



GT AND CGT CONSERVATION CASEWORK RESPONSES SEPTEMBER 2022

The GT conservation team received 161 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, 61 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Kings Weston House	Avon	E22/0803	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>New gates at the entrance adjoining the Gate House and to the Loggia to improve safety and security.</p> <p>Kings Weston House Kings Weston Lane Lawrence Weston Bristol BS11 0UR</p> <p>ACCESS/GATES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Grade I listed Kings Weston House, surrounded by a mid to late C18 park, which is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, laid out with advice from Lancelot Brown in the period 1758-1774. The park contains the remains of a formal layout dating from Sir John Vanbrugh's early C18 redevelopment of an earlier site.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Avon Gardens Trust have considered the information that you have provided. The Trust appreciates the need to improve security at the House and park, and have no objection in principle to providing additional gates. It is noted that the location of the gates proposed adjacent to Home Lodge (referred to as the gatehouse) has been already been amended from that originally proposed to allow vehicles to turn off Kings Weston Lane in the</p>

					<p>event of the vehicle gate being closed. However, the plan of the proposed gates seems to show the new vehicular and pedestrian gates as having cast iron posts, whereas the elevation of the proposed gates shows new bathstone gate piers, and this needs clarification. The plan is annotated to show new fencing to the turning head, but there is no detail of the type of fencing proposed. There is a variety of fencing in the vicinity and the design and materials need to be confirmed.</p> <p>The alignment of the proposed gates and fencing to the Loggia would conflict with the original spatial relationship between Kings Weston House and the Loggia, which was characterised by courtyards and gardens on a formal and symmetrical arrangement. The proposed fence line would conflict with this earlier plan and prevent restoration of it, which is an aim of Policy HG10 of the Kings Weston Conservation Management Plan 2014. The design and materials for the fencing to be provided adjacent to the new gates to the Loggia would need to be confirmed, and the details of how it would meet with the existing fencing to the Brewhouse, and the existing stone balustrade to the north west front of the House.</p> <p>As the area of the works is beneath the canopies of existing trees, any measures for hand dig to foundations and posts to the gates and fencing should also be confirmed.</p> <p>In summary, Avon Gardens Trust have no objection in principle to the proposed gates but expect to see further consideration of the alignment of the proposed gates and fencing to the Loggia, in order to meet the aspirations of Policy HG10 of the Kings Weston Conservation Management Plan. The details of the gateposts to the Home Lodge gateway, the design and materials of all fencing, and any mitigation measures for works beneath the canopies of existing trees, also need to be confirmed.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Kay Ross MA Chairman, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Hedsor House RECONSULTATION	Buckinghamshire	E21/2009	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of two existing buildings creating 1 x 3-bed short term let holiday dwelling with creation of linked walkway and demolition of redundant out buildings</p> <p>Buildings At Woolmans Wood</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site, Hedsor House, listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>This is the third time we have been invited by the Planning Authority to comment on this application and we refer to our previous timely responses dated March 9th and May 27th. On both previous occasions, we had</p>

				<p>Hedsor Park Farm Heathfield Road Hedsor CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>objected to the application and stated that applicant had not provided enough information for us to make a proper assessment of the proposals and their potential impact on the RPG.</p> <p>As we had not visited nor were we invited to visit the site, we specifically and politely requested concluded our letter dated May 27th as follows: "We have reviewed the application details again and cannot see anything that addresses the potential impact on the RPG which is so close to the application site. We note the comparative views but these do not appear to show the impact on the RPG and, whilst we are aware that there is surrounding tree cover, it cannot be assumed that the proposed works will therefore not be visible from the RPG. If there is such information within the application, we would be grateful to be directed to it. Otherwise, we recommend that the planning authority request the applicant to produce a Visual Impact Assessment and follows the guidance in the two documents attached. In the absence of this additional information we continue to object to the application."</p> <p>We have been consulted a third time because the applicant has commissioned a 'Visual and Setting Impact Assessment' dated July/August 2022 which has been submitted along with revisions to the proposals. It is regrettable that this document directly quotes our previous letters but fails to quote them accurately by omitting the paragraph above as well as stating that our objections are unreasonable.</p> <p>Can we take this opportunity to remind both the planning authority and the applicant that, whilst the GT is a statutory consultee, we rely on the unpaid volunteers in the county garden trusts who endeavour to assess these applications frequently without access to the application site and dependent on the information provided within the application.</p> <p>Therefore it is not unreasonable for them and us to raise questions and request further information when we are unable to properly assess applications due to the lack of adequate information.</p> <p>It is further regrettable that a VIA was not carried out as part of the original application as this might have aided the progress of this application. Nonetheless, the applicant has now submitted Visual Impact Assessment as requested, which is helpful in addressing the concerns that we had raised primarily in terms of the potential impact on the RPG. We also note that the 'Visual Impact and Setting Assessment confirms';-</p> <p>"5.9 In addition, the applicant is also considering extending the living roof over the proposed small, glazed hallway and also replacing the proposed</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>external glazed (west elevation) hallway wall with a green living wall. I understand that these drawing changes will be submitted to the Planning Authority with this report (Figs. 17 and 18). These amendments can only further reduce the already limited light spillage and reflective effects upon the nearby registered Park."</p> <p>As the applicant has now provided adequate information as requested for us to make a further desk-based assessment and has revised the proposals as stated above, the information provided combined with the revised proposals are such that we withdraw our objection on condition that;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the planning officer supports the application on heritage matters b) No changes are made to the amended scheme c) No further openings and lighting are permitted at a later date. <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E22/0774	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The crown reduction by 10m from approx. 35m and 6m from the sides of T1 London Plane tree protected by Milton Keynes Council Tree Preservation Order no. PS/540/15/36C</p> <p>The Dower House 18 Garden Lane Tyringham Newport Pagnell MK16 9ED</p> <p>TREES</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Tyringham, 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*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We note that there is no arboricultural report with the application but that, providing the LPA are happy to approve the works, we have no comment to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Stoke Park	Buckinghamshire	E22/0796	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Part two storey, part single storey side, single storey rear and single storey side extensions, the addition of nine rooflights to the front elevation (Amendment to planning permission 17/01231/FUL)</p> <p>Aramghar , Park Road, Stoke</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Stoke Park is a landscape park which was one of the first commissions by Lancelot Brown. The park was then subsequently modified by Nathaniel Richmond and Humphry Repton who provided designs for the landscape</p>

				Poges, Buckinghamshire, SL2 4PJ BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>around the new house then being built.</p> <p>We note that the application site sits to the north-west of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden for Stoke Park and is part of the encroachment of housing around the perimeter of the park.</p> <p>This application seeks amendments to a previous application 17/01231/FUL. We have reviewed our correspondence and would like to express that we feel it is regrettable that we were not consulted on the previous application on this site despite the application site sitting so close to the RPG boundary.</p> <p>However, we have reviewed the application and note that the planning permission has already been granted for alterations. Therefore, if the LPA are minded to grant consent to this amended application and are confident that the revised fenestration does not result in light emittance and reflection to the RPG, the Gardens Trust has no comment to make.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Hall Barn	Buckinghamshire	E22/0798	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 17 (proposed plans) of planning permission PL/19/1268/FA (Demolition of a garage and erection of 3 two and a half storey dwellings with basements and integral garages. Formation of a vehicular access with associated hardstanding and landscaping.) to allow changes to the size of basement and ground floor on plot 3, minor alterations to the appearance of plot 3 and boundary adjustment between plots 2 and 3 (part retrospective)</p> <p>Land To The Rear Of Wycombe End House, Wycombe End, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust who are familiar with the site.</p> <p>We have been consulted on this application due to its close proximity to Hall Barn.</p> <p>Hall Barn is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) with the first landscape park and woodland created by the poet Edmund Waller between 1651-1687. Further works were carried out by his grandson Edmund between 1715-30 with influence from John Aislabie.</p> <p>However, we note that this application is for variations to the planning application 16/01506/FUL which has already been granted planning consent along with a number of subsequent revisions and amendments. The Gardens Trust notes that both the original D&A statement and Case Officer reports do acknowledge the proximity to the RPG but that, at no point, has the Gardens Trust been consulted on this original application despite the fact that the application site directly abuts boundary of the RPG. The Gardens Trust has been previously consulted on the adjacent plot at Bradbury House which is already developed but not on this plot which,</p>

					<p>until these applications remained undeveloped garden land.</p> <p>We find it deeply regrettable that the approved plans have already allowed the proposed development to come so close to the northern boundary of the Old Park. We find it all the more regrettable that the planning consent allows for rooflights and a substantial glazed ridge detail on Plot 3 which is the 3 storey proposed structure nearest to the RPG boundary. The Gardens Trust would have preferred to discourage such interventions which will result in light emittance and reflection into the RPG.</p> <p>However, as consent has already been granted and this current application concerns variations, we can only state that we object to any further development, alteration or intervention that brings the proposed development even nearer to the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Gayhurst Court	Buckinghamshire	E22/0804	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The proposed formation of pitched-roof dormer window, new first floor window to existing gable and rear rooflight to accommodate loft conversion 16 Gayhurst House Gayhurst Court Newport Road Gayhurst Newport Pagnell</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Gayhurst Court, 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. We have liaised with our colleagues in Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>Gayhurst Court (formerly Gayhurst House) is an 18th century landscape park with mid c19 formal gardens around an earlier house. The gardens are attributed to Lancelot Brown c1750-60 with modifications by Repton c. 1793. The application site is no.16 Gayhurst Court which is one of a number of flats within the converted building.</p> <p>We note the proposal to introduce a new window into the gable and a new dormer window. The Gardens Trust does not object to these alterations as they appear to be in keeping with the historic fabric of the building and will not be detrimental to the RPG.</p> <p>We have previously reviewed a number of planning applications for works to Gayhurst Court and, in all of these cases, we have objected to the installation of rooflights due to their position on roof pitches which can potentially result in high levels of light reflection and emission into the registered park and garden.</p> <p>As we do not know the site and the rooflight is not shown on any of the</p>

					<p>proposed elevation drawings, it is difficult to assess if there would be any impact from a rooflight into the RPG but, if the LPA considers that the rooflight would be visible from the RPG, the Gardens Trust objects to it. If the rooflight is not visible from the RPG, we offer no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Dullingham House	Cambridgeshire	E22/0806	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of show area and associated pavilion and parking</p> <p>Dullingham Park 10 Eagle Lane</p> <p>Dullingham Newmarket Suffolk</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS, PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2022</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 the development has been well designed and will result in minimal harm to the RPG, a view shared by your Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Our only concerns lie with the potential for on-going expansion of the stud farm leading to applications for further developments within the Dullingham House RPG. Developments to date appear to have been successfully absorbed into this landscape but if continued will eventually have a cumulative impact on, and therefore erosion of the character of, this historic landscape. We are also well aware of the separate pressures being exerted on the southern parkland, with the gradual expansion of housing along the boundary.</p> <p>To summarise: whilst the Gardens Trust does not object to this application, we would ask that the Council assures itself that the public benefits of this application do indeed outweigh the harm caused to the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Kedleston Hall	Derbyshire	E21/1812	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single and two storey extensions to provide accommodation associated with the existing furniture restoration, manufacturing and education business; and the regularisation</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for your email of 8 August with the three images requested of the proposed development as viewed from the south side of Vicar Wood. It would have been helpful if the images had been annotated to indicate exactly what was being illustrated but we accept that that Wheathills Farm is some distance from the boundary of Kedleston Hall registered park and garden (RPG) and screening will be more effective over the summer</p>

				of 2 flats Wheathills Farm Brun Lane Mackworth Derby Derbyshire DE22 4NE BUILDING ALTERATION	months as much of the intervening tree cover is deciduous. The application site does however lie within the setting of this Grade I (RPG), as defined in Amber Valley Local Development Plan (EN33). The Gardens Trust is becoming increasingly concerned by the number of small-scale applications in this area collectively leading to a cumulative impact on and the erosion of the setting of the RPG. We confirm we have no further comments to add. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Willersley Castle ENFORCEMENT NOTICE SERVED	Derbyshire	E22/0741	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Without planning permission the unauthorised erection of structures in the grounds of a listed building as shown on both aerial photographic views and individual photographs attached to the notice 1. Octagonal structure 2. Three poles and tyres 3. Wired climb through 4. Rope and tub balance 5. Run over platform 6. Air rifle shooting range 7. Archery range 8. Assorted climbing/rope walking structures 9. Axe throwing range 10. Raised timber planter with seating around 11. 2 x timber river bank landing stages Willersley Castle Hotel Mill Road Cromford Matlock Derbyshire	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2022 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 the Derbyshire Historic Gardens Trust (DHGT) and one of our colleagues there has made a site visit which, combined with their local knowledge, informs this joint response. Looking at the planning history of Willersley Castle, the GT was not consulted at the end of 2021 when a change of use application (21/01283/FUL) was submitted to enable the former hotel to be converted into a children's residential educational adventure centre. The importance of Willersley Castle and its Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) was recognised in the documentation for that application, lying as it does within the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site (DVMWHS) and the Cromford Conservation Area. The application did not comply with NPPF paragraph 194 as there was no description of the significance of the heritage assets or the contribution made by their setting. It was asserted that the proposal would accord with NPPF paragraph 206 but there was no explanation as to how the significance might be affected by the proposed development. Neither of these omissions has been rectified in the appeal documents. HE made clear the importance of finding a use for the building (and by association its RPG) compatible with its context, to secure its long-term future. Looking at the responses submitted by both HE and your own conservation team, it is apparent that by and large, concerns were not raised for internal alterations to the Grade II* Willersley Castle, but that any possible future changes or development within the grounds were flagged up as requiring the applicant to make clear their intentions for the

					<p>future and that any development within the grounds should be considered on their individual merits. We also note that in 2015 a Management Plan for the Designed Landscape was produced. It would be helpful if a copy of this was included amongst the documents for the enforcement notice.</p> <p>The World Heritage Site Nomination Document describes the Derwent Valley as a unique cultural landscape of outstanding universal value. The mills, industrial housing, estate buildings and supporting infrastructure form a well preserved ensemble set within a distinctive landscape, valued in the eighteenth century for its picturesque quality.</p> <p>The DVMWHS Management Plan 2020-25 draws attention to the elevated routes followed by the road and the railway line: “These braided lines of transportation form the spine of the World Heritage Site and constitute one of the most important elements of the cultural landscape. Views of the site obtained from the road and the railway line are of particular importance. This sequential experience of views, travelling north to south or vice versa, is what constitutes for most visitors, and even residents, their principal experience of the site.”</p> <p>Appendix 9 of the DVMWHS Management Plan includes indicative views worthy of protection that have been selected for monitoring. View 14 (Willersley Castle and Park from the S bank of the River Derwent) shows that the parkland is clearly visible from Church Walk.</p> <p>The Management Plan also includes objectives to restore lost features, to conserve eroded or damaged features and to undertake tree clearance to open up overgrown designed views.</p> <p>The Cromford Conservation Area Appraisal identifies further important views. Two Principal Views shown in Fig 11d are particularly relevant here: a view looking eastwards from the A6 at the point where the river makes a sharp turn below Masson Mill, and another looking westwards towards Willersley Castle from the minor road near Cromford Bridge. From both these viewpoints, there are clear views over the open parkland to the south of Willersley Castle.</p> <p>As well as being a major component of the RPG, the parkland between Willersley Castle and the River Derwent forms a prominent part of the setting of Willersley Castle, Masson Mill, Cromford Mill and Cromford Wharf. Its open character plays a crucial role in defining the relationship between these important buildings at the northern extremity of the World Heritage Site.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The schedule of activities that accompanied Roger Yarwood's letter dated 10th Feb 2022 stated that "no fixed equipment will be located within this area" [Riverside Meadow]. It is apparent that since the letter was written numerous structures have been erected in contravention of that assurance.</p> <p>Most of the structures that are the subject of this enforcement action are in clear sight from the viewpoints described above as well as from the grounds of St Mary's Church and the adjacent picnic area, even now when trees are in full leaf. They will become even more visible for the six months of the year when the trees are not in leaf.</p> <p>The larger field shelter structures appear to be substantial constructions, permanently fixed to the ground in excavated post holes. They are clearly not designed to be portable. We firmly believe that these are buildings that constitute development. These structures are prominent and out of keeping with the local character, so detract from the setting and significance of the RPG and other heritage assets. Their prominence is exacerbated by close cutting of the grass that surrounds them and their associated target structures.</p> <p>The appellant claims that many of the less substantial structures do not constitute development as there are no foundations but merely posts set into the earth. We contend that since the excavation of post holes is patently an engineering operation these do in fact constitute development. We are especially concerned about the elements of structure 8 (assorted climbing/rope walking structures) that are inappropriately attached to mature parkland trees in such a way that damage is virtually guaranteed even before they are used by visitors.</p> <p>The GT/DHGT strongly objects to the erection of the equipment listed above and supports the removal of these unauthorised structures.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Preston Manor and Preston Park	East Sussex	E22/0648	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Woodland Creation/Planting 40 standard trees planted into grass Species: Tulip tree, Norway Maple, Black Walnut, Elm, Austrian Pine, Cedar of</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2022</p> <p>Representatives of Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) recently met Kerry Pickett (Friends of Preston Park, FoPP) at Preston Park and discussed the proposals in detail. SGT is now fully supportive of the proposals and welcomes the planting of new trees within the Park, particularly the species that in the longer term will grow into large trees and help replace those that have been lost due to disease.</p>

				<p>Lebanon, Turkey Oak, Hawthorn, Beech, Cherry, Horse Chestnut, Crab Apple, Davidia Involucrata, Foxglove, Paperbark Maple, Catalpa</p>	<p>SGT believes that further tree planting in the Park beyond that envisaged in this application would benefit the significance of the site. To help develop the case for such planting, SGT has agreed to collaborate with the FoPP using existing documents, in particular the Conservation Management Plan prepared by the consultancy ACTA some years ago.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell</p>
Hall Place	Greater London	E22/0489	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of the existing structures and erection of seven buildings comprising residential units (Use Class C3), with associated access and highways works, parking and landscaping, creation of a riverside walk and retention of open space, with ecological enhancements, on the area of the site forming part of the Crayford Rough.</p> <p>Former Electrobases/Wheatsheaf Works Site Maxim Road Crayford</p> <p>DEMOLITION, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and Gardens LPG). LPG is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the Historic England (HE) Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. LPG is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Hall Place is on the Inventory and its entry is here: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=BEX021</p> <p>We were made aware of this application by the Gardens Trust, because of its potential impact on Hall Place and Gardens, a Grade II Public Park on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England. Hall Park is situated to the north of the A2 Rochester Way trunk road, east of the Black Prince interchange (list entry: 1000247). The heritage asset comprises early 20th century gardens and grounds of a 16th / 17th manor house, opened to the public in 1952.</p> <p>LPG has now considered the information that you have provided and raises no in principle objections to the proposal, however, offers the recommendations below; this does not constitute support for the proposed development.</p>

					<p>The proposals will have a negative effect on views from the Hall Park Registered Park and Garden, as visible in representative view 14, provided in the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The scale and massing of the proposed residential blocks is such that they do not integrate well with the surrounding townscape; blocks C1-4 and B4, as proposed, combine in long views to create a cumulative mass. We therefore recommend that greater consideration be given to how the massing could be 'broken down' to offer greater glimpses of sky and visual relief in views from the Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>With regards to boundary screening to the west of the site, it is unclear whether the planting shown on the landscape masterplan (55693-LLB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-L-0001) is existing or proposed and there are no details as to how this planting will belt will manifest. We therefore recommend detailed landscape proposals be submitted to council as a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Stuart Taylor</p>
Victoria Park	Greater London	E22/0655	II*	FORESTRY COMMISSION Woodland Creation/Planting Victoria Park east and west, Bow East and Tower Hamlets	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.09.2022</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). We have received further details on the proposals from Mr Adam Armstrong, Senior Arboricultural Officer at Tower Hamlets; please see attached. Having reviewed the information, we have concerns regarding the proposals and the impact they may have on the setting, character and original planting aspirations of the park, particularly with regard to the proposals set out in Victoria Park 2.pdf, Victoria Park 3a.pdf and Victoria</p>

					<p>Park 3b.pdf.</p> <p>As the Conservation Management Plan for Victoria Park sets out, in order to maintain the existing setting and original planting aspirations of the site, the paths should not be planted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 3.26 notes that ‘the habit of planting trees in lines alongside paths... has become endemic in the park. Originally Pennethorne only proposed an avenue alongside the drive parallel to the Regent’s Canal... In recent years new trees of diverse species have been planted along most paths traversing the park, a pattern that had a detrimental impact on views, spaces, containment and character.’ • Paragraph 6.7 notes that ‘linear tree planting along most paths [has created] inappropriate spatial divisions, blocking views and diminishing the spatial quality and significance of designed spaces and plantings.’ • Paragraph 7.5 directs the reader to the Management and Maintenance Plans (https://we.tl/tsYjiqdxanp) to understand more about the plans for addressing inappropriate planting schemes in the park. <p>We would be happy to share a copy of the Conservation Management Plan via WeTransfer if this would be helpful.</p> <p>Further Details</p> <p>In relation to Victoria Park 3b.pdf: there are currently no trees planted along the path adjacent to Victoria Park Track, which means views in the vicinity of the track across the park towards the path running from St Mark’s Gate and beyond are currently uninterrupted by planting. This view embodies the deliberate, open character of the park as originally designed and should in our opinion be preserved.</p> <p>With regard to Victoria Park 2.pdf: the Baroness Burdett-Coutts Drinking Fountain is Grade II* listed and we are concerned that planting on the path leading to the fountain from the north-west will negatively alter its setting and risk compromising views of the asset.</p> <p>With regard to Victoria Park 3a.pdf: there are three designated heritage assets along the path running adjacent to Cadogan Terrace, where trees are proposed to be planted – Stone Alcove (on east side of southern drive and south-west of Cadogan Gate), Alcove from Old London Bridge, and Hackney Wick Great War Memorial. LPG is concerned that planting here may alter the setting and risk frustrating access and obscuring views of the assets. It is of note that the MMP (see pages 8 and 9 in the attached) specifically denotes the areas proposed for planting in Victoria Park 3a.pdf as inappropriate for tree planting, advising that ‘trees [are] to be removed</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>within 10 years gradually on an annual basis.’</p> <p>LPG acknowledges 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. However, LPG urges more careful consideration to be given to the location and species of any new trees planted for the setting and character of the park as a whole to be maintained with the designated heritage assets within the park and the original planting aspirations respected and conserved where possible.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>As a result LPG objects to the current proposals to plant along the paths running across the historic cricket ground (Victoria Park 3a.pdf), the path adjacent to Victoria Park Track (Victoria Park 3b.pdf) and the path running from the north-west of the Burdett-Coutts Drinking Fountain (Victoria Park 2.pdf.) We note there are no trees planted in these areas on the OS County Series map 25-inch map, Epoch 1 (1843-1893) - please see attached pdf. LPG suggests that the Urban 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>Please do advise of your decision, and keep us informed of any further information submitted.</p> <p>Martha Bailey</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Brockwell Park	Greater London	E22/0691	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Creation of a community Football Turf Pitch including 4.5m high fencing enclosure and entrance gates and internal barriers with entrance gates within the pitch area, and a barrier along pedestrian access. Maintenance equipment storage container. 6 x 12m high floodlights masts with</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2022</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</p>

				<p>LED luminaires around FTP perimeter and 6 x 4m high amenity lights. Hardstanding areas for pedestrian access and circulation, and portable goals storage, and landscaping around the pitch. Brockwell Park Dulwich Road London SE24 SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>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). With regard to this planning application, we note that the proposed pitch would be sited in an area of the park which is used for sports, and within which sporting structures stand currently. It would replace an old 'redgra' football pitch that has fallen into disrepair, and which appears to have been out of formal use for some time.</p> <p>We acknowledge that improving access to sport and, in particular, football, is a priority for Lambeth.</p> <p>Additionally, we note the support that this proposal has, for example as expressed in many comments to this application, in sections of the Lambeth community. As such, we do not object to the proposal to upgrade the football facilities in Brockwell Park.</p> <p>Based on the information that the applicants have provided, we have the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We trust that the lighting, fencing and other installations will be made as unobtrusive as possible, with black or 'invisible green' paintwork, and dampers to reduce noise pollution from ball stop fencing. - We would want to ensure that light pollution is kept to an absolute minimum and is not detrimental to ecology and bats, and that lights are turned off at a time agreed with the community, as set out in the Lighting Assessment document. - The loss of much of the existing 'wildflower meadow' area is regrettable, and we would encourage Lambeth to replant/re-establish the meadow in a suitable area to compensate for the loss of this area as a priority. - 3G pitch sustainability: LPG is aware that the rubber particles may end up in drainage water or surrounding soils, with potentially harmful environmental effects. LPG therefore recommends that filtration is installed to prevent migration of rubber particles into the drainage, and gratings and/or other systems are installed to limit foot-born particle migration. <p>From a procedural & documentation perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is within a registered park and garden. We note that Lambeth Plan Q21 requires proposals in such cases to be "justified and supported by robust Heritage Statements". No such Heritage Statement appears to have
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>been supplied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We note some apparent confusion in the 'Design and Access Statement with Planning Statement' as to whether the site is within a conservation area (CA). As it does lie within a CA, we note the apparent absence of a Heritage Statement compliant with Lambeth Plan Q22, 10.106. - The visualisations supplied are restricted seemingly to aerial views. There are no ground-based views of the proposal. It is, for example, difficult to gauge the height of the lighting masts in relation to nearby trees, and to gauge seasonal effects. <p>Yours sincerely, Mark Davies Borough Planning Volunteer</p>
Avonmouth House 6 Avonmouth Street, London	Greater London	E22/0813	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing building and structures and erection of a part 2, part 7, part 14 storey plus basement mixed-use development comprising 1733sqm (GIA) of space for class E employment use and/or class F1(a) education use and 219 purpose-built student residential rooms with associated amenity space, including at 7th floor roof level, and public realm works, car and cycle parking, and ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>Avonmouth House , 6 Avonmouth Street, London</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, PARKING, OFFICE/COMMERCIAL</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning application.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and Gardens (LPG)). LPG is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the Historic England (HE) Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. LPG is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). LPG's primary concern with regard to these proposals would be the potential effect on Newington Gardens, a non-designated heritage space. In general, LPG is wary of the overshadowing effect of tall buildings adjacent to parks and gardens; particularly so with regard to developments to the south of them. We also view negatively loss of amenity value in areas of dense social housing, and/or in areas with open space deprivation. We note that the southern part of Newington Gardens is hemmed-in currently by medium-rise, mostly residential, buildings, particularly to its south-eastern side. These structures do have a significant overshadowing</p>

					<p>effect, accentuating the natural shading effect of the many large London Plane trees.</p> <p>Based on the information that the applicants have provided, we have the following observations:</p> <p>We note that the proposed building height appears to have been reduced by two floors, versus the original 2021 application (21/AP/4297) – we welcome this change. LPG notes also that the proposed development lies mostly to the west of Newington Gardens, would be marginally set-back from the road, and in any case across the road from the gardens. In summary, LPG has considered the information that the applicant has provided, and on the basis of this we neither support nor object to these proposals. Should new information come to light that may have an impact on this heritage asset the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p> <p>If any future proposals were to come forward to raise the height of No. 6 Avonmouth St, e.g., by adding additional floors, then LPG would object to these. Similarly, we would tend to view negatively any future proposal which might have a significant additional overshadowing effect on Newington Gardens.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these matters.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mark Davies Borough Planning Volunteer For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Richmond Local Plan	Greater London	E22/0835	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2022</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.</p> <p>LPG is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). We</p>

					take note of all planning protections including sites within Conservation Areas, Green Belt or any other planning protection including protected views and the settings of historic sites in accordance with the NPPF.
Kings College Maughan Library, Chancery Lane	Greater London	E22/0862	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Works to fell 1no. fig tree (ficus carica) and poison including of adjacent saplings, and pruning works to 2no. olive trees (olea europaea).</p> <p>Kings College Maughan Library Chancery Lane London WC2A 1LR</p> <p>TREES</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 26.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning applications.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning & 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). The site is situated 0.3 miles from Grade II Lincoln Inn Fields Public Park on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England and it is also on the LPG Inventory: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=CAM066&sitename=Lincoln%27s+Inn+Fields+%2A</p> <p>LPG has considered the information you provided and has no comments on these proposals. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals and should new information come to light that may have an impact on the heritage asset the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Emma Sweeney For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Ashridge	Hertfords hire	E22/0739	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Removal of temporary dry bay practice structure, replacing with a permanent teaching and</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. The area where the new building proposed to be is part of the Registered (II*) historic landscape of Ashridge, with important rides and views across</p>

				<p>practicing building Ashridge Golf Club Golf Club Road Little Gaddesden Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1LY MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>the landscape, enhanced by 'Capability' Brown in the 18th century. The current building, although unattractive, is temporary and could be removed to enhance the landscape. The proposal for a new more substantial building would cause harm to the landscape by being an inappropriate intrusion into the overall pattern of rides and views to the detriment of the significance of the landscape.</p> <p>We note that the heritage statement submitted does not take into account the wider historic landscape, as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF further states that any proposals should conserve, and if possible, enhance the heritage asset. This proposal would cause serious harm to the registered landscape and we thus object to it.</p>
Julians	Hertfords hire	E22/0794	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Woodland Creation Mill End and East, South-East of Shaw Green cottages.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for contacting the Gardens Trust about this proposal within the setting of the Registered Parkland of Julians.</p> <p>Your email has been forwarded to me, as I deal with planning issues in Hertfordshire on behalf of the GT.</p> <p>We know the area and that it has long been farmland with small copses. We consider that the mature woodland would be visible from the nearer parts of the Registered parkland but have no objection to the tree planting. There is little detail on the design of the area, which to be mixed woodland, which grassland and whether you will try to replicate wood pasture. There is also no detail on whether there will be public access as there is on the other RPG sites managed by the WT: Gobions and Tring, or at the newish Heartwood at Sandridge.</p> <p>We would be interested to see further details of this project, including any proposed car parking, which has been put in at Tring in an area adjacent to the RPG but which has an adverse affect on it.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing more on this project.</p> <p>Kind Regards Kate Harwood Conservation & Planning Hertfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Napsbury Hospital	Hertfords hire	E22/0817	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Residential development of nine units comprising six terraced houses, two semi-detached houses and one detached house, together with associated</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. Napsbury Park is Grade II on the Historic England's Register, is within the Green Belt and covered by a blanket TPO. This park was laid out by William Goldring as informal parkland near to the hospital buildings but with farm, kitchen gardens and orchard to both feed the residents and to contribute to their therapy. It is</p>

				landscaping and parking (resubmission following refusal of 5/2021/2336 dated 19/11/2021) Land To Rear Of 28 To 34 North Cottages Napsbury St Albans Hertfordshire RESIDENTIAL	one of only 2 known public landscapes by him and the only surviving complete hospital one. The area of this particular application lies on former allotment ground and just north of the important orchard planted on a grid plan which is overgrown but largely intact. We consider that development on this site would harm the Registered park, adding a high density of housing to a rural area which is remote from transport and retail facilities, The adjacent historic orchard, of which the original varieties are known, would also lose significance in the removal of its original setting. We object to this inappropriate development
9 Osborn House Howardsgate, Welwyn Garden City RECONSULTATION	Hertfords hire	E22/0846	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 2 sets of externally illuminated fascia text and 1 externally illuminated projection sign 9 Osborn House Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AT ADVERTISING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.09.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. We commented on earlier proposals this year; 6/2022/0291/ADV and 6/2022/1407/ADV that the design does not reflect the WGC aesthetic, for a key site within the town centre. Those comments also apply to this application
1-3 Newgate Street Village, Hertford	Hertfords hire	E22/0890	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of single storey rear extension, amendments to rear elevation fenestration and creation of a steel-framed veranda/balcony 1-3 Newgate Street Village Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8RA BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. This property lies on the edge of the historic Ponsbourne Park estate which is on the List of Locally Important Parks and Gardens. We are concerned that the proposals state that the rear fenestration is to be amended to open up the house to the views. This will also open up the historic views to the large amount of glass proposed with subsequent harm to the significance of the heritage asset of the park. If this application is approved we would support a condition that planting to help mitigate the harm to the landscape and its significance is put in place. Carefully considered it should not block views of the park but would protect the parkland
Lullingstone Castle RECONSULTATION	Kent	E22/0840	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Maintain, repair and stabilise ice-house. Install a handrail. Ice House East Of Lullingstone Castle Lullingstone Lane Eynsford Dartford Kent DA4 0JA REPAIR/RESTORATION	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Lullingstone Castle, 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. We have liaised with our colleagues in Kent Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the documents submitted and confirm that the Gardens Trust and Kent Gardens Trust fully support this application to maintain,

					<p>repair and stabilise this listed ice-house.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Waldershare Park	Kent	E22/0865	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use and conversion to 1no. holiday let and 1no. estate worker's dwelling, and creation of parking</p> <p>Gliding Club Clubhouse , Sandwich Road, Waldershare, CT15 5NH</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2022</p> <p>The above application has recently been brought to the attention of the Gardens Trust (GT). The development may affect Waldershare Park, 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 was disappointed not to have been included in the consultation.</p> <p>However, we have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Kent Gardens Trust, whose local knowledge forms this joint response.</p> <p>Although the site is within Waldershare Park it is outside the RPG which is approximately 150m to the northwest. The setting of the park is protected by a screen of trees around the current glider club building which is proposed to convert to an estate worker's dwelling and a holiday let, which will reduce the overall size of the building.</p> <p>On the basis that this screen will be maintained, the Gardens Trust and Kent Gardens Trust have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Harlaxton Manor	Lincolnshire	E22/0777	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration of the Walled Garden to become a new visitor destination. Works to include restoration of the Gardener's House and ancillary buildings to become a ticket office, cafe, kitchen, toilets and education centre. Restoration of an existing log store and used as a gardener's Mess. The buildings will be heated using ground source heat pumps and LPG. Creation of new visitors' carpark with associated</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with GT in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites. LGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Lincolnshire Gardens Trust (LGT) has studied the main aspects of these ambitious proposals for Harlaxton Walled Gardens (c1832-34) and welcomes the considerable and significant detailed advice from Historic England experts. The need for a major restoration such as this has long been the hope of our members and the wider community. These proposals should help towards the removal of this significant registered park and</p>

				<p>access and exit drive, including a new junction onto the A607. Creation of a network of pedestrian footpaths to provide access between the carpark and the Walled Garden as well as the wider landscape. Change of use of arable agricultural field to meadows and wood pasture, including creation of new play area</p> <p>Harlaxton College, Harlaxton Manor, Harlaxton Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>garden from the Heritage at Risk Register.</p> <p>We welcome the inspirational, exciting, and educational opportunities that this restoration project will undoubtedly offer not just for the college students but for the visiting public and local communities. We are hopeful that, going forward, consideration might be given for educational seminar/lecture room facilities provided on site not just for Harlaxton College students and staff, but also for visiting student groups, charities, and organisations. In addition, LGT recommends that the position of plant sales should be reconsidered, perhaps nearer café and carpark, so that members of the public are able to carry purchased plants with relative ease to their vehicles. LGT has reservations, however, concerning the proposal for a boardwalk within a Grade II* Registered Park and Gardens. A boardwalk would not be in keeping within a nineteenth-century designed parkland pasture setting, where gravel or sand walks were more the norm for circuit walks to take in the parkland views.</p> <p>It seems that Gregory Gregory (1786-1854) was immensely proud of Harlaxton Manor's walled garden, since he agreed for it to be situated in full view on the main axial approach to his house, in order for it to be admired both by visitors, and by passers-by, for its unforgettable, mesmerising vista from the main road. Rather than being tucked away, it is shown off as specifically designed as the latest, most technologically advanced at that late Georgian period, and equally, if not more, impressive than his neighbour's, the Duke of Rutland's croquetted walled garden at Belvoir Castle.</p> <p>LGT supports the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Chairman Lincolnshire Gardens Trust</p>
Sefton Park	Merseyside	E22/0710	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION To erect 15no. 8m high floodlight columns to the existing tennis courts and to construct new footpath.</p> <p>Mersey Bowmen Tennis Club Aigburth Drive, Liverpool, L17 1AP. EXTERANL LIGHTING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Sefton Park, 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 I.</p> <p>We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and consider it is inevitable that the fifteen 8m high floodlights will have some visual impact on Sefton Park. The canopy height of the surrounding established tree cover is generally higher than 15 metres and therefore likely to provide a degree of screening for the lighting columns. However, it</p>

					<p>does appear that they will be most exposed when viewed from the south-east, from the area of the bowling club. On balance we agree with the conclusions of the Planning and Heritage Statement that the floodlighting will cause less than substantial harm to Sefton Park RPG.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst not wishing to object outright to the application, we would ask that Liverpool City Council assures itself that the public health and wellbeing benefits to be obtained from this proposal outweigh the harm caused to this Grade I historic park and garden, in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Policy 202.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Raynham Park	Norfolk	E22/0766	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of outdoor restaurant building, toilet block and provision of associated car park, and formation of access track Land At Grid Ref 588801.08 326994.39, Swaffham Road, Dunton, Norfolk MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee on the proposed erection of an outdoor restaurant building, toilet block, provision of associated car park, and formation of access track. The planning application is on land (Grid Ref 588801.08 326994.39) within Raynham Park, a Grade II Registered Park & Garden which has high significance as a setting for Raynham Hall, one of the most important country houses in Norfolk. As a multi-phase estate parkland, Raynham Park is a highly significant heritage asset in its own right. The Norfolk Gardens Trust submits this response on behalf of The Gardens Trust.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a comprehensive heritage statement and assessment with this application.</p> <p>The proposal is modest in scale and not a conspicuous feature, being timber framed, single-storey and sympathetic to the character of the landscape. It is remote from the hall, water tower and gardens (1.6km to the north east) and not visible from them, or from public roads.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are pleased to note that existing trees - particularly the copse to the west side which was part of the mid 18th century plantation belt to the estate - will be retained with only minor trimming.</p> <p>We understand that the facility is intended for private hire and use by community, social and corporate groups and is expected to be used approximately three days a month, except in the winter months. We welcome the fact that it will generate income to support ongoing maintenance and restoration of historic assets and will not result in harm to heritage assets or their setting.</p> <p>In short, The Gardens Trust has no objection to the proposed works</p>

					<p>which it considers in keeping with the heritage significance of Raynham Park.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Susan Grice Planning Officer, Norfolk Gardens Trust</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 PARKING</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Aynho Park, 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 Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response.</p> <p>We have studied the amended plans submitted and confirm we have little further comment following our letter of 14 July, remaining concerned about the proposals for the Southern Terrace. In particular, we are disappointed to note that the amount of clipped hedging proposed appears to have been increased. Whilst we appreciate this is unlikely to interrupt the southward views from the house as intended by Capability Brown's design, we would hope that the height is kept minimal to avoid interruption into views back to the south elevation of the house.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Scampston Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0669	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Plantations between The Firs and Wintringham Common Farm, woodland surrounding Scampston village, Lodge Plantation and woodland South of Lodge Plantation</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Scampston Hall, which is registered grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The designed landscape at Scampston Hall includes a park laid out to a design by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-1783) during the 1770's and which incorporated earlier 18th century features, possibly designed by an earlier important designer Charles Bridgeman (d.1738). The grade II* registration indicates that Scampston is a particularly important site of</p>

					<p>more than special interest. (This grade only applies to c. 28% of registered sites.)</p> <p>We understand that as this is a thinning licence only, there will be no restocking and that thinning is generally carried out to promote the growth of the remaining trees. (Compartments 2, 5A & 5B will be removed from this application as they are already covered by a previous approved licence.)</p> <p>The following compartments in the application are within the registered park and garden:</p> <p>3A – Mill Plantation, immediately north of Scampston Farm. Scot’s Pine.</p> <p>6A and 6B – small compartments/clumps of Scot’s and Corsican pine, on ‘The Plain’ which is the parkland. The parkland is largely used as pasture with other scattered mature trees, part of Brown’s design work where we trust that particular care will be taken.</p> <p>8A – Lodge Plantation, at a distance south of 9B but part of the western boundary plantation. Scot’s Pine and Corsican pine.</p> <p>9B – Spur to the north-west part of the western boundary plantation. Scot’s Pine and Corsican pine.</p> <p>10 – East of the Palladian Bridge (listed grade II*) which was designed by Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown or possibly his assistant Henry Holland c.1775. The Palladian Bridge is prominent in views from the park and parts of the garden. Compartment 10 is also east of the Lower Fish Pond/Lake and to the west of Rock House Plantation. Sycamore, beech, oak (robur and petraea) and ash.</p> <p>2 – this compartment – Park Plantation - is also within the registered park and garden and is part of the eastern boundary plantations. We think that it is shown on a map of 1829 by Edward Page. It is east of the cascade/waterfall that was designed by Brown. (Sir William St Quintin (5th baronet) wrote to Brown in 1773, ‘I have received the favour of your letter with the plan inclosed for the cascade which I like very much.’) Scot’s pine. There are two compartments outside the registered boundary but within the setting:</p> <p>14 – compartment north of 10 above. Mixed broadleaves and mixed conifers.</p> <p>3B – compartment south of 3A but just outside the registered boundary. Scot’s pine.</p> <p>As you will appreciate the above compartments proposed for thinning are integral to Scampston’s significant historic designed landscape with its</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>boundary plantations and incorporating views and vistas that are especially important in a naturally somewhat flat landscape on the southern edge of the Vale of Pickering. We trust that care in that regard has been taken in determining which trees to fell and which to leave to grow on. If this is the case, then the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the thinning work.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Middleton Lodge	North Yorkshire	E22/0736	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Acre Howden plantation, Lodge Covert, Acre Howden Spring Plantation, Rye Hill Plantation, land between Lodge, The Farmhouse, and The Coach House</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</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>Middleton Lodge, (Listed Grade II*, list entry number 1317085), was designed by John Carr of York and built between 1777 and 1780 for the barrister George Hartley with the grounds being laid out at a similar time. The Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of c 67ha consists of pleasure grounds, formal gardens, landscape park and walled kitchen garden. The main (west) drive, its entrance gateway and its additional gateway are also thought to have been designed by Carr. The grounds to the south of this were landscaped at the same time by an unknown designer; although the semi-circular clump of trees on the boundary to the south-east of the house, depicted on the 1838 'Plan of the Township of Middleton Tyas', and on the Operations and Restocking maps is characteristic of some of the designs produced by Adam Mickel II, (1747-1810). Mickel II was part of a dynasty of landscape designers, his father worked for Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and he himself completed numerous commissions in Yorkshire and is known to have worked with the architect John Foss at Swinton Park. However, the attribution of a designer at Middleton Lodge cannot be made with certainty on the present evidence. George Hartley died in 1780 before he took up residence at Middleton Lodge and subsequently, the stable block, by either John Carr or John Foss, and the walled garden were constructed. The park, permanent pasture with a scattering of mature</p>

					<p>trees including foreign specimens, is believed to have been laid out when the house was built in 1780. It is in the English natural landscape style favoured in the later C18. The house overlooks parkland to the north-east and south-east bordered by a belt of trees, which served to frame views in the middle distance while more distant tree planting break longer views to the moors beyond. Views of the house could be gained across parkland from Five Hills Lane to the south.</p> <p>Several of these original vistas are currently filtered by C20 planting near the house, but those to the east and south-east remain. Views of the park can also be enjoyed from the west drive.</p> <p>Compartment 1b is a boundary plantation including Rye Hill Plantation to the east, compartment 1d is Acre Howden Plantation and Lodge Covert at some distance to the north/north-east of the house and compartment 1e north of the house and east and north of the stable block (parts used as car parking) are to be thinned. We note Corsican pine on the schedule for this compartment. Corsican pine was introduced in 1759 and grows to form a picturesque tree that grows well in poorer conditions so would probably be a good species to retain here.</p> <p>Compartment 1a lies to the south of the house, partially outside the registered boundary and partly within, incorporating Lodge Gill a picturesque stream. Regenerative felling is proposed on the schedule. Is the Corsican pine growing in this compartment also being retained? As noted above it is a picturesque tree that grows well.</p> <p>Compartment 1c also to be regeneratively felled is of interest as it comprises Acre Howden Spring Plantation which is on the north-east boundary of the park. It is depicted on the 1854 6":1 mile OS map with the same name, drawn as rough ground with an open planting of mixed conifers and deciduous trees. The same features are drawn in more detail on the 1892 25": 1 mile map. It does not constitute a main view from the house or carriage drive and so perhaps this is one of the plantations extended by Edmund Backhouse in the mid- 19th century. (The register description mentions that "Edmund Backhouse may have extended some of the plantations, [and] added exotic specimen trees".)</p> <p>Thank you, Martina for your further information. We understand about ash dieback and that the ash to be felled are of mixed age but mainly less than 70 years old and that no exotics are to be felled. The pines are younger at probably c. 50 years old. The proposed restocking with oak and beech should be fine and to conform with the 19th century maps we suggest that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>some conifer is retained as maybe they are the exotics mentioned.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Val Hepworth</p> <p>Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Hornby Castle Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0746	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application New Covert Plantation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Hornby Park, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Hornby Castle Park, a medieval hunting park was modified as a landscaped pleasure gardens and park for Lord Holderness in the 1770s. The Earl of Holderness, a politician and also a patron and friend of Revd William Mason the poet and landscape gardener, holds the distinction of having employed Lancelot 'Capability' Brown at four estates: his country seat Sion Hill on the edge of London, Shillington in Bedfordshire and his two Yorkshire estates, Hornby near Bedale and Aston, near Sheffield. John Carr was employed at Hornby in the 1760's whilst Brown was at work on the landscape, creating a grass terrace around the castle that then rolled gently down to a string of serpentine lakes that appeared as a river in the middle ground as seen from the higher ground by the mansion; part of Brown's distinctive English landscape style, such an important design style developed from the mid-18th century. Brown planted new plantations encircling the estates giving privacy and also shelter to the rides that usually wound through them, but these were cut though occasionally to allow the passer-by to admire the landscape within. Clumps of native trees such as oak, beech and sweet chestnut broke the expanses of lawn and meadow, and there were individual specimens of exotic species such as Cedars of Lebanon and various firs. Meandering gravel paths, often edged with shrubs to hide them from the windows of the house, allowed the ladies to keep their feet dry when they walked out in damp weather. New Covert Plantation lies immediately within the north- eastern registered boundary and consists of compartments 1 and 2. Looking at OS 1st Ed 6 inches:1mile (1851): Cpt1 incorporates the little circular 'Fox Covert' with obviously later planting round it (shown on the</p>

					<p>OS 1inch: 1mile 1885-1900) and Cpt 2 incorporates 'West Close Plantation'. The map with the sale catalogue for the Hornby estate in 1930 shows Cpts 1 and 2 as they are now and are called 'New Covert Plantation'.</p> <p>Unfortunately, I don't know details about the trees here at Hornby. I presume that it is wet ground as there are willows and Taxodium (Swamp Cypress) proposed. The latter can grow to 35m, a size which may not be in scale with the other planting. Red Oaks should do fine here. They were introduced in 1724 and have been used historically in designed landscapes. Thank you, Marina for the very helpful further information:</p> <p>'Cpt 1 is currently dominated by elm (all dead or dying) with other mixed broadleaves. The intention is to fell the diseased elm and ash, and restock with 30% beech, 30% sweet chestnut, 20% Douglas fir and 20% Scots pine. Cpt 2 is currently a predominantly: 20 yr old oak plantation with several other (more mature) broadleaves on the western side, and semi-mature beech with other broadleaves on the most eastern third of the compartment. The owner's intention is to keep looking after and enhancing the oaks on the west and the beeches on the east. The proposed felling targets the diseases ash and elms (only 0.25 ha) and restocking with a few interesting specimens (mixed conifers including the swamp cypress and possibly 1-3 redwoods) and red oaks (to keep in line with the 'oak plantation theme' as well trial new species for resilience). The proposed restocking density in this 0.25 ha area is 1100 stems / ha, but any retained tree counts towards this density, so we are talking in the range of 100-200 new trees max.'</p> <p>And thank you so much for looking up the OS 1inch: 1mile 1885-1900 maps for us. We find the National Libraries of Scotland web site very useful as it contains old OS maps of the whole country in a very clearly visible format. Maybe you know that the link is https://maps.nls.uk/index.html. Select either "explore georeferenced maps" or "mapfinder with outlines" depending on the map series you want to view. There is also an option to view an old map with the satellite imagery either side by side or by changing the transparency of the view.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposals although we wonder if the mass and scale of the redwoods may be at odds with the current situation and eventually with the mass and scale of the other trees.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Thorp Perrow	North Yorkshire	E22/0808	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of Photo Voltaic ground mounted system Firby Hall Firby Bedale North Yorkshire SOLAR	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</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>Firby Hall is a large country house located approximately 1km south of Bedale. It dates from the late 18th century, with later additions in the 19th century. It was constructed in the late 18th century by Colonel Thomas Coores upon his return from the American War of Independence. He demolished the vast majority of the village of Firby to replace it with the country house that stands today and its surrounding 50 acre park. Firby lies to the north of Thorp Perrow, registered at grade II. The Solar panel array will be set out at the top (north) end of the horse arena, on the ground, and will comprise some 380 sqms of panels over 4 rows (measuring 20m+ each in length). The proposed location of a former horse arena is surrounded by trees. According to the heritage statement the western side is blocked by the walled garden wall. To the north and eastern sides are woodland and to the south which is closest to the house lies a 8 m high laurel hedge.</p> <p>There will not be any harm to the setting of the registered park and garden, nor for Firby Hall and we do not have any comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Kiplin Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0820	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Application for a New welcome centre with associated landscaping, drainage, signage and interpretation including alterations to existing drying yard walls Kiplin Hall Kiplin Richmond North	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The historic park and gardens at Kiplin Hall are not included on the Historic</p>

				<p>Yorkshire MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>England Register of Parks and Gardens but nevertheless are important regionally and to some extent nationally. The Jacobean house was built between 1622 and 1625 is listed grade I and its builder George Calvert was the first Lord Baltimore, proprietary founder of the colony of Maryland in the USA – Maryland is the only United States state where the founder’s home in England is still extant. There is no evidence to suggest that the Calverts laid out formal pleasure grounds around Kiplin Hall in the 17th century. The parkland begun in the mid- 18th century by the next family at Kiplin, the Crowe’s, included the creation of the serpentine lake or ‘fish pond’ that curved round the west of the house, by damning and channelling the Kiplin Beck. The serpentine lake has been lost due to the gravel extraction in the former western parkland and the formation of lakes in the late 20th century. Of the two subsequent families; the Carpenters during the late 1870’s and 1880’s had the new east entrance front and new drive with its avenue of lime trees, designed by William Eden Nesfield with formal gardens by Joseph Meston. Sarah Turner (nee Talbot) sold land between 1905 and 1930 reducing the estate to 120 acres, less than a quarter of the land purchased by George Calvert in 1619 and heralding the decline of Kiplin’s fortunes during much of the 20th century. Kiplin Hall is now a successful historic house and garden visitor attraction with more than 30,000 annual visitors. There has been a need for augmented visitor facilities for some time to sustain its long-term future. This application includes alterations to the existing historic drying yard walls and the formation of the new Welcome Centre on the land immediately outside the west drying ground wall on the edge of open woodland to the north of the main house. Most of the drying yard north and west walls will be retained and conserved as will the east wall which is in much better condition.</p> <p>This is a very well-considered and well-documented application. The Design and Access Statement and Landscape Strategy are comprehensive, easily understood and indicate a sensitive proposal to develop a new welcome centre with ticketing, retail, tearoom and exhibition space utilising an area that has been under-used but accessible from the existing entrance drive from the north and the existing car park. We understand that the scheme’s siting strategy, layout, form, materials and landscaping have been developed with input and support from Historic England and Hambleton DC Conservation and Planning officers. We have no objection to this application and support this sensitive</p>
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	---

					<p>development of the facilities at Kiplin Hall.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Rudding Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0831	II	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application The Whins</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Rudding Park, which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Rudding Park is notable for its links with Humphry Repton who drew up a Red Book in 1790 for its then owner Lord Loughborough, and then later the work on the gardens by James Russell in the mid- 20th Century.</p> <p>Compartment 20a is the south-western belt of the Whins which lies to the south -west of the registered boundary of Rudding Park, south of the A658 road. It is outside the registered boundary but has been part of the estate and can be considered as part of the setting. We understand that the compartment is mainly mid rotation Ash, Oak, Birch and Cherry, (approx. 40 years old). Ash is about 75% of standing crop with evidence of early onset die-back. Some larger semi-mature Oak, Beech and Sycamore adjacent to southern boundary are to be retained. A Footpath/Cycle route follows the southern boundary.</p> <p>There is to be 100% restocking of the Ash felled area with 20% Sycamore, Acer pseudoplatanus, and the remaining 80% divided equally between Pedunculate Oak, Quercus robur and Small-leaved Lime, Tilia cordata. We presume that the arrangement of the species in the restocking will be dependent on a variety of factors and trust that the future aesthetic qualities of the woodland both as part of the setting of historic Rudding Park and for public enjoyment will be taken into consideration in this replanting.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the felling and restocking of this compartment.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>

Aske Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0860	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building Consent to Dismantle Existing Stone Gate Pier, Construct New Stone Walls to Include Formation of Bin Store Recess, Piers and Wrought Iron Gates at Aske Hall, Aske, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL10 5HJ</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.09.2022</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 – Aske Hall 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 Registered Park and Garden extends to c. 165ha with the present footprint essentially established by the Wharton Family who owned Aske between 1611 and 1727. It was subsequently embellished by Sir Conyers D'Arcy between 1727 and 1758 followed by Sir Lawrence Dundas and his successors from 1763. Sir Lawrence approached Lancelot 'Capability' Brown to plan the grounds in 1769 although it seems that his proposals were not implemented at the time. In the 19th century William Andrews Nesfield (1793-1881) may also have been involved – the large cedars and ornamental conifers in the pleasure grounds near the Hall may have been planted at his suggestion.</p> <p>Aske Hall is listed grade I with its Chapel Range extending north-eastwards listed grade II* and which originated as a stable block of 1763 designed by John Carr of York. It was converted to a chapel and estate office in 1887 when a new stable block was built. This proposal is for the approach to the east side of the Chapel Range and the family entrance to the Hall and overlooks the pleasure grounds immediately to the north of the Hall. In addition to the new pair of stone entrance piers and wrought iron gates there will be a small bin recess which should help to reduce their harmful impact on the setting of the heritage assets.</p> <p>This is a well-documented application proposing high quality materials in sympathy with the existing structures. We note that the drive is to be re-aligned and trust that care will be taken to protect the root zone of any of the adjacent trees in the pleasure grounds that may be affected.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this planning application which should have minimal impact on the historic park and garden.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
-----------	--------------------	----------	-----	---	--

Christ Church	Oxfordshire	E22/0787	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Alterations to landscaping and paving. Installation of railings, gates, lighting and rain water drainage channel.</p> <p>Christ Church College St Aldate's Oxford</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Christ Church, 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 I. We have liaised with our colleagues in Oxfordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs their joint response. We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and would like to make the following comments. We understand that both a Conservation Management Plan and a Tree Strategy have been prepared for the Christ Church Meadows, yet neither of these documents appears to have been referred to in the preparation of the Design, Access and Heritage Statement.</p> <p>There is a precedent for railings along New Walk (which dates from 1865 and not C17 as stated) and replacing these following the existing style makes sense. We would advise that the railings should be extended further alongside the maintenance compound too. Where we do have some concerns is with the relative alignment of the trees, railing and grass verge. Historically it is really important that the railing line is OUTSIDE the tree line so that the walk has a grass margin planted with trees, as has been achieved along the Broad Walk through the realignment of the railings. We are currently rather confused by the Proposed Landscaping Plans, Drawings 2000 and 2003 which appear to appear to show the proposed railings weaving in and out of the avenue trees. There is also little detail included in the application about the proposed soft landscaping.</p> <p>To summarise: whilst the Gardens Trust and Oxfordshire Gardens Trust do not wish to object outright to this application we would be grateful for clarification of the proposed railing alignment relative to the avenue trees, and to be provided with further details of the proposed landscaping.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Bishops Palace, Wells	Somerset	E22/0726	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION and Listed Building Consent Erection of a visitor reception building into the forecourt at the Bishop's Palace. The Bishops Palace</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Bishop's Palace, Wells, 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>

				Market Place Wells Somerset BA5 2PD. VISITOR FACILITIES	<p>We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and note the small scale of the building and its location near the modern cafe building. We welcome the similar construction and materials of the reception building to the café, a copper-clad timber framed building and agree that this will enable it to be recessive in the Forecourt landscape. Whilst it will be visible, it will cause less than substantial harm to the landscape and in general, we have no concerns with this part of the application.</p> <p>Where we do have concerns is with the proposal to create an additional straight foot path from the gatehouse to the new reception building, cutting across the historic elliptical lawn of the Forecourt. Not only would this appear to be so close to the existing sweep of driveway/footpath immediately to the west as to be totally unnecessary, it would also cause harm to this feature of the historic landscape. In addition, in the application detailed measures are described for the protection of the trees in the area of the new reception building, including soil decompaction and amelioration but the construction of a footpath along this line, with its subsequent pedestrian traffic is likely to increase stress on tree T1 (Black Walnut) which is immediately adjacent and such a feature of the Forecourt lawn.</p> <p>To summarise: whilst the Gardens Trust has no objection to the construction of the new reception building, we do object to the new footpath across the Forecourt lawn.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Marston House	Somerset	E22/0758	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Application for Outline Planning Permission with some matters reserved for change of use and 2no. travellers caravan pitches with details of access/landscaping/layout/scale. (part retrospective) Land At 376979 145064 Bulls Quarries Road Tytherington Frome Somerset MISCELLANEOUS	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Marston 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. We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and welcome the additional details supplied following our concerns expressed in response to pre-application consultation 2021/1365/L4PA dated 29 June 2021. We appreciate the application has arisen from a particularly complex planning history for this site, in an attempt to resolve the problem of unauthorized development.

					<p>The conclusions of both the Design & Access Statement and the Planning & Heritage Statement state that the impact of the proposed development on the Registered Park & Garden will be neutral, owing to the replanting of trees in accordance with the requirements of a Forestry Commission Tree Restocking Notice for 110 trees, to replace the specimens already felled. Whilst the Gardens Trust would agree that this may well be the case in 50 or 100 years when the trees have matured sufficiently to provide a screening canopy, the unauthorized felling has already resulted in less than substantial harm to the RPG which cannot be rectified quickly. We also have concerns that none of the new planting is being used to screen the structures from the RPG, and this appears to rely solely on the proposed boundary fencing, of which no details appear to be available yet, and established planting within the RPG to the west.</p> <p>We accept that the Mendip Local Plan Part 2 identifies a significant shortfall in Gypsy and Traveller pitches and can only advise that this need should be considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the Marston House RPG if permission is to be granted for the development. Over the past few years, we have been included in consultations relating to another travellers' site impacting in Marston House RPG, at Marston Bigot. With this proposal now granted permission we had hoped that the need for travellers' pitches in the immediate vicinity of Marston House was now satisfied and have general concerns regarding on-going small-scale erosion of the RPG boundary and the resulting cumulative damage.</p> <p>To summarise, whilst the Gardens Trust welcomes the additional details submitted for this proposal we remain concerned about the impact of another travellers' site on the Marston House RPG and consider that the design of the proposed replanting could be improved to strengthen the longer term screening of this development from the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Cricket House	Somerset	E22/0816	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a lean-to steel framed, profiled metal clad extension to an existing cheese manufacturing factory</p> <p>Manor Farm, Lubborn Cheese Ltd</p> <p>Windwhistle Cricket St Thomas</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Cricket 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*. We have liaised with our colleagues in Somerset Gardens Trust and their local knowledge and recent site visit informs this</p>

				Chard Somerset TA20 4BZ BUILDING ALTERATION	<p>joint response.</p> <p>We have studied the documents submitted in support of the application and are disappointed that there appears to be no Heritage Appraisal and Impact Assessment on the Cricket House RPG included. On 11 May this year we submitted comments in response to planning applications 21/03236/FUL and 22/00771/FUL and many of the comments made then remain relevant to this latest application. We accept that the successful cheese factory has necessitated expansion over the past twenty years and in general do not object to the current application for a small extension. However, we would advise that additional screen planting should be included as a condition of any permission being granted.</p> <p>The success of the factory has resulted in this area of the RPG becoming overdeveloped and the Gardens Trust and Somerset Gardens Trust consider a further condition should be imposed on any consent that, a long-term planting and conservation management plan is produced. Although the production area is currently well hidden by maturing Cupressus, when these pass maturity their screening effect will start to wain and it is essential that more planting is undertaken in and around the site to ensure a continuity of screening to reduce the impact on the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Patshull Hall RECONSULTATION	Staffordshire	E21/2101	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of modern hotel extensions and removal of hard standing car parking, retention of the listed Temple, siting of 100 holiday lodges and construction of new Boathouse Central Facilities Building, including associated access, parking and servicing</p> <p>Patshull Park Hotel Golf And Country Club Patshull Park Burnhill Green WV6 7HR</p> <p>DEMOLITION, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the SGPT and The Gardens Trust on the additional information submitted by the applicants' agent. As in our initial consultation response of 16 March 2022 SGPT is commenting on behalf of both trusts in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two organisations.</p> <p>The Trusts have carefully reviewed the additional material and rebuttal statements provided by the planning agent and heritage advisor. While we remain supportive of the principle of demolishing the modern hotel extensions attached to the grade II* listed Temple we remain concerned at the lack of information about the extent of demolition anticipated (e.g does it include the 19th century cottage for example, a feature of historic interest in its own right), treatment of demolition scars, fabric repairs and proposed future use. Fuller information is required before we can fully endorse this aspect of the applications.</p> <p>The Trusts remain concerned at the lack of analysis of the historic</p>

					<p>landscape; how missing or damaged features and planting might be recreated and managed for the future; and how the proposed holiday chalets/lodges would be accommodated within it. Insufficient information is provided about the proposed fence around the development such as its height, design, colour and any measures to avert it appearing an arbitrary intrusion into the parkland. The proposed design of the chalets/lodges remains insensitive; the tenancy/lease/licence arrangements for individual occupiers remains unclear. These and other matters must be clarified in detail before determination of the applications. This would demonstrate that the applicants have a clear understanding of the historic significance of the site; how the development has been devised to respect and integrate into the historic setting and that they have prepared robust, enforceable management procedures in place to protect and uphold that heritage significance. The answers to these matters are fundamental to understanding the impact of the scheme in heritage terms and cannot be deferred, as suggested by the applicants' agents, to resolution through planning conditions. Their absence is a serious omission from the application.</p> <p>The Trusts dispute the applicants' argument that because the development site comprises only a limited proportion of the RPG and designed landscape it should be found acceptable thereby. Designed landscapes can rarely be divided into self-contained compartments. Their character and appearance derives from the integrity of the whole design whether as the work of a single creation or from cumulative evolution over time. Although Patshull Park contains elements from the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries the key components pertinent to the current applications are the sequence of wood pastures running south from the Hall across Middle Ley past the church into Far Ley where they are bound together by the mid 18th century Great Pool created by Lancelot Brown. The current proposal to subdivide this sequence would create an artificial segregation at variance with its historic character. The intrusion into the open space of roadways and other structures at the high density shown on the revised Masterplan of 19 May 2022 would harmfully alter both its internal appearance and views of it from other parts of the wider historic park (for example from across Great Pool). Redistributing the lodges further away from the Temple would be useful but would not mitigate their overall intrusive presence in the historic park.</p> <p>While the Trusts agree there is potential public benefit from increased</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>public access to and across the site as suggested in the submission creation of permissive rights of way is not exclusively contingent on granting planning permission for the development. The applicants' arguments in this respect are misleading. No compelling argument has been submitted to show that commercial development is a public benefit essential for the future upkeep of the parkland such as to outweigh harm to the heritage of the park. The Trusts reiterate that reversion to grazing would be an acceptable reuse of the site and be fully in accordance with its use historically.</p> <p>In conclusion the Trusts concur with the views of Historic England and your Council's conservation officer that the rebuttal material submitted by the planning agent and heritage advisor does not give cause to revise our previous overall objection to the applications. While supportive of the principle of demolishing the existing modern hotel as an enhancement to the setting of the grade II* listed temple and the wider setting of the grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden the Trusts remain of the view that these applications are deficient in information and, on the basis of the evidence provided, will cause severe harm to the significance of the heritage assets. No overriding public benefits are adduced. The Trusts still consider the applications should be refused.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E22/0631	I	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Land West of A61 and South of Sandy Gate	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.09.2022</p> <p>You will have received our letter on this felling consultation dated 22nd August where we explained the difficulties that we have assessing such a complex consultation and thank you for your additional summary information as follows:</p> <p>"Harewood (Grade I Registered Parkland) is proposing maintenance felling on approx. 340 ha of their woodland Estate. By maintenance felling it is meant thinning, which is mostly overdue on the Estate as very little felling took place since 2008, and regeneration felling.</p> <p>The plan of operation spreadsheet might contain multiple entries for the same compartment (cpt). This happens in the instances where the Estate wants to undertake more than one felling operation type on the same cpt (e.g. T – thinning – and RF – regeneration felling).</p> <p>For the vast majority of cpts, the proposal is in line with standard felling operations i.e. discerning felling followed by adequate restocking, avoiding</p>

					<p>monocultures and non-natives (*the latter being a recent common spread tendency rather than a UKFS prescription). In fact, you will see a blanket approach by the Estate to restock with 40% pedunculate / sessile oak, 20% mixed broadleaves, 10% shrubs, 10% open space, 10% lime, 10% mixed conifers (Scots pine preferred) at a density of 1800 stems / ha. Again, this is a standard approach and we (FC, NE and HE) had no concerns over it so far.</p> <p>However, we would particularly appreciate your comments on the proposed felling for cpt 17a and 17b (Carr Park). The Estate is proposing the partial deforestation (75% felling) and restock 5% to convert the site into woodland pasture. “</p> <p>Unfortunately, my colleague, Peter Goodchild, has been unwell and he has more knowledge than I of the historical development of the designed landscape at Harewood. He may be able to give you further insights via e-mail next week, but I would like to offer the following comments:</p> <p>I would like to point out two sources of information in addition to the early OS maps that I’ve been looking at.</p> <p>There is the Teal’s map of Harewood of 1796 which is very helpful in relation to compartments 17a and b, and probably for others. For 17a and b it shows one or two small clumps on the edge of Carr Park and one around a pond further out in the park. There are a number of scattered individual trees but no large areas of woodland within it. Clearly it, Carr House Park, was then open space with a few small clumps and individual trees to animate it. We are sure it was meant to be seen from the House as part of the whole expansive scene. It would make the lake much less enclosed on its southern side and the space of the park, as a whole, more freely flowing, instead of being rather restricted at its western end.</p> <p>The other source of possible information is Plate 16 from John Claudius Loudon, ‘Country Residences’ London 1806, vol 2. I think that Loudon shows the view of the lake as seen from the ‘lawn’ in front of the house both as it existed at that time and his proposals. Peter will have a good copy but there are clearly on the drawing as existing, individual trees, small clumps and longer groups all very attractively laid out with pasture between. I don’t think that Loudon’s proposals were actually carried out but Peter will be able to advise.</p> <p>Clearly Cpts 17a and 17b are significant in views from the house and the boat house terrace across to the south side of the lake/fish pond.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Looking at the 1909 OS map it was clearly pasture with tree clumps and this was the case largely until 1951 estate map. The OS 25 inch sheet CLXXXVIII.10 surveyed 1888-1892 is much as 1909 ie Carr Plantation doesn't exist, as the whole area is parkland (Carr House Park) including cpts 17a and 17b with clumps and loose belts and scattered trees.</p> <p>OS 1st Ed 6 inches surveyed 1846-47 and published 1851 (sheet 188) is an even sparser treed version than 1888 with some lines of trees possibly from old field boundaries, so largely pasture as a backdrop to the lake when looking from the house but the east (Piper Wood) and south (Hazelwood Leys) are flanking boundary plantations of Carr House Park. The term Hazelwood Leys makes me think that was originally a hazel coppice wood with meadow perhaps, so more open than dense canopied trees.</p> <p>We would say therefore that 1888/1909 maps should be the guide to felling and replanting – this would be a type of wood pasture but not evenly planted rather following the OS map as a guide.</p> <p>Cpt 18a has Stub House Beck running through it and I would be concerned to expose this by felling but it will be replanted. Only deciduous trees are shown on OS sheet CLXXXVIII.SW surveyed 1891-2, published 1894.</p> <p>Cpt 23b to East of New Bridge and North of Beech Bank is woodland on 1st Ed (surveyed 1846-7) with some conifers on OS 1891-92.</p> <p>Cpt 25g is Grey Stone Whin immediately south of Grey Stone Pasture. Shown as woodland, presumably lots of gorse too, and more or less no conifers on CLXXXVIII. SW surveyed 1891-2 and published 1894.</p> <p>We can't find cpt 32a.</p> <p>With our time limitations and my lack of detailed knowledge of the woodland at Harewood, we have not considered the species suggested for replanting. We would also point out the importance of any relationships between historic walks/rides and views.</p> <p>So, in summary as far as we are able, we think that the 1888/1909 maps should be the guide to felling and replanting. This would be a type of wood pasture but not evenly planted rather following the OS map as a guide (and also maybe Loudon as noted above). The several veteran trees should remain – they must have been present when the early OS maps were being surveyed. Could the English bluebells and dog's mercury come in from adjacent ASNW in the past 60/70years? As I wrote in our previous letter Harewood is a grade I for its designed landscape and breadth of significant designers that have been associated with it. So, we think that to return to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>the historic designed landscape situation as shown on the early maps for cpts 17a and 17b would be an interesting contrast to ASNW elsewhere and would also give a breadth of land management for the future.</p> <p>We would also like you to note particularly in complex consultations such as this one, that it would be useful to us to know of the particular areas, where our knowledge can be most helpful.</p> <p>Peter has complied some comments about the documents that the Forestry Commission sent to YGT in connection with the Felling Licence for the Harewood Estate. They indicate our difficulties as volunteers with historic designed landscape expertise, but without the detailed forestry knowledge of officers at the Forestry Commission. We are attaching these comments.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning cc. Chris Mayes, Landscape Architect North of England, Historic England e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk; Conservation@ the Gardens Trust</p> <p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) has recently received two sets of consultation documents from the Forestry Commission concerning the Harewood Estate, near Leeds. 1. Woodland Creation Harewood Estate EIA-2022-0304. 2. FW: 012/2496/2022 Harewood Estate – Felling Licence Consultation.</p> <p>2. The notes and comments set out in this document relate to the second of these, namely the Felling Licence Consultation FW: 012/2496/2022. The documents provided by the Forestry Commission in connection with this include: (i) a completed 'Basic Details Form' for the proposed felling. Ref.37141 of 28/09/2021 (ii) a spread sheet setting out the details of the proposed felling and restocking. (iii) two sets of maps showing the parts of the Harewood Estate affected by the proposals with the reference numbers of the woodland compartments involved. One set of maps shows the compartments where felling is proposed. The other shows the areas where restocking is to take place. (iv) a key to the abbreviations used for the various tree species involved.</p> <p>3. The spread sheet is divided into 5 sets of vertical columns: Set 1: Sub-Compartment Record. Set 2: Felling. Set 3: Notes [on Felling and Restocking]. Set 4: Restocking. Set 5: [Additional notes about designations (?)]</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>4. The headings of the columns in Set 1 (Sub-Compartment Record) are: 1. Cpt [Compartment reference no, 1, 2, 3, etc.] 2. Sub Cpt [Sub-Compartment reference letter, a, b, c etc] 3. Area (Ha) Gross. 4. Area (Ha) Net. 5. FC digitised Area (Ha). 6. Species. 7. Designations.</p> <p>5. The headings of the columns in Set 2 (Felling) are: 1. Area to be felled (ha) 2. % of compartment area to be felled (auto generated) 3. Confirmed felling area (Ha) (auto generated) 4. Type of Felling. 5. Identify species of more than 20% of the volume to be felled. Below 20%, record as MB or MC. [NB within Set 2, there is a separate column for each species.] 6. Est[imated] Vol[ume] (m3) con[ifers]</p> <p>7. Est[imated] Vol[ume] bdlv [broadleaved] 8. Pref[erred] Felling Year</p> <p>6. The headings of the columns in Set 3 (Notes [on Felling and Restocking]) are: 1. Notes (use this column for felling and restocking notes).</p> <p>7. The headings of the columns in Set 4 (Restocking) are: 1. Restock area (ha). 2. % of compartment to be restocked. (auto generated) 3. Confirmed restock Area (ha). (auto generated) 4. % of open space. 5. Spp: Species to be restocked. %: percentage of restock area, split by species. [NB There are 2 columns for each species; the first is for the species, the second for the percentage. The species are recorded by using standard abbreviations which are explained in a separate document. See item 2 (iv), above. 6. Total % including open space must equal 100%. (auto generated) 7. Stocking Density (Stems per Hectare). 8. % established by natural regeneration. 9. Confirm the restock proposal type.</p> <p>8. The headings of the columns in Set 5 ([Additional notes on designations]) are: 1. TPO [Tree Preservation Order] [Answer Yes/No] 2. Conservation Area. [Answer Yes/No] 3. Is the PAWS restoration [Answer Yes/No] [What is PAWS and the missing text?] 4. TPO /CA Details. Details of TPO / conservation Area. Only required if either TPO or CA is "Yes".</p> <p>9. Three main problems for members of the YGT when commenting on a Felling Licence are: 1. How to extract from the spread sheet, the information that is needed. 2. How to relate information from the spread sheet to the maps showing the affected compartments/sub-compartments. 3. How to form an overall picture of how the proposals will affect the appearance and historical character of the place in question as a whole, as well as in parts.</p> <p>10. Extracting information from the spread sheet. (i) The spread sheet contains a great deal of information, all of which is presumably needed for</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the purposes of the Forestry Commission. For people who are not professional foresters, the information is presented in a very dense way and this makes it difficult to read and use without enlarging it. This can be done on a computer screen, but it complicates interrupts the process of reading across the spread sheet. (ii) Allowance needs to be made for those who find it easier and wish to use the spread sheet as a paper document. Even when printed out at A3 size, it is very crowded and the text is too small to be read comfortably. To print it at A2 size makes it cumbersome to use and expensive to print (about £13 per sheet at a printing shop in York). (iii) For the purposes of the YGT, and perhaps other consultees, a simpler and clearer way of presenting the information in the spread sheet needs to be found. For printouts, this needs to be one that can be comfortably read and used at A4 or A3 size.</p> <p>(iv) I can think of 2 potential approaches to improving this situation from the point of view of the YGT and perhaps other consultees: (a) Could the spread sheet be split so that it is presented as more than one page? For example, could it be split into: - page 1: all of Set 1 columns (Sub-compartment Records), with all of Set 5 columns (Additional notes on designations). This would have the advantage of bringing together information about the various designations affecting the various sub-compartments in question. - page 2: columns 1 and 2 of Set 1 (Sub-compartment ref. nos), with all the columns of Set 2 (Felling) and Ser 3 (Notes). - page 3: columns 1 and 2 of Set 1 (Sub-compartment ref. nos), with all the columns of Set 4 Restocking) and Set 3 (Notes). (b) Could one set of the reformatted spread sheet have the number of vertical columns reduced to those that are of particular relevance to the YGT (and perhaps other consultees)? This would require discussion about which are the most useful columns for the purposes of the YGT. This might help to improve the readability of the spread sheet. Another version of the reformatted set could have the full number of columns, so that the all the other information is available for situations where it might be useful to the YGT.</p> <p>11. Maps with information from the spread sheet. (i) Could information that is of particular importance to the YGT when commenting on the felling and restocking, be indicated on the maps that show the sub-compartments that will be affected by the licence? (ii) the YGT and the FC would need to discuss which would be the most helpful types of information that would be shown on the maps. I have prepared a table showing the headings of the columns of the spread sheet. This could be used to identify which</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>columns and their information would be most useful to have in map form.</p> <p>12. Forming an overall picture. Both a simplified presentation of the information in the spread sheet and also providing key information in map form would greatly assist the YGT in the building up of an overall picture of the effects of felling and restocking proposals. In the case of proposals that affect a large and significant area of an historic park (such as on the Harewood estate), it is particularly important for the YGT to be able to understand their overall and long term effects. The character and appearance of whole area is as important as those of its parts.</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E22/0785	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of electric gates</p> <p>5-8 Norwood Fold Menston Ilkley</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Listed Building, HE ref 1240191; and set within the grounds of High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT’s behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>High Royds Hospital was built as a mental hospital by West Riding County Council, and it was opened in 1888. It had been designed by the County Surveyor, Vickers Edwards. Edwards adopted an “echelon” layout for the wards – only the second such building in England. Constructed around the centre of its 100ha site the Hospital enjoyed a generous boundary of fields and trees.</p> <p>The hospital closed in 2003 and it has been progressively converted to residential use since 2007 to the present day. The site now consists of a carefully managed mix of original hospital buildings, now converted to residential use, and groups of new dwellings. This application concerns a location within a cul-de-sac of new detached dwellings. Whilst the proposed gates and associated fencing/railings do not directly impact on either the original buildings, nor the parkland setting, they do play a part in the overall well-controlled architectural arrangement of the site.</p> <p>The proposed installation appears to be practical in principle, but we are concerned at the lack of resolved final design. We are concerned that the submitted documents note that only the location is indicated, and not the final design. As “sketched”, the design appears to propose unnecessarily high gates (should be no higher than adjacent masonry piers),</p>

					<p>unnecessarily fiddly gate profile and unresolved abutment to existing adjacent railings. Because of these unresolved details we object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Thornes Park	West Yorkshire	E22/0814	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION extension to the existing children's play area with associated equipment, surfacing and fencing.</p> <p>Thornes Park Stadium, Thornes Park, Horbury Road PLAY AREA</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Thornes Park, a public park which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. It was very useful to have our telephone conversation about this planning application and the one for Clarence Park Lodge the other day.</p> <p>As you will know Thornes Park consists of three historically distinct areas of landscaping, the earliest dating from the later 18th century. With Clarence Park and Holmfield Park, it forms a large parkland to the south- west of the centre of Wakefield, and the features include the earthwork remains of a former motte and bailey castle, a rose garden within the old kitchen garden of Thornes House (house now lost), gate lodges and two drinking fountains. It is a good example of an urban municipal park of the late 19th and early 20th centuries where the layout survives almost intact. It has added interest in a late 18th century landscape possibly designed by John Carr of York.</p> <p>The playground is located in the northern area of Thornes Park away from the most historic features and the proposed playground extension is between the existing main playground and its large car park. We note the comments of your Authority's Senior Arboricultural Officer and support his points that it is unclear whether adjacent trees will be impacted. This should be determined, and steps taken to protect the trees as he proposes. We are unsure as to whether there should be any new tree planting, but your Arboricultural Officer can advise. We are aware that from a safety point of view that there should be clear sight-lines for the children's carers between the parking, seating and playing areas.</p> <p>The parks and countryside officers will be aware that the Wild Flower Area</p>

					<p>immediately to the north of the play area will need careful management to ensure that the wild flowers thrive. The land needs to be nutrient-poor, so if currently grass, it will need mowing and the arisings (mowings) removed to reduce the fertility until it can accommodate the successful growth of wild flowers. It is likely that some hand weeding to remove invasive grasses and weed species will be required in the first years. Maybe this could be supervised and done by pupils from a local primary school? The area will need to be mown after the flowers have set seed, say during August annually and the arisings again removed.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposal and trust that it will increase the community value and use of the park.</p> <p>You may not know that the YGT runs a Small Grant Scheme which may be useful for small projects or as additional funding for larger schemes in historic parks and gardens where there is public access and details can be found on our website.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Thornes Park	West Yorkshire	E22/0815	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Use of existing building to provide residential accommodation and care for no more than two children (Use Class C2); and addition of windows to south elevation Clarence Park Lodge , Lawefield Lane, Wakefield BUILDING ALTERATION, MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Thornes Park, a public park which is registered grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. It was very useful to have our telephone conversation about this planning application and the one for the children's playground the other day.</p> <p>As you will know Thornes Park consists of three historically distinct areas of landscaping, the earliest dating from the later 18th century. With Clarence Park and Holmfield Park, it forms a large parkland to the south- west of the centre of Wakefield, and the features include the earthwork remains of a former motte and bailey castle, a rose garden within the old kitchen garden of Thornes House (house now lost), gate lodges and two drinking fountains. It is a good example of an urban municipal park of the late 19th and early 20th centuries where the layout survives almost intact. It has</p>

					<p>added interest in a late 18th century landscape possibly designed by John Carr of York.</p> <p>Clarence Park Lodge lies to the north within the former Clarence Park. This small red brick lodge was erected between 1893 and 1907 as part of the landscaping of the new Park. It is one and a half storeys with a steeply pitched roof and a gable facing into the park. The upper floor wall projects and is tile hung with dentils below, and the apex of the gable is timber framed.</p> <p>Externally the proposal includes an additional window in the side elevation to the south constructed of wood to match the existing and above this a new roof light in black metal. This elevation faces down the park, and the additional windows will somewhat alter the aesthetic quality of the lodge, however we support the revised use of Clarence Park Lodge particularly as we noted that at the time of the registration of Thornes Park it was boarded up and unused.</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>
Bretton Hall	West Yorkshire	E22/0821	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>To replace existing changing rooms which are no longer fit for purpose</p> <p>Bretton Village Cricket Club , Park Lane, Bretton</p> <p>SPORT/LEISURE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II*. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Bretton Village Cricket Club and Cricket Ground lies just within the northern boundary of Bretton Hall registered park and garden southwest of Bretton Lodge and within the West Bretton Conservation Area. It is separated from the main parkland by a belt of trees. The land here slopes slightly to the east, whereas the registered parkland beyond the trees slopes to the south. As a result, this area cannot be viewed from within the main area of the registered site and the Yorkshire Sculpture Park.</p> <p>The development site is an old (1940s) detached timber- built pavilion with</p>

					<p>a newer attached garage to its southern end. The property is constructed of timber with a gable roof with felt tiles. It is clad with green timber – a feature to remain. The proposal is for a single storey replacement to the end section of the pavilion (north end) to give improved facilities.</p> <p>We consider that the application will result in less than substantial harm to the registered park and garden and the Conservation Area and we have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Ledston Hall and Park	West Yorkshire	E22/0830	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed Building Application to dismantle and rebuild two sets of garden steps within the West garden</p> <p>Ledston Hall Hall Lane Ledston</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 27.09.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case the park and garden at Ledston Hall is registered grade II* with the Hall listed grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Ledston Hall is significant as a fine example of an English Country House estate with a long history. The Park has 17C origins and the walled gardens and terraces are probably of a late 17C date with later additions/changes. The gardens, designed landscape and park registered at grade II* means that it is a nationally important site of more than special interest. The garden steps are listed grade II.</p> <p>The West Gardens ('Fore Garden') may have been laid out in the 17th century. They are shown on one of John Settrington's series of paintings in 1728 and the steps are clearly visible leading down into the formal gardens within the enclosures that remain today. The 'Fore Garden' but not details of the steps are shown on an Estate Plan of 1770. The steps are clearly shown on the OS 25 inch:1mile map surveyed 189 and published in 1892. The steps are in a very poor condition with many stones suffering subsidence and metal cramps have also caused damage to the stonework. The planning application proposes to dismantle and rebuild the steps using conservation techniques. We understand that both a pre-commencement record and watching brief are to be integral to the works. This will be very helpful to our understanding of the development of the Hall and its designed landscape.</p>

					<p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust support this careful conservation work that will enable the residents and the visitors to Ledston Hall to enjoy the gardens in safety and secure the future of the steps.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---