes themselves are of historic interest which could be harmed by inappropriate development which may not affect the individual assets mentioned.</p>
Hatfield House	Hertfords hire	E22/1004	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Outline application (access sought) - Demolition of existing house and stables and the construction of up to 150 dwellings including affordable and custom-build dwellings together with all ancillary works</p> <p>Land To The Rear Of 42-100 Tollgate Road & 42 Tollgate Road</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.10.2022</p> <p>OBJECT</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member on this site affecting the important landscape of North Mymms and its listed mansion.</p> <p>The park is the only one by the great garden writer, William Robinson and contains long designed views across the site and up to Tollgate Road. This design was added to a deer park and the associated formal garden, by Robinson and George, had views across this parkland. Housing on the crest of the hill behind Tollgate Rd would seriously harm the views and therefore the significance of the park and garden. The Elizabethan mansion of the</p>

				Colney Heath St Albans Hertfordshire	first importance (Grade 1) modernised by Ernest George also has views across the parkland to the northern boundary which would be harmed by the proposed development. No adequate justification for the harm to these heritage assets has been included and no justification for building on Green Belt land contrary to the NPPF (Section 13), especially 134 (c).
Markyatecell Park	Hertfords hire	E22/1005	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demollition of former residential care home (C2) and 2 detached dwelling houses (C3) and construction of 4 x 2 storey buildings forming 34 flats (12 affordable dwellings) with associated hard and soft landscaping, parking, bin store and main entrance gateway. Caddington Hall Luton Road Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8QB	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.10.2022 Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Gardens Trust, a member of the Gardens Trust, on this application within the Locally Listed Caddington Hall and within the setting of The Registered parkland of Markyate Cell. We are concerned that the recent plans do not show updated landscaping including augmented screening on the southern side, to protect the setting of Markyate Cell park from harm to the setting by the visual intrusion of this development, as proposed in our previous comment. This intrusion would not only be the buildings themselves but also the light pollution from the large number of dwellings proposed. The NPPF requires enhancement of heritage assets and there is no proposal put forward in this application for enhancing the heritage value of the Caddington Hall trees, many with TPOs or the setting of Markyate Cell parkland.
Hatfield House	Hertfords hire	E22/1043	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Outline planning application with all Matters reserved except Access (apart from internal circulation) for the Proposed Development as shown on the Parameter Plan, Land Use Budget, Access Arrangements Plans and Mineral Extraction Plans, comprising: 2,650 new homes; sites for two primary schools and one secondary school, including associated sports facilities; two mixed use local centres, which could include land uses within the following Use Classes: C1 (hotels); C2 (residential institutions); C3 (dwellinghouses); E (commercial,	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2022 The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for planning applications affecting Registered historic parks and gardens. This application affects Grade I Hatfield House landscape and the GT should thus have been consulted. The WHBC Local Plan has not yet been adopted and this area not allocated for housing. We consider this application premature and object on the following grounds. The Inspector at the Examination in Public had many reservations about development on this site. There are many constraints which cannot be mitigated until the extent of the issue is known, including the proximity of the old contaminated Cole Green Tip which still leaches pollutants into the stream and emits methane (What Lies Beneath 2016). Heritage Perspective Historic Registered and Locally Listed Parks The landscape on which this development is proposed is an important part of the history of the county and the region, helping to define the County of Small Towns (Slater & Goose, 2008) which has made Hertfordshire so unusual. The importance of the surrounding landscape (including the

				<p>business and service); F1 (learning and non-residential institutions); and F2 (local community); a gypsy/traveller site, accommodating 15 pitches; a network of green infrastructure complementing that in the site's environs and including extensive informal open space, as well as allotments / community orchards and play areas; vehicular access via the A414, B195 and Cole Green Lane, including the re-alignment of the B195; internal roads, footpaths, cycleways and bridleways; sustainable drainage and utilities infrastructure, including drainage basins, foul water pumping stations and electricity sub-stations; prior extraction of circa 162,000 tonnes of sands and gravels from that part of the site to the north of public footpath Hertingfordbury 023 and to the west of Birchall Wood; and management and control of the historic landfill in the central part of the site, including measures to ensure the safety of site users. Land southeast of Welwyn Garden City to the north of the A414 and straddling Birchall/Cole Green Lane</p>	<p>interfluvium between the rivers Mimram and Lea) as a setting for the designed parks which were the work of 'improvers' of the calibre of Capability Brown, Humphry Repton, and others is considerable and the significance of the parks, especially those at Hatfield Park and Cole Green/Panshanger would be severely harmed by developments within this setting.</p> <p>The intrinsic importance of certain sites has been recognised at a national level by Registration by Historic England, but many more are of great local importance and arguably be on the National Register. (HE Register of Parks & Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, and Hertfordshire Gardens Trusts Local lists and reports)</p> <p>HERTFORDSHIRE GARDENS TRUST</p> <p>Researching and preserving historic gardens. Working with schools to improve and sustain their environment.</p> <p>The inclusion on the HE Register of Parks and Gardens is awarded to very few parks and gardens and the award of Grade I (Hatfield Park) signifies a landscape of the highest value and of international importance and that of Grade II* (Panshanger) of exceptional national historic interest. A key component these gradings is the setting of the parks. The NPPF makes it clear that the setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced, which includes noise, light pollution and traffic as well as visual intrusion.,</p> <p>Views which contribute to the understanding the significance of a heritage asset include those deliberate links to other designed landscapes, and remote 'eye-catching' features or 'borrowed' landmarks beyond the park boundary, such as the views between Panshanger and Hatfield and Brookmans Park, and between Hatfield Park, Essendon and Strattons Tower at Little Berkhamsted</p> <p>The interfluvium between Panshanger Park and Welwyn Garden City/Hatfield is the setting for a wide range of both registered and Locally Important designed landscapes and other heritage assets and the importance and interconnectivity of the designed landscapes set around the area is recognised with policies in both the WHBC Local Plan and the EHDC Local Plan.</p> <p>Earlier Historic Landscape</p> <p>The landscape is a palimpsest of previous use and occupation. The green corridor from Stanborough in the west through to Panshanger Park in the east and the surrounding environs has a history of occupation from the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Palaeolithic period to the present day. Evidence of prehistoric settlement by Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age people can be seen in the landscape by the wealth of finds and earthworks that have been recorded. Extensive Roman, Saxon and medieval settlement is also recorded that has led to the cluster of elite parks in the centre of Hertfordshire.</p> <p>Welwyn Garden City</p> <p>This was designed according to Garden City principles and is the best example in the UK, the precursor to many examples abroad and the post-war New Towns. As such, the key ideas of ease of communication; close proximity of work, housing and amenities: low density; plenty of green space within the housing developments; and high quality housing should all be present in any new developments within the WGC area</p> <p>These proposals do not adhere to these.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>The development is contrary to at least 3 principles of the Green Belt as defined in the NPPF (para 134): it would increase the sprawl of WGC; assist, together with developments in EHDC with the merging of WGC and Hertford; and encroaches on the countryside.</p> <p>As the Local Plan is not yet agreed with the Planning Inspectorate, there can be no assumption that this site is suitable for exemption from Green Belt policies and no exceptional circumstances have been agreed to alter the Green Belt boundaries in this area.</p> <p>We have grave concerns on heritage grounds over the harmful effect this development would have on the setting, and therefore the significance of Grade I Hatfield Park and other heritage assets with designed views across and along the Lea valley.</p> <p>Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust The Gardens Trust</p>
Youngsbury	Hertfords hire	E22/1058	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of single and two-storey side extensions, canopied entrance, alterations to fenestration, rooflights, internal alterations. Erection of two storey garage with loft, car parking area, sewage treatment</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust is statutory consultee for Registered Parks and Gardens and should have been consulted on this application concerning the Youngsbury Grade II* landscape and the Grade II listed Garden Cottage and garden walls.</p> <p>This application would cause harm to the listed cottage and walls, walled garden including the setting of the listed glasshouse by reason of overlarge extensions and excessive glazing. No heritage statement has been attached</p>

				plant, oil storage tank, new pedestrian gateway and associated landscaping works. Youngsbury Wadesmill Hertfordshire SG12 0TZ	as required by the NPPF and no justification given for the considerable harm which would be done to the significance of all these heritage assets by the proposals, contrary to the NPPF which encourages conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Further the setting of the listed stable block and the mansion itself would be harmed by loss of context and inappropriate development in their settings. We therefore object to this proposal
104 Parkway Welwyn Garden City	Hertfords hire	E22/1060	N	PLANNING APPLICATION 1 x Holly to reduce by 2m in height, cut back overhanging branches by 1m 104 Parkway Welwyn Garden City AL8 6HL TREES	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.10.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, or which HGT is a member. On the basis of the information in this application we have no objections to the proposed tree works.
Thwaite Hall	Humberside	E22/0945	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of 2 pairs of entrance gates (retrospective application) Thwaite Hall Thwaite Street Cottingham East Riding Of Yorkshire HU16 4RE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Thwaite Hall, 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. John William Hentig, a Hull merchant, built Thwaite Hall in 1803-7 and by 1839 had created a garden. The ship owners David and Charles Wilson (later Lord Nunholburne), whose wealth came from the expanding port of Hull, subsequently bought the estate and during 1870-80s developed the garden, pleasure grounds and small parkland. Cottingham was a favoured rural retreat, located away from the city of Hull, where the wealthy had space to build villas and lay out gardens. Albert Rollitt, a solicitor and Mayor of Hull, bought the estate and during his ownership, as President of the Hull Botanic Garden, the gardens were well maintained. He sold it on to Colonel Goddard, who by 1928 sold it to University College, now the University of Hull. They extended the house renaming it Thwaite Hall and established a botanic and experimental garden. This almost certainly resulted in its survival as many contemporary villas and gardens at Cottingham were built over in the 20th century. While most of these villas had relatively small gardens (1 to 2 acres), Thwaite House was considerably larger (31 acres), which gave more scope for the initial layout of a formal

					<p>garden, with parkland containing a spring fed stream, surrounded by shelterbelt plantations. The design was meant to be a miniaturised view of the larger landscape gardens associated with more substantial properties that designers such as Humphry Repton was working on at the time. The second phase of landscaping during the 1870-80s, particularly the sinuous lake, shows influences from the more informal style as advocated by William Robinson later in the century. Thwaite Hall is important as a rare survival of an impressive 19th century villa garden in an urban setting at Cottingham and is recognised as such by its inclusion on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (NHLE: 1000137). It is also significant as an important part of the Cottingham Conservation Area. The boundaries to Thwaite Hall are formed by mature hedges and trees and this retrospective planning application is for two metal gates with gate posts that are galvanised steel with galvanised steel hinges. Gate 1 is painted black, and Gate 2 is proposed to also be painted in black gloss paint. The entrance at Gate 1 is between a pair of ornamental pillars. Gate 2 is within an opening with the hedge. Both gates and gate posts are modern and pedestrian in appearance completely at odds with the architectural style of the Hall and the historic significance of the registered park and garden. We understand the need to protect Thwaite Hall and its occupants however the gates as installed do not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the significance of the registered park and garden. In their present form they are failing the site. We note the statutory duty of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas and the requirements of NPPF (July 2021) Section 16, particularly paragraphs 189, 199. In conclusion the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust object to this retrospective planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Waldershare Park RECONSULTATION	Kent	E21/0976	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use to Gypsy/Traveller Site for 8no. pitches with 1no. static, 1no. tourer, 2no. parking spaces and dayroom per pitch (part retrospective)	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.10.2022</p> <p>Despite having objected to the above application on 6th September 2021 and corresponding with you on several occasions about Waldershare, we were surprised that Dover failed to consult the Gardens Trust about important relevant recent amendments. We would be grateful if you could please look into how this can have happened to ensure that we are always</p>

				Land North Of Eastling Down Farm Cottages And East Of Sandwich Road Waldershare CT15	<p>consulted in future. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Subsequent to our original objection to this application, the applicant has made various changes to the layout in order to mitigate the concerns raised by ourselves and the Woodland Trust. Having considered these amendments, should your officers decide to approve the application, we will withdraw our objection provided the following conditions are applied: All new tree planting, native hedge screening and the 15m wide fenced buffer zone, shown on drawing 71300-1001RevE, are installed PRIOR to any of the 8 pitches being occupied, to minimise the effect on the setting of the former entrance to Waldershare Park. We would also like to see a condition imposed as to future management of the planned planting, to ensure that the plants establish and any losses are replaced, as well as monitoring the impact of possible trespass on the ancient woodland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Port Lympne	Kent	E21/1147	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of a pergola and the temporary siting of a glass marquee to facilitate weddings/functions</p> <p>Howletts & Port Lympne Wild Animal Parks Port Lympne, Aldington Road, Lympne, Hythe, Kent, CT21 4PD</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) and Kent Gardens Trust with regard to amendments for proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>There appear to be no heritage changes to this application since we last wrote on 26 November 2021 and therefore our previous comments still stand. In our opinion the proposed conservation works are insufficient to balance the medium adverse impact of the glass marquee upon the RPG and Claire-voyee and therefore we cannot support this part of the planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.02.2022</p> <p>We very much appreciate you taking the time to meet our colleague Mike O'Brien from the Kent Gardens Trust on Thursday last week, and please accept my apologies for not getting a response back to you on Friday. I was working in London that day and due to the storms was unable to get back home to Gloucestershire until Saturday.</p>

					<p>The site meeting was extremely helpful and has given us a much better understanding of the complexities of the site and the future vision for Port Lympne. Should your officers be minded to grant approval for the glass marquee, then the effect of the conservatory should be mitigated by requesting approval of the colours of the major elements of the structure, limiting the permission to three years (not temporary). Our previous comment would still remain.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens	Lincolnshire	E22/1010	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a six storey Travelodge hotel, Starbucks drive-through cafe and a sub station, provision of car parking and construction of a vehicular access with reuse of listed railings.</p> <p>FORMER CRAZY GOLF SITE, SOUTH PARADE, SKEGNESS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have consulted the online documentation relating to this application and although the application site lies outside the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Skegness Esplanade and Tower Gardens, it is surrounded to the north, east and south by the RPG. The application site is slightly sunken from South Parade to the west by the original sea wall and opposite by a bund to the east, possibly from soil taken during the excavation of the lake to the east. Currently the area is given over to a run-down Crazy Golf course.</p> <p>The site is clearly visible from South Parade, and whilst currently hidden from the RPG to the east, this is due to the bund hiding the Crazy Golf Course. The imposition of a six-storey hotel will entirely change this dynamic, amply demonstrated by the wire frame renditions within the Heritage Statement (6.3.3) from both viewpoints 1 and 2 taken from inside the RPG. The Heritage Statement (HS) (5.3.9) makes the point that the 'setting of the Boating Lake is restricted to the original layout, designed as a landscape entity to be experienced from within.... There were no views that were meant to be enjoyed beyond the boundary of the gardens.'</p> <p>Should this application be permitted, that experience would be altered substantially, with the eye being drawn to the large, overpowering new hotel, towering over the previously undisturbed boating lake. Whist we concur with the HS's comments that at present the application site is 'visually and physically separate from The Tower and Esplanade Gardens' ...and 'does not contribute towards the setting', once a substantial building</p>

					<p>is in situ, that will also change and the separation will be negated by its presence.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with HE's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). Page 2 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.' In our opinion, the proposed new hotel would change the way in which the tranquillity and separateness of the boating lake was experienced, especially as the new building would have windows overlooking the RPG. Pertinent too is the following (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.... 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.' The section dealing with the Experience of the Heritage Asset (p11) draws attention to impacts from : 'Surrounding landscape or townscape character; Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset ,Visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point' ... and 'Sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy'. All these are relevant in this application.</p> <p>We also believe that other proposals may be submitted for the seafront area, and the SHA also states on page2 '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.'</p> <p>The height of the new Travelodge is our primary concern and we are unable to support this application due to the adverse impact the proposals will have upon the setting and significance of the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Holkham Hall	Norfolk	E22/1075	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion, part demolition and extension of Building H to provide 625sqm office space (Eg(i)), with	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and the Norfolk Gardens Trust support these proposals and make the following comments .</p> <p>The site is right at the southern end of the estate, well separated from the</p>

				<p>associated facilities and ancillary meeting space and facilities; Conversion of Building K to provide two ancillary storage units (70 sqm); Repairs and conversion of Building L to provide 386sqm office space with associated facilities (Eg(i)); landscaping and the provision of a total of 42 additional car parking spaces at Longlands Buildings At, Longlands, Holkham Estate, Wells-next-the-sea, Norfolk</p>	<p>hall and it's surroundings and from the walled gardens. This is nevertheless an important group of buildings in the estate and its history, originally a farmstead.</p> <p>This is Phase 3 of proposals for this group of buildings, which are now in commercial use. The proposed changes affect 3 existing building within the group. There would be extensive alterations to the buildings, including repairs to historic fabric and an extension to one of them. Nevertheless the changes to buildings would be contained within the existing group and would not affect the wider historical interest of the estate.</p> <p>3. The existing car park is on the west side of the group. While the car park would be extended, the extension is described as being within an existing framework of a hedged enclosure, with no impact on wider views.</p> <p>4. Careful attention will be required to the detailing of materials and to appropriate landscaping to avoid any adverse effects.</p>
Aynho Park RECONSULTATION	Northamptonshire	E22/0420	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Physical works to site layout including reconfiguration and extension of car park and alterations to hard and soft landscaping. Aynhoe Park House Aynho Park, Aynho, Northamptonshire, OX17 3BQ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) on amendments to the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this second joint response.</p> <p>We would like to restate our original concerns about the Southern terrace as outlined in our first response dated 14th July 2022. Whilst accepting that a largely uninterrupted view can still be had from the central and main focal point of the house, we still have concerns about the impact the proposed new clipped hedges will have on this. We think it desirable to maintain the simplicity of the garden to the south front over the curvaceous ha ha which frames this area, in line with Capability Brown's concept of the view southwards from the house (and also back to the house), providing uninterrupted views.</p> <p>We also concur with Erika Diaz-Peterson's of Historic England's comments relating to the lack of information regarding the contribution of the existing layout of the forecourt to the significance of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) and the impact that the removal of the layout could have on significance.</p> <p>We accept the need to bring the existing parking spaces up to current size requirements.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Castle Ashby	Northamptonshire	E22/1009	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration of the balustrades on the north and east garden terraces.</p> <p>Castle Ashby House Castle Ashby NN7 1LQ</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation relating to the restoration of the terracotta balustrades which makes the scale of the work required all too apparent. We support the wish to replace the lost fabric and return the balustrading to something near its original form, and can only sympathise with the enormity of the task and the loss of archive material in a fire. We consider that this will ultimately be beneficial to the Grade I registered park and garden at Castle Ashby.</p> <p>As we do not have the technical expertise to comment on the use of Jesmonite for the proposed repairs, we have consulted our colleagues at Historic England. We understand that their Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas for Northamptonshire will be leading on this and we would refer your officers to their specialist advice.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Belford Hall	Northumberland	E22/0954	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>RESUBMISSION - Outline Application with all matters reserved for construction of new extension to golf clubhouse, children play park, crazy golf course, two tennis courts, farm shop/hardware with offices above, golf driving range, microbrewery, and 21 dwellings (12 detached bungalows and 9 two-storey houses)</p> <p>Belford Golf Club And Driving Range South Road Belford Northumberland NE70 7DP</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Belford 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 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 note that the current application replaces 21/01414/OUT and draw your attention to our comments contained in our letter of 24 May 2021, many of which remain relevant to this application and are attached below for your information.</p> <p>In general, whilst we welcome the removal of the more intrusive elements to the north of the burn in the current application and the reduction of the impact on Belford Hall RPG, we still consider the proposals to be over</p>

					<p>development and urbanization of this semi-rural location. On the basis that the Heritage Statement concludes that there will be less than substantial harm caused to the Belford Hall RPG we do not wish to object to the application but unfortunately neither is it one which we welcome or can support. We therefore adopt a neutral stance and confirm that the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust have no further comments to add at this stage.</p> <p>“Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Belford 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 Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The GT and NGT are concerned that the proposed development will have both a direct and an indirect adverse impact on the registered park and garden [RPG] at Belford. The designation of the RPG was presumably intended to acknowledge and defend the parkland setting of Belford Hall (LB, Grade One) and building a housing development and a supermarket within the designated area cannot surely be regarded as appropriate development within the RPG. Beyond the direct impact we are also concerned that the proposed development would affect views from the parkland (beyond the obvious sight line south from the hall). It seems entirely inappropriate to consider a development of this scale and nature, partly within the RPG and entirely within the Belford Conservation Area, and we therefore object to the proposed development.</p> <p>While we acknowledge that the principal view south from the hall towards the development site is filtered to an extent by the existing parkland plantings [Fig 5 in the HIA], we would be concerned that the long view to the south [Fig 6 in the HIA] would be considerably altered by the “walled garden” housing development within the boundary of the RPG and the proposed housing estate to the south of the Belford Burn. The argument given in the HIA that building more appropriate buildings to take the eye away from the distant industrial buildings seems hardly defensible and it seems more likely that the overall effect would be to replace a semi-rural outlook now with a fully urban one.</p> <p>The curious proposal to create a new “walled garden” to partially hide the new housing proposed to be built within the RPG to the north of the Belford Burn, is unlikely to soften the appearance of the new houses</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>greatly, unless the new walls are so high that the residents will have no outlook (presumably the view towards the hall and the parkland would be a major selling point for these houses) and feel imprisoned in their crowded enclave.</p> <p>The proposed developments to the North of the Belford Burn, within the RPG, will presumably require the loss of most, if not all, of the present tree cover to accommodate the new “walled garden” housing, supermarket, farm shop, extended clubhouse and new access roads and parking areas to serve the various new buildings. Available satellite imagery shows that these plantings are significant in screening the present golf club building (and the more distant industrial buildings) from the parkland and Belford Hall and any loss of the existing tree cover here would open up the development site further in views from Hall and parkland.</p> <p>In addition to enhancing the principal view to the south from the Hall it should be remembered that the parkland also provided an approach created to provide a sense of anticipation for the approaching visitor to the hall from the Great North Road. On passing the South Lodge and entering the parkland an immediate change of pace and contrast was intended. This approach is an early C19 alteration from the original more direct approach and was part of Dobson’s alterations to both house and landscape. The impact of the proposed development from the south drive seems to have been little considered in the HIA and a better appreciation of how the parkland was used for quiet enjoyment historically (as it no doubt still is by the residents of Belford Hall) would make it easier to appreciate what the proposed development would be eroding. Were there circuit walks or carriage drives (perhaps by reference to the estate plans of 1754 and c.1818) and did these include features of interest (such as the fish pond shown to the N. of the development?) and designed views to the wider landscape beyond the parkland? Were the parkland plantings intended to enhance walks and drives within the parkland or just to be seen from the south front of the hall and the entrance drive? Did the boundary plantings serve to screen the public road and the edge of Belford?</p> <p>It seems that an improved understanding of the historic development of the parkland and its evolution would enable a better evaluation of the impact of the proposed development and appropriate mitigation measures such as new planting.</p> <p>To summarise: the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust object to this application.”</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
St Mary's Hospital, Stannington	Northumb erland	E22/0984	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Provision of playing field, including pitch drainage, and landscaping of viewing mounds. St Marys Hospital Development Site St Marys Hospital Drive Stannington Northumberland NE61 6BL	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects St Mary's Hospital Stannington, 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>Having studied the documents submitted in support of the application we understand that the earthworks to create the viewing mounds have already been undertaken and assume these were approved under a previous planning application. We have no record of having been consulted about the construction of these features which are our greatest concern in this area of the RPG. We understand that the predicted use of the playing pitch is unlikely to generate the need for the replacement pavilion and are slightly mystified that viewing mounds are considered necessary to allow the anticipated crowds to view activity on the pitch satisfactorily. As the Planning Statement (6.15) notes, the Conservation Plan (2003) identifies that The open aspect was an important view from the airing courts and south facing hospital wings and clearly this view will have been altered by the construction of the mounds.</p> <p>In general, we have no concerns with the provision of the playing field itself, of which there is a precedent in the southern parkland of St Mary's Hospital. However, details of the proposed soft landscaping are vague and a clearer key to the proposed specimen tree planting would be helpful, together with details of the composition of the Proposed Scrub Mix, e.g. the inclusion of one single QR specimen tree, which we would assume is Quercus robur would appear to be an odd choice in terms of numbers and species. Overall, we would advise that the species chosen should be a continuation of the species historically planted in this area by the former patients.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust cannot support this application in its current form and wish to lodge a Holding Objection until further information has been sought from the applicant</p>

					<p>including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Visual analysis of the impact on the southward views from the airing courts and south facing wings of the hospital · Further details of the proposed tree planting <p>We look forward to receiving this information in due course</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
<p>Temple Grounds RECONSULTATION</p>	<p>North Yorkshire</p>	<p>E21/0333</p>	<p>II</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Planning Permission for an Agricultural Barn for the Storage of Hay and Firewood for Applicants Own Use at Temple Lodge , 3 Cravengate, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 4ED</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 6th October 2022, consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the amended proposal for development affecting Temple Grounds, a designated heritage asset 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>We note that four siting options have been explored for the agricultural barn, and that Option 4 (the originally proposed site) appears to be the preferred choice of the applicant. We further note that modifications have been made to the front elevation of the proposed structure to give more of an appearance of a traditionally built barn, as stated in the Heritage Impact Assessment, and that the area between the building and the tarmac access road to the Culloden Tower will be covered with coarse hardcore and soil and re-seeded, which is welcomed.</p> <p>Nevertheless, this planning application for an agricultural barn adjacent to Mews Court is sited on land within the south-eastern corner of Temple Grounds. This is an historic designed landscape registered under the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 for its special historic interest warranting every effort to preserve it. The parkland and pleasure grounds here were developed through the 18th and early 19th century, including the earthwork remains of formal late 17th-century gardens associated with the 17th-century mansion known as Yorke House which once stood on the north bank of the River Swale to the south-east of the parkland. The 'Temple' of Temple Grounds is the mid-18th-century Culloden Tower built in the central-southern part of the park c. 1746 to commemorate the victory of the Duke of Cumberland's army at the Battle</p>

					<p>of Culloden and is listed Grade II*. The former menagerie associated with the pleasure grounds, built c. 1769 in the north-eastern corner of the park is now known as Temple Lodge and is listed Grade II.</p> <p>The application site is currently waste ground, situated within an area of what was once formal 17th-century gardens lying to the north west of the former mansion of Yorke House, which are shown on Harman's plan of Richmond of 1724. Two mature yew trees adjacent to Mews Court appear to date to at least the 19th century (trees are shown in this location on the first edition six-inch Ordnance Survey map of 1856), and may possibly be earlier, from the period when Yorke House was still standing in the 18th century.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.12.16 of the Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028: Core Strategy specifically mentions that particular regard will be given to Temple Lodge Grounds when considering matters affecting historic assets.</p> <p>Core Policy CP12: 'Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets' states that "Development or other initiatives will be supported where they conserve and enhance the significance of the plan area's natural and man-made, designated or undesignated assets. Development will not be supported which: a. has a detrimental impact upon the significance of a natural or man-made asset", and also that "the landscape character of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to ensure a sustainable future for the natural and historic environment".</p> <p>Whilst we have no objection in principle to a barn for the storage of hay, wood and implements, and welcome the modifications to the original plans, further to our previous letter dated 11th June 2021, we still have some concerns about the visual impact of the proposal on the surrounding parkland and do not feel that the proposal will conserve and enhance the significance of the designated heritage assets of Temple Grounds.</p> <p>We hope these comments are helpful to you.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Gail Falkingham YGT Trustee and member of Conservation and Planning Sub-Committee</p>
Tudor Croft, Guisborough RECONSULTATION	North Yorkshire	E21/1633	N	PLANNING APPLICATION RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 65 HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING, PARKING AND	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Yorkshire Gardens Trust re the Biodiversity Net Gain Report and a Protected Species Report in respect of the above proposal.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) is the Statutory Consultee with regard to any</p>

				<p>DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE. LAND OFF TREFOIL CLOSE AND MEYNELL AVENUE, GUISBOROUGH. RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We also on occasion respond to planning applications affecting non-registered sites that are locally or regionally important as in this case with the gardens at Tudor Croft, Guisborough.</p> <p>We refer you to our letter dated 10th December 2021 explaining that the Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly objects to this planning application which will permanently damage the setting of Tudor Croft, Stokesley Road, Guisborough; a significant Arts and Crafts designed house with associated gardens of the period.</p> <p>The application site comprises a series of small fields, woodland, hedgerows and stream (Hutton Beck) and is located within an existing residential area on the western side of Guisborough close to the main A171 road. The boundaries of the site are generally formed by hedgerows and/or trees and the north- eastern boundary marked by a tall, thick hedge beyond which lies a horse paddock. The small stream, Hutton Beck, flows broadly south-west to north through an area of deciduous woodland on the site. Tudor Croft with its 5 acres of gardens, woodland and stream lies along the north-west boundary of the area that is proposed to be filled with built development.</p> <p>We note that the Protected Species Report indicates the following species have been recorded on the land subject to this application: European Otters (spraint and otter travelling upstream), bats (mainly Common Pipistrelle but also, Soprano Pipistrelle, Noctule), barn owl, hedgehogs (A Species of Principal Importance defined in the NERC Act 2006 and recorded within the development footprint and in the Zone of Influence). Although the site includes some very wet areas the reports do not indicate amphibians however, we understand that Great Crested Newts have been seen near the site.</p> <p>We have noted that the area proposed to be filled with built development will potentially act as a barrier to wildlife, seemingly at odds with the Biodiversity Net Gain Report p7 which writes: 'The Hutton Beck water course flowed through the site from south- west to north and provided a corridor of a native and semi-natural woodland which connected with an area of deciduous woodland priority habitat to the immediate south -west</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>and with another area about 275m downstream.'</p> <p>We also note the Biodiversity Net Gain Report Report, p7:</p> <p>'The course of Hutton Beck through the Application Site is considered to form a corridor of natural aquatic, riparian and terrestrial habitats favourable to a number of species, linking the offsite High Bousdale Beck to the southwest of Guisborough with Chapel Beck to the north and thus facilitates the movement of aquatic, terrestrial and riparian wildlife through the western part of the town of Guisborough and the site itself. This corridor provides ecological permeability within this urban area and ecological connectivity between the Application Site and the offsite habitats.'</p> <p>Turning from the impact of the proposed development on this last large area of green open space left in Guisborough with its associated wildlife and its medieval ridge and furrow (what would have been part of the settlement's open field system), to the impact on Tudor Croft.</p> <p>There is no doubt that Tudor Croft Gardens are the best known and probably the most beautiful, unique private gardens on Teesside. The media often refer to them as Botanic Gardens since every plant, shrub and tree planted since 1995 has been labelled and catalogued. They are a significant heritage and horticultural asset to the area, much appreciated by locals and visitors alike who have visited since 1954 raising huge sums for charity. (This year they opened on eight days and raised over £10,000 for local charities.)</p> <p>The 2 ha of gardens at Tudor Croft were created over some ten years in the 1930's by a brick manufacturer and have been diligently cared for and improved by the Heagney family since 1952. The gardens provide employment for several skilled gardeners and some fifteen people work as regular volunteers. The gardens are an important part of Guisborough.</p> <p>The damage that a development such as that proposed will be permanent. Part of the 'borrowed landscape' of Tudor Croft gardens, is Highcliff, which dominates the views from the garden to the south and towards the moors. By building houses on raised ground between the gardens and Highcliff, the unique setting and beauty of this special garden would be lost for ever. The effect of the increased human activity, hard landscaping, the noise and light pollution and especially even greater sewage pollution will adversely affect the wildlife and the natural balance of the garden would be lost; it is unlikely to survive. This would be a huge loss to us all, and to Redcar and Cleveland in particular.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>We understand that the Heagneys' offer to allow the regulatory committee to visit Tudor Croft has not yet been taken up and in our view your committee cannot reach a balanced understanding of the proposals and their impact without spending time at Tudor Croft as part of their site visit. We also understand that many years ago when a previous application was refused there was a pledge from your council to keep the land in question as green open space.</p> <p>In conclusion the Yorkshire Gardens trust wishes to continue to register its strong objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Mrs Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Sutton Park RECONSULTATION	North Yorkshire	E22/0211	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Planning application for the siting of a marquee.</p> <p>Sutton Park Main Street Sutton On The Forest York MARQUEE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We refer you to our previous letters dated 6th June and 15th July.</p> <p>We understand that this application is to be determined on the basis of providing temporary permission for a two- year extension to allow the applicant to consider further a permanent site for a marquee. We have no objection to this principle of temporary permission provided it does not create a deemed consent for this development and after any consented period, the site is returned to its previous condition. This re-consultation also relates to the time limits to be applied to the twelve licensed events and we refer you to the advice of your Authority's Environmental Health Officer.</p> <p>As we wrote in our previous letters a 27mx9m white marquee in this location will have some impact on the historic park and garden and its setting and the setting of the Hall even though screened by existing planting, and the existing concrete base in conservation terms is not so easily reversible. It is unfortunate that the marquee in such a historic setting is proposed to be a bright white and query whether it could be a more subdued colour.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0859	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing orangery and day room. Erection of two storey rear extension , single storey extension and front porch. Alterations to fenestration. Gardeners Cottage Allerton Lane Allerton Park North Yorkshire HG5 0SE	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2022</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 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 Gardener's Cottage on the north-western boundary of a triangular section of the walled garden immediately north of the main kitchen garden.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that two ground floor extensions will be demolished, the new ground floor is much bigger with another single- storey extension and the new main block which will be two- storey. This, along with four large 'French windows'/patio doors into the walled garden, will create an overall large mass with a huge amount of glazing that is totally out of keeping as a Gardener's Cottage in a grade II historic park and garden.</p> <p>We have not noted any information on the colour/texture of the tile or brickwork and would have expected the application form or plans to state, 'to match existing'.</p> <p>The new windows should be timber to match existing and not in upvc/aluminium.</p> <p>The two-storey extension is very close to the northern boundary of the rectangular walled garden and the first floor will overlook the walled garden.</p> <p>We are not clear about the new access route to the highway. What sections are new and where is the old route?</p> <p>For the above reasons the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust consider that this is an out of character proposal in a historic park and garden and recommend refusal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Rowntree Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0903	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Dormer roof extension, access ramp, and storage container to rear Pavilion Rowntree Park Terry Avenue York	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Rowntree Park was York's first municipal park. Laid out in 1919-21, it is a memorial to the Cocoa Works staff who fell and suffered during the First World War and was designed following proposals by Frederick Rowntree. Plants were provided by James Backhouse Nursery. It was presented to the City by Messrs Rowntree and Co and is Registered at grade II.</p> <p>The park is a rectangular shaped site of c.8.5ha and consists of a formal garden on an east/west axis, with hump- back bridge and dovecote. Other features include a rockery and defunct cascade, and a building with a tea-room. The gateway to Terry Avenue has relocated wrought iron gates of 1715 by Jean Tijou. The whole of the park is subject to flooding which takes a long time to drain away.</p> <p>The Pavilion built c.1980 is near the boundary fence, facing the tennis courts and is adjacent to a large skate- board structure which dominates this section of the park. The building floods so the proposal is to use the upper portions which involves new windows and roof line to the west, facing into the park</p> <p>On the 28th March 2022 we responded to 22/00220/FUL Dormer to front, access ramp to side and front, and container storage to rear in Rowntree Park, a Designated Park/Garden Pavilion, Rowntree Park Terry Avenue York. This application was refused largely due to the storage container intruding into a flood area that would have been contrary to the City of York Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2013).</p> <p>This resubmission appears to be identical to 22/00220/FUL except that the storage container has been omitted. We do not have any further comments to make. Although a new dormer is proposed with Juliet balcony overlooking the tennis courts, overall we do not consider that this application will materially affect the registered park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Alne Primary School Alne, York	North Yorkshire	E22/0955	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Variation of condition 2 (Drawings) from previously approved application 21/02381/FUL Construction of a single storey office extension to the front of the main school building and the construction of a new modular classroom building on the school playground Alne Primary School Alne York North Yorkshire BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.10.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. We have nothing further to add to our letter of 15th November 2021. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E22/0997	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission for Redevelopment of Potting Shed to be Used for Tourist Accommodation, Storage Building to Gardener's Office, Plant Room and Shed and Repair of Stone Wall (Part Retrospective) at Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 6NJ	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2022 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 in the English Landscape Style. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and walled kitchen garden with orchard and ancillary buildings. The site for this planning application lies within the RPG, to the south - west of the walled garden and within the orchard. The proposed development comprises the part retrospective redevelopment of an existing potting shed that has been derelict and its change of use to tourist accommodation, as well as the redevelopment of a storage room which would be used as a gardener's office and shed, and the repair of a stone wall. The potting shed is located to the immediate west of the storage building. A small garden is proposed to the south of the redeveloped

					<p>potting shed, bound by a low and curved stone wall. The potting shed would provide one bedroom. It is proposed that the overgrown ivy is removed to mitigate further damage to the site. The redeveloped storage room is proposed to be used for a gardener's shed, gardener's office, and plant room. Each use would be allocated to its own separate room and would support the maintenance of the orchard and wider Estate. A part of the stone wall to the rear of the storage room would be repaired. A door opening would also be installed in the wall to the immediate north- east of the gardener's office.</p> <p>We note that the documents are all dated 2021. This is the Gardens Trust first consultation on this planning application.</p> <p>It is a well-documented application and having been out on site today we can confirm that the works are seemingly completed and appear to be to a pleasing standard. It is sympathetic to the historic character of the site. The other works are to also to a pleasing standard with site appropriate materials. The orchard is being managed as a floriferous meadow and planted with older varieties of fruit trees. The whole area has been sensitively enhanced and can be enjoyed by the visitors staying in the accommodation.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planningm</p>
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E22/0998	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Planning Permission for Provision of Four Shepherd Huts to be Used as Tourist Accommodation at Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 6NJ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2022</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Middleton Lodge, although relatively small has all the characteristics of a designed estate (c.1780) in the English Landscape Style and complements Middleton Lodge (Listed Grade II*, list entry number 1317085), designed by John Carr of York. The designer of the park and garden has not been determined but John Foss of</p>

					<p>Richmond may have been involved. It was laid out at a similar time to the building of the Lodge for the barrister George Hartley. The RPG of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and the walled kitchen garden with orchard and ancillary buildings.</p> <p>The site for this planning application lies within the RPG, to the south - west of the walled garden and within the orchard with the shepherd's huts being positioned where trees are less dense. Each shepherd hut would accommodate one bedroom, a seating area, a bathroom, and would be loaded on wheels. Materials used in the design of the shepherd's huts include wooden timber for the main build, doors and windows, and curved metal for the roofs. The four shepherd's huts would be accessed via a wood chip path which would be able to be reached by the internal road network at Middleton Lodge Estate near the former dog- house. Tree planting within the orchard would also be provided as part of the wider regeneration plan, as well as replacement of the existing fence line to the north- west of the orchard with a stone wall, which is subject to a separate planning application. This would create wind and cold protection for the orchard.</p> <p>Although shepherd's huts would not historically have been part of the Middleton Lodge estate, in conservation terms they are moveable and removeable structures and would provide accommodation of a low-key external appearance within the orchard. There would be very little impact on the significance of the RPG and we have no objection. However, it should be noted that the replacement of the four shepherd's huts with more permanent structures would have a significant impact and would need to be the subject of new planning proposals.</p> <p>Having been out on site today we can confirm that the shepherd's huts and associated works appear to be to a pleasing standard. The orchard is being managed as a floriferous meadow and planted with older varieties of fruit trees. The whole area has been sensitively enhanced and can be enjoyed by the visitors staying in the various accommodation associated with the orchard.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E22/0999	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Planning Permission for Redevelopment of Gardener's Cottage and Dog House to be Used as Tourist Accommodation and Erection of a Timber Fence to Protect the Orchard from Strong Winds (Part Retrospective) at Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 6NJ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2022</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Middleton Lodge, although relatively small has all the characteristics of a designed estate (c.1780) in the English Landscape Style and complements Middleton Lodge (Listed Grade II*, list entry number 1317085), designed by John Carr of York. The designer of the park and garden has not been determined although it is possible that John Foss of Richmond was involved. It was laid out at a similar time to the building of the Lodge for the barrister George Hartley. The RPG of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and the walled kitchen garden with orchard and ancillary buildings. The site for this planning application lies within the RPG, immediately to the south - west of the walled garden and within the orchard with its wall enclosures.</p> <p>We note that the documents date from 29th April 2021 with revised details in early 2022 and a Retrospective Bat Assessment August 2022. The 2021 documents indicate the poor condition of the site at that time. This is the Gardens Trust first consultation on this planning application.</p> <p>It is a well-documented application and having been out on site today we can confirm that the works are seemingly completed and appear to be to a pleasing standard. The Gardener's Cottage with its overhanging eaves on the short flanking ranges either side of the central gabled entrance bay overlooking the orchard, and with its small 'front' garden, look very well. It is sympathetic to the historic character of the site. The other works are to also to a pleasing standard with site appropriate materials. The orchard is being managed as a floriferous meadow and planted with older varieties of fruit trees. The whole area has been sensitively enhanced and can be enjoyed by the visitors staying in the accommodation.</p> <p>As an aside, the walled garden designed by the notable designer Tom Stuart Smith, looked stunning in its autumn colours and is a credit to Middleton Lodge, the staff who care for it and the design concept and</p>
-----------------	-----------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>planting.</p> <p>In conclusion the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/1003	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Replacement of window in chapel exterior with an entry/fire exit door within existing space leading into vestry service room.</p> <p>Allerton Castle Allerton Lane</p> <p>Allerton Park North Yorkshire</p> <p>HG5 0SE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.10.2022</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>This application is a minor alteration to the Chapel, and we have no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Nuneham Courtenay RECONSULTATION	Oxfordshire	E22/0084	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a Fusion Demonstration Plant with ancillary office space, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including plant and machinery.</p> <p>Land in the North East Corner of Culham Science Centre near Clifton Hampden OX14 3DB</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for reconsulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint 2nd response. Further to our original response of 8th June 2022, we would like to reiterate the necessity and importance of additional tree screening and ask that should the application be permitted, the interior illumination of the FDP drum is as unobtrusive as possible. We are unable to support the erection of a building 38 metres high, lit 24 hours a day, on the edge of the Grade I registered historic park of Nuneham Courtenay, as it will have a highly detrimental effect on its setting and should be strongly resisted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Margie Hoffnung</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p>
Biddulph Grange	Staffordshire	E21/1675	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building consent for the</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.10.2022</p> <p>Further to our previous letter to you dated 28 December 2021 the Trusts</p>

				<p>proposed installation of wrought iron balustrade around the internal perimeter of the existing Bandstand to prevent falling.</p> <p>Biddulph Grange National Trust Grange Road Biddulph</p>	<p>have been able to discuss the proposals with the applicants and have now received copies of amended designs based on those discussions. It is understood these revisions (drawings 20078-05-BCG-TACP-SP-D-A-0101 rev B and 0102 rev E; LCT-10-001-rev A; and Heritage Impact Assessment, October 2022) have been submitted to your Council. This letter offers the Trusts' comments on the revised proposals in anticipation of a formal re-consultation from your Council.</p> <p>As indicated previously the Trusts accept the principle of enclosing this historically open area for health and safety reasons. As acknowledged in the applicant's HIA, the balustrade will represent an intrusion into the historic landscape. However the harm it will cause will now be mitigated by the revised design of the balustrade with its references to historic metalwork elsewhere in the grade I RPG, its dark colour scheme with no highlighting blending with surrounding foliage, and the enhanced public access it will allow.</p> <p>The Trusts are therefore satisfied that the proposals will not damage the significance of the Registered Park or conservation area and have no objections to the amended application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Alan Taylor Chairman</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0934	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of beaver proof fencing within the Estate and associated landscaping.</p> <p>Trentham Gardens Stone Road Tittensor</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The parkland at Trentham has evolved over several centuries and derives its principal significance from the contributions of several major landscape designers of the 18th and 19th centuries - in particular Lancelot "Capability" Brown, Charles Barry and George Fleming. The landscape is designed around a central north-south axis encompassing the 19th century parterre gardens immediately to the south of the former hall and the mile long lake with banked woodlands on its western side as created by Brown in the 18th century. The eastern side of the parkland is bounded by the River Trent which follows an artificial channel excavated in the 19th</p>

					<p>century to divert the noisome polluted water away from the designed landscape. Although largely screened from the wider landscape to the west by tree planting it does appear that this boundary was intended to be visually permeable allowing glimpses of the wider countryside towards Barlaston to the east.</p> <p>The Trusts have no objection in principle to reintroducing beavers to the historic park and acknowledge that some physical control measures are necessary to safeguard both the animals and, in the current state of understanding, the wider bio-safety of this part of Staffordshire. The Trusts have no objection in principle therefore to introducing new “beaver-proof” fencing. However the essential character of the designed historic landscape is its openness. As recognised in the applicants’ Heritage Statement the new fencing by its very nature is inimical to safeguarding this characteristic. Its design and positioning will need to be very carefully considered to avoid or minimise the potential to harm the significance of the heritage asset. The submitted information does not demonstrate that the scheme will achieve this objective.</p> <p>As a general observation the submitted site plans, e.g. Key site plans 19009-GNA-MP-00-DR-A-004 , 005, 006 – are at too small a scale to show the relationship of the new fence to existing landscape features in the park. For example what is its horizontal proximity to paths, fences or established planting? Will it weave behind or in front of established planting? Much larger scale plans showing the alignment of the fence more precisely along its length are needed before its impact can be fully understood, preferably augmented by topographical cross sections showing its context to both ground form and vegetation. These issues are more significant on the open eastern side of the lake than the west where the fence will relate to established planting or the security fence around the monkey park. Nonetheless it is unclear even here if the new beaver-proof barrier will be merged with the existing fence or run in parallel and at what degree of separation?</p> <p>Where additional information is provided, as in drawings A-1011 and 1012 for fence locations 1-4 (on the river bank opposite the garden centre and near the model railway respectively), positioning the fence at path level and reinforcing it with a new (and rather impressionistic) hedge will emphasise its prominence and intrusion into these historically open parts of the landscape. Visually it would be preferable to recess the fenceline away from the crest of the ridge as far as possible down the river bank.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Depending on the final location selected there may be more merit in discontinuous, naturalistic shrub planting rather than a hedge for screening purposes to play down its presence. If a hedge is felt to be the most suitable screening treatment it should be no higher than the associated fence as the most appropriate response to its parkland situation.</p> <p>While there is no objection in principle to locating an otter and kingfisher viewing hide on the bank of the River Trent the extent of the proposed structure appears rather excessive and its precise form is unclear from the submitted drawings (A -1018). A cross section or end elevation is required to understand the design properly: a photomontage would help clarify its impact within the landscape. The submitted elevations show a thin sheet material roof but describe it as a "green roof" which would surely be of much greater depth and require a more substantial structural support? It is suggested that the most helpful way of resolving the issues highlighted in this letter would be to walk the course of the fence with the applicant team and agree a preferred location and screening option for individual sites before determination of the application. The Trusts would be very pleased to contribute to such an exercise.</p> <p>Finally the proposed angular and utilitarian steel box support above the weir (drawing A-1010) would look out of place in this important historic landscape. Could consideration be given to a structure with a concave face on the western (lake) side to soften its appearance?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0935	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed welcome sign at the main visitor's entrance associated with Trentham Park and Gardens. Main Visitors Entrance To Trentham Park And Gardens Stone Road</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The application site lies within the vehicular entrance to the park and area dominated by a modern highways layout. Other than the belt of yew trees immediately to the west of the proposed sign there are no features of any historic date in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>While the Trusts would prefer not to add to the existing signage in this part</p>

					<p>of the park the need for an additional direction sign to improve guidance for motorists is acknowledged. The new sign is not considered to cause harm to the significance of the RPG or conservation area. The Trusts do not object to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Glemham Hall	Suffolk	E22/0916	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Retention of marquee for a further period of 10 years Glemham Hall, Main Road, Little Glemham</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Suffolk Gardens Trust (SGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. It is encouraging to read from the application documents that the Glemham wedding business and their other events appear to be thriving, and that the income received from these is making a positive contribution to the upkeep of the heritage assets. We can see that there is a necessity for a large enough venue to cater for groups.</p> <p>We do however, share HE's concern about the impact of the unsympathetic structure on the setting of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Glemham, and concur with their comments that the marquee's 'location within the formal gardens, within sight of the principle (sic) rooms of the house and within the views towards the gardens from these rooms, is harmful to the setting and significance of the highly graded heritage asset and the way the gardens are experienced.' The marquee has been 'temporary' for 19 years and whilst the Heritage Statement mentions (p5, 11) that 'the marquee is a temporary structure and can be moved from the site without resulting in any harm or damage to the hall or gardens', 'temporary' is perhaps not the correct adjective after such a long period in situ. We appreciate that post Covid the business plan model may need to change but having failed to find an alternative solution/site in almost two decades, we do think that if your officers are minded to allow a further extension, the applicants need to prioritise finding a more permanent solution. Clearly with the increase in wedding numbers for this season, they must be on the right track.</p> <p>We appreciate that many clients book their weddings several years in advance, but consider that HE's suggestion that a maximum of a further five years is sufficient to reevaluate the situation and work out a new</p>

					business model. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Royal Horticultural Society's Gardens, Wisley	Surrey	E22/0937	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed access relocation responding to M25 Junction 10 and A3 Interchange DCO (Development Consent Order) works. Royal Horticultural Society Gardens, Wisley Lane, Wisley, Woking, GU23 6QS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.10.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Royal Horticultural Society's Gardens, Wisley, an historic designed landscape of national importance which is included by Historic England on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II*. Further to our telephone conversation of 28 September, we have considered the information provided in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Surrey Gardens Trust. The access and large car parks are not included within the Register area and the proposed changes would not appear to have any physical or visual impact on the interests of the RPG. On the basis of this we confirm we have No Objection to the application. If you have any further queries, please contact us, and we would be grateful to be advised of the outcome of the application in due course. With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Warwick Castle	Warwicks hire	E22/0742	I	PLANNING APPLICATION 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. Land to the east of Stratford Road, Longbridge, Warwick, CV34 6XU	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 31.10.2022 Thank you for sending us Aspect Landscape Planning's Landscape & Visual Response Note (LVRN) in response to our earlier comments relating to the above application. We appreciate that the applicant has taken the trouble to get the wire frame visualisations done. However, in para 1.3 the LVRN they state that : 'It should be noted that access to the Grade I Listed Warwick Castle Park and Garden is restricted beyond the publicly accessible grounds of the Castle itself. As such views from the wider park and Leafield Bridge were not recorded.' We appreciate that currently access to these areas is problematic, but that does not alter Historic England's advice in 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 page 2 of this advice note it clearly says : 'The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting' and also (p4) : 'Because the

					<p>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 would downplay such qualitative issues as the importance of quiet and tranquillity as an attribute of setting.' Therefore, it follows that despite the applicant dismissing possible views from other sensitive, publicly inaccessible areas of the Grade I registered park and Garden (RPG), these less accessible areas must also be included in any assessment of the impact of the proposed large structures upon the RPG. In particular, wire frame views of the proposed warehouses from Leafield Bridge are vital to enable us to assess their impact upon the setting and significance of the Grade I RPG. It should also be noted that there is the potential for boating enthusiasts and anglers to access these areas, so views from the river cannot be ignored.</p> <p>The advice note also states (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. 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.' This applies in this instance.</p> <p>The experience of the Asset is also covered in the advice note (p11) and we would draw your attention to the following aspects : 'Visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point, Noise, vibration and other nuisances.. Busyness, bustle, movement and activity.' The impact of proposals as outlined above, will affect the experience of the RPG to varying degrees, but are all relevant.</p> <p>Until a complete assessment of the impact has been undertaken, including private areas of the RPG, we continue to object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wakehurst Place RECONSULTATION	West Sussex	E22/0494	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing agricultural buildings (with those of heritage value to be retained), formerly known as Havelock Farm, and the	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.10.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member</p>

				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. Havelock Farm Wakehurst Place Selsfield Road Ardingly	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. SGT continues to support the application and welcomes the comment that the applicant will engage with SGT regarding the design and development of the Walled Garden. Kind regards Jim Stockwell Trustee On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E22/0923	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of new sports clubhouse and changing rooms and associated landscaping works Land Off Ingle Lane Off High Royds Drive Guiseley	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.10.2022 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. 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. 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 a proposed new sports pavilion to service existing football pitches and an existing cricket pitch. We understand that the original planning permission for the residential development of the site recognised the important social and sporting role of such a facility and ensured the provision of a sports pavilion as part of a Section 106 attachment. We further understand that permission was consequently granted for a substantial clubhouse in 2016 (16/06151/FU), but not constructed and that permission may have lapsed. This current

				<p>application seeks to construct a smaller, simpler building.</p> <p>We recognise that the proposed location is not only practical, but it is also prominent and, in this Grade II Registered Park, demands an appropriately sensitive, simple building. In this context, it is our view that the currently proposed building in terms of fenestration, elevations, massing and materials does not meet that challenge. We are disappointed that the Design and Access Statement does not acknowledge that the site is within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden and the consequent unsympathetic mean/clumsy design.</p> <p>Although the pavilion site is some distance from the main buildings it does need to show respect for the old hospital. It's a beautiful setting, prominently located between mature trees, mown grass and the hospital – in a Grade II Park</p> <p>We are additionally concerned at the prospect of uncontrolled PV panels on the roof. The layout “sketched” is muddled – can a controlled arrangement be adopted perhaps ensuring that the panels fall within an ordered area?</p> <p>The application advises that no hedging is to be removed – but we note that there is a length of approximately 17m of mature hawthorn hedge apparently occupying the very location of the proposed building. Does this question need to be re-visited?</p> <p>We note that the cricket pitch appears to be already served by a pavilion (Crompark Cricket Club), which is located further round the cricket boundary. Is the pitch to be served by two pavilions?</p> <p>We note that, close to the existing clubhouse, there appears to be a substantial badger set. Does this need to be taken into account in the construction of the new building?</p> <p>We are also concerned that the pavilion as shown could be hammered by footballs which are driven at the goal but miss. We note that the designer has “sensitively” omitted windows from this vulnerable side (except for the entrance doors) – but putting a building behind a goal may become a mistake. We also query whether the building will be large enough for all the pitches and players.</p> <p>As it is our opinion that the currently proposed building design does not meet the challenge of this sensitive location, and we are concerned about the lack of control over PV panels, we conclude that we object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Ramsbury Manor	Wiltshire	E22/0849	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Partial demolition and redevelopment of the estate yard to provide an Exhibition Centre, demolition of existing cottage and provision of a new Staff Accommodation and Operational Hub, the creation of a new Estate Yard, ancillary car park and associated lodge, and associated access, tree planting, landscaping, lighting and site infrastructure to support The Ramsbury Manor Foundation's Plans for education and conservation, and the sustainable ecological management of The Ramsbury Manor Estate, including facilitating use by school children, students and the general public. The Ramsbury Manor Estate, Whites Hill, Ramsbury, SN8 2RG</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.10.2022</p> <p>The above application has recently been brought to the attention of the Gardens Trust (GT). The development affects Ramsbury Manor, 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 and as Statutory Consultee, the GT is disappointed not to have been included in the consultation.</p> <p>We have now studied the documents submitted in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Wiltshire Gardens Trust, whose local knowledge forms this joint response. We also note that extensive pre-application discussions have taken place with Historic England.</p> <p>Regarding the exhibition centre complex in the existing estate yard, we agree with the findings of the Heritage Statement that this aspect of the development is unlikely to result in any significantly increased impact on the RPG. The new buildings will be of no greater height than the existing and as the Landscape Analysis has shown is already well-screened by established tree planting, which can be maintained and strengthened by additional planting and good management.</p> <p>Where we do have concerns is with the creation of the new estate yard and additional access in the north-east parkland, and the impact this will have. Again, we agree with the Heritage Statement that the introduction of the development into the Ramsbury Manor parkland is likely to cause 'less than substantial harm' and to some extent can be mitigated by additional tree planting. Where we disagree with the conclusion is that the introduction of this irreversible development is 'towards the minor end of the scale of less than substantial harm'. Therefore, as per NPPF paragraph 201, the Gardens Trust and Wiltshire Gardens Trust can only advise that Wiltshire Council should assure itself that this level of harm to the RPG is indeed outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>