



GT AND CGT CONSERVATION CASEWORK RESPONSES NOVEMBER 2022

The GT conservation team received 232 new cases and re-consultations for England and seven for Wales in September. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 74 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Bristol Zoo Gardens	Avon	E22/0519	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Redevelopment of site to include 201 residential units (Class C3), the provision of community floorspace (Class E, F1 and F2), and open space with associated landscaping, play space, parking, accesses (pedestrian, cycle and vehicular), infrastructure, works to listed buildings, and selective demolition of buildings. (Major) Bristol Zoo Gardens, Guthrie Road, Clifton, Bristol BS8 3HA MAJOR HYBRID	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022 The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such applications. The Trust refers to the above planning application and our letter of 7th July 2022 which provides our comments on the original submission. Thank you for inviting us to further comment on the revised drawings. The revised proposals include a reduction of the number of residential units from 201 to 196, reduction in height of the extension to the clock tower building, changes to materials and elevational treatments of the proposed buildings, and changes to the design of the pedestrian accesses and pocket park on the north east corner of the site. However, the Trust remains concerned at the impact of the proposed development on this Local Historic Park/Garden and on the character of this part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area. The Trust is still strongly of the opinion that the proposed extent and scale of development, and the site layout, would result in the Zoo Gardens being enclosed by

					<p>extensive and overbearing blocks of development. The essential character and quality of the Zoo Gardens would be lost, with resultant impact to the character of this part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area. Although the gardens would be open to the public, the massing of development and introduction of vehicles to the site would reduce the quality of visitor experience.</p> <p>The Trust also remains concerned at the impact on trees, in particular TPO trees. The development would result in the loss of 80 trees and 31 groups or part groups of trees. The translocation of 17 trees and 11 part groups (41 total trees), and 2 hedges is proposed as part of the proposals, but the Trust is concerned as to whether such translocations would be successful. Whilst the Arboricultural Report includes a drainage plan overlay showing root protection areas, there will be a need for other below ground services and the location of these may result in further trees needing to be removed, and difficulty in accommodating new planting. The proximity of some trees to proposed buildings, and the need for working areas and construction compounds, may also result in difficulties during the construction period leading to the loss of further trees. Future residents of the development may also call for trees to be removed where they are considered to be too close to windows, and block views out, even where daylight and sun lighting requirements are met.</p> <p>Summary:- The Trust maintains its objection to the proposed development as it considers that the proposed development would be in contravention of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy Policy BCS22. The proposed development would fail to 'safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance', namely the Local Historic Park / Garden of Bristol Zoo Gardens. .</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chair, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Cote House	Avon	E22/1249	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application for full planning permission and listed building consent for internal and external works to Cote House including amendments the layout of existing apartments (Use Class C3), restoration of existing</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 18.11.2022</p> <p>The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the Gardens Trust and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such applications.</p> <p>The Trust refers to the above planning application. Cote House is a Grade II* Listed Building, located within The Downs Conservation Area. The Orangery is also Grade II Listed and the gardens are designated as a Local</p>

				<p>orangery, car and cycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping. Cote House Cote Drive Bristol BS9 3UP BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>Historic Park and Garden. The Trust welcomes the proposal to carry out internal and external works to the House, removing modern additions, restore the Orangery and carry out minor landscape works including the restoration of steps and reinstatement of the alignment of an historic path. However, the Trust would have liked to see more information on the landscape works proposed, including the detailing and materials for the hard landscape elements, as some of the existing details are rather poor. The application is also silent on whether the mid 19th century cast iron post and chain fence would be restored. The Trust think it would be reasonable to provide such information given the Listed status of the House and Orangery, and the designation of the gardens as Local Historic Park and Garden. Summary:- The Trust does not object to the proposed development but would like to see more detail of the landscape works proposed. . Yours sincerely, Kay Ross MA Chair, Avon Gardens Trust</p>
Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan	Berkshire	E20/1706	N/A	<p>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation https://www.finchampstead-pc.gov.uk/community-projects/neighbourhood-development-plan</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the Finchampstead NDP. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire. The key aims of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) are to identify, understand, appreciate, and promote the conservation of historically significant designed landscapes in Berkshire whilst enjoying and caring for our park and garden heritage, now and for future generations. We fully support the principles set out in the NDP to protect the historic environment and green spaces. We have noted that the Parish does not have any of Historic England's Registered Parks and Gardens within its boundary. Notwithstanding this, the Parish does have landscaped open spaces in the form of Country Parks and a Nature Reserve. We are pleased to see the landscape setting of the Conservation Areas is recognised. The draft of the Finchampstead NP has addressed the historic environment by providing a new policy, in section 8 Identity and Rural Setting (IRS3) which teases out the 'Conservation and Enhancement of the historic</p>

					<p>character of the area'. We suggest some editing is required of the text to remove ambiguity.</p> <p>There are two points in 8.4 Recognise, respect and preserve identity and rural setting:</p> <p>i) a decision needs to be made as to whether Finchampstead is a rural or a semi-rural setting. Elsewhere in the draft the term 'semi-rural' predominates.</p> <p>ii) the other 'general principles', designed to help development proposals recognise, respect and preserve the identity of Finchampstead Parish as a whole, need identifying.</p> <p>The last sentence could be omitted in section 12 Annexes, S. References to Wokingham Borough Council, vii. LPU/DH5:2 The Historic Environment. A 'Statement of Heritage Significance' is also the term that should be used instead of 'a heritage assessment'.</p> <p>Overall the NDP submission appears comprehensive and reflects a good deal of work that has gone into its production and we hope that this will be helpful in completing your NDP.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Helen Parvin</p>
Park Place, and Temple Combe	Berkshire	E22/1089	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full application for the proposed erection of 1 no. dwelling and pool house, installation of a new external swimming pool and minor amendments to the internal access road, plus erection of a detached covered car port and refuse store and associated landscaping, following demolition of existing dwelling, pool house and outbuilding Templecombe, Wargrave Road, Remenham, Wokingham, RG9 3HU</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL, MISCELLANEOUS, DEMOLITION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to development affecting sites listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>One of the key activities of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is therefore to help conserve, protect and enhance designed landscapes within Berkshire. We are therefore grateful for the opportunity to comment on this planning application within Grade II* Park Place. The historic assets of the Templecombe Estate are well documented in Historic England's citation and LUC's CONSERVATION PLAN EDITION 1 2005 prepared for Park Place Estates & Aspect Park Ltd. It is important to bear in mind that although the Templecombe estate has fewer significant assets than other parts of the Park, it remains an important and integral part of the Park as a whole; and conservation and enhancement of its historic character is equally important to ensure conservation and enhancement of this Grade</p>

					<p>II* Park.</p> <p>We received notice of this application in October 2022 and understand that a decision is to be made at the end of November. Thank you for the extension of time to 17 November in order for us to comment. I visited the site with the applicant's then representatives and Jeanette Davy and other council officers in 2020 when previous proposals and requirements for any future application were discussed. We recommended that a full Heritage Impact Statement be produced which could be read alongside the results of a LVIA, an arboricultural assessment, an archeological and ecological assessments.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Statement refers to comments from Historic England on a second pre-application scheme. However these are not available through Wokingham Council. We do also not comment on the merits of submissions on landscape design, and arboricultural, ecological, architectural matters as these will be considered carefully by Wokingham officers. We note that no account has been taken of the LUC character assessment and advice carried out for the whole of Park Place in 2005. This study covers the whole of Park Place, whereas the IEMP excludes the Templecombe Estate.</p> <p>BGT welcomes a number of changes to the scheme since 2020 as set out in the proposals and supporting documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Location of the proposed main dwelling on the site of the existing (and historic) main house, thus retaining the setting of the Druids Temple and open landscape of the Park; · Removal of modern buildings which did not conserve or enhance the historic value of the Park; · Containment of the ornamental gardens to the immediately north of the proposed house and south of the existing tennis courts thus retaining the open simple landscape beyond the new house to the south-west to south-east; · Removal of the modern access track to the existing house and diversion to the north and then west to arrive at the east side of the proposed house. The original historic approaches to the house have been lost and as the new route follows an existing open ride into fields to the north, it would be unobtrusive and remove a modern access. We welcome restoring the route of the modern track to calcareous grassland; · Scattered trees to the north-west and west of the house reflect historic plantings;
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Extension of the chalkland grassland areas across the open landscape; and · Retention of the lodge off Wargrave Road and omission of the earlier extension proposed. <p>We have examined the visual impact analysis carried out for the LVIA. This is particularly important as a key feature of the Park at Templecombe, as noted by Historic England and in the Heritage Impact Assessment, is the openness of the unwooded parts of the site and the long and very beautiful views to and from the site. Rarely is the existing house visible due to the woodland, tree and hedgerow cover around the site and in the area. For the same reason the location of the new house should be well contained whilst retaining the panoramic views. However, we are concerned about the accuracy of the LVIA ZTV. The LVIA states that the proposed house would be a height of 7.71m. This seems lower than the plans show. Neither does it include the pool house which is not much lower and set in much more open ground. Whilst the location of main house would be well screened, the Druids Temple and the open landscape stretching south-west to south-east of the house is much more visible. Views from the approach to Templecombe, and from the wider Park Place have not been included (presumably because they are private views) but the effects on the other parts of the registered Park should have been considered to inform the design and Heritage Impact Statement. We are already aware of views of the Druids Temple and surrounding open landscape and the open landscape from Strowdes to the east. We are particularly concerned that the rather high pool house has been badly located and would intrude into the open landscape. It is considerably larger than the existing small building and almost as high as the main house and would be accompanied by a more ornamental landscape design than has been historically the case. The pool house also lies forward of the main house, detracting from the prominence of the main dwelling (as found historically). Illustrations 4.09 and 4.10 in the Design and Access Statement show this clearly.</p> <p>We are aware that the pool house was moved at Historic England's behest to avoid an impact on existing trees. A better location would have been in the open land close to the tennis courts or elsewhere in this unwooded area north of the house, or in the area of scrub west of the proposed parking, which are less sensitive to harm.</p> <p>The scale, location and prominence of this building does not conserve or enhance the setting of the Druids Temple or the key historic visual features</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>of this part of the Park.</p> <p>The existing woodlands at Templecombe largely still reflect the historic form and the area of the Pleasure Ground around the Druid's Temple contains an excellent collection of exotic and native specimen trees including lime, wellingtonia, pine and beech. LUC recommended conserving important veteran and specimen trees with a view to thinning the woodland to create tree clumps within an open grassland setting, recovering the 18th-century character of this area. Hopefully this can be achieved.</p> <p>Future proofing the management of the estate is key given the effects of climate change on historic plantings. We suggest that this is considered carefully.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Park Place is one of only 8 Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens in Berkshire. Although the Park has suffered from sub-division and inappropriate development in the past, this should not influence the need to now conserve and enhance this valuable historic asset and ensure that future development does no further harm. We commend the applicants for taking on board many of our previous concerns (although these are not reported by the applicants).</p> <p>However, despite the considerable improvements to the proposals since 2020, as we have listed above, we do not consider that the proposed pool house conserves and enhances the integrity of Park Place. The pool house would detract from a) the setting of the Druids Temple (even if it is set 75m away); b) from the open wooded and pasture landscape that is a key feature of this part of the Grade II* Park; c) from views of the open parkland; and d) the relationship between the main house and its historic parkland setting. We consider that the pool house would adversely affect the significance of this part of Park Place. In this respect this aspect of the development would be contrary to NPPF paras 184, 189 to 196 and the Local Plan Policy TB24.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI (Retired) BGT Chair.</p>
Winkfield NDP	Berkshire	E22/1340	N/A	NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Submission consultation https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/planning-and-	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the Winkfield NDP. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it</p>

				<p>building-control/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/winkfield-neighbourhood-plan</p>	<p>in respect of the protection and conservation of historic sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations within Berkshire.</p> <p>The key aims of the Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) are to identify, understand, appreciate, and promote the conservation of historically significant designed landscapes in Berkshire whilst enjoying and caring for our park and garden heritage, now and for future generations.</p> <p>BGT regret that we were not consulted earlier during the progress of the NDP. We note that Winkfield Parish has a high number of heritage assets which include the Grade II* Ascot Place and the non-designated Foliejon Park listed in the HER records, two Conservation Areas and numerous listed buildings. BGT has an interest in both registered, locally listed and other non-designated historic parks and gardens and their settings.</p> <p>We are therefore disappointed that the conservation and enhancement of historic assets is not included in your vision for the parish, on the lines of para 5.2 Vision F for environmental assets. This is despite the Plan's acknowledgment of its environmentally sensitive heritage in para 2.24.</p> <p>Vision A refers to 'visual' heritage only which does not comply with national or local policy and guidance which seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets, whether visible or not, and their setting. We recommend that a new vision is added reflecting national guidance.</p> <p>This leads to further concerns that the NDP has no policy to protect its numerous historic assets, including those unlisted assets, all of which make a significant contribution to the character of the parish. We accept that these assets enjoy the protection of both national policy and the emerging Bracknell local plan policy LP45 but the NDP omits to identify these sensitive assets which are valued by the parish and contribute to its character, whether they are features of Ascot Park or Foliejon Park or other non-designated historic features.</p> <p>At this late stage in the progress of the NDP, we would recommend that the NDP converts the wording under para 2.30 and 2.31 into a single policy, reflecting the wording used in national policy, to conserve and enhance all historic assets of the parish and their settings, which would cover the historic parks and gardens of the parish. We suggest something on the lines of the wording below:</p> <p>New development throughout the WNDP area should conserve assets of the historic environment (designated or non-designated) and enhance or reinforce those characteristics, qualities and features (including landmarks</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>and important views) that contribute to the local distinctiveness of the NDP area's character and environment. Proposed development within the setting of heritage assets must pay special regard to conserving and enhancing its setting and any special architectural or historic features of significance it possesses.</p> <p>We however welcome the reference to heritage landscape assets at Maidens Green under policy W2.10. This more detailed approach could be rolled out to identify other assets elsewhere in the parish's character areas. I hope that this will be helpful in completing your NDP.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Bettina Kirkham DipTP BLD CMLI (Rt)</p> <p>Chair and Planning Advisor for the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Dropmore	Buckinghamshire	E22/0006	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of house and outbuildings, temporary road for construction, proposed new dwelling, garaging, enhancement of adjoining parkland setting including altered driveway, 1.2 metre deep ha-ha and estate railings</p> <p>Burwood House , Taplow Common Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8NR</p> <p>DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL, LANDSCAPE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding the Report dated October 25th 2022 by Dominic Cole Landscape Architects which was commissioned with regard to the above planning application. We apologise for the delay in responding. We have reviewed this Report and can confirm that we maintain our objection to the proposed development within the Dropmore Registered Park and Garden (RPG). We refer to the conclusion within the report which states "I do not support or disagree with the proposal to build the new Burwood House but offer this review and observations that there would be a substantial benefit in removing the existing Burwood House and associated infrastructure."</p> <p>We offer the following comments on points raised in both the DCLA Report and also on the Report submitted by Quinlan Terry 'Replacement Dwelling and Restored Landscape' dated September 2022 (uploaded to planning site September 16th 2022). Both Reports mention the Gardens Trust description of the 'little damaged parkland setting'.</p> <p>We consider there are two areas to the existing development: one the present Burwood House outside the RPG, and the other the existing structures at the site of the proposed new house within the RPG.</p> <p>We reiterate our comment in our letter dated 25th April 'retaining the present 1980s ranch style residence would be less harmful than the building proposed by the applicant, in terms of the impact upon the designated assets on the estate'. Burwood House sits entirely outside of the RPG and has negligible physical impact on the RPG. It would therefore be preferable to retain this or redevelop this site with appropriate screening rather than to introduce a new substantial dwelling house into</p>

					<p>the RPG, to which we entirely object.</p> <p>The inclusion of drone photographs (such as figure 2.4, page 4 of the Quinlan Terry report) of the existing Burwood House and the proposed application site, emphasizes how the existing Burwood House sits close to the road and outside the RPG. On both site visits made by the Bucks Gardens Trust, it was concluded that Burwood House and its associated landscaping was barely visible from the proposed application site, with only small glimpses of roof visible and with the small ‘formal’ garden area adjacent to the RPG making very little impact because of existing vegetation. The partial glimpses of Burwood House is preferable to the physical and visual effect of the proposed house and all its accoutrements within the RPG.</p> <p>The application site includes the Walled Garden, greenhouses and stabling, which are ancillary structures to the main dwelling and therefore not uncommon in the wider parkland of a large estate such as this. The Walled Garden exists, is visually recessive from the wider parkland and the historic drive and we support its retention and restoration. It is not inappropriate or unusual to have greenhouses close to the Walled Garden. The stabling is set into the ground with lower ground parking and therefore maintains a low profile in the setting and is relatively visually recessive from the wider park and drive.</p> <p>Subservient ancillary structures create a very different character and effect to the proposed design for a new manor house which would introduce a new scale, hierarchy and character to this area. Furthermore, the presence of ancillary structures and suburban-style garden developments on the site does not mean that the application site is compromised permanently, or prevent their removal and its restoration as parkland.</p> <p>Both reports mention the proposals to restore historic planting around the application site. We would always welcome this but from a restoration perspective and not as a means to attempt to mitigate the impact of a new development which changes the character of the site.</p> <p>The DCLA report states “there have already been substantial works elsewhere on the estate, and more planned, to manage and present the historic landscape and buildings based on understanding their historical importance and with a view to managing and improving habitats to maintain and increase their biodiversity.” Whilst this is to be welcomed as good stewardship, we do not consider that it provides any justification for the proposed development on this site.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>We are writing again to confirm that we maintain the same response as to all previous applications : the proposed new house should NOT be positioned within the RPG. A site within the RPG is not appropriate for such a landmark building, or indeed any new structures/development other than refurbishment of the Walled Garden to bring it back into horticultural use, within this little damaged parkland valley. Therefore, our objections to the revised site remain.</p> <p>We uphold our comments that the revised site would still be prominent from the parkland and particularly in dynamic views along the south drive. We have suggested to the applicant that they consider alternative options in the area to the west, in the current garden but outside the RPG, to include visual mitigation in the views particularly from the south drive with proposed and future ancillary structures positioned on the site of the existing house.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Formal Gardens at Stockgrove House	Buckinghamshire	E22/1031	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Listed building application for light tunnel and extractor fans to be added, Internal changes to the ground floor and erection of boundary fence</p> <p>The Pool House Stockgrove Park House Stockgrove Park Soulbury Buckinghamshire LU7 0BB</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022</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 and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation relating to the above proposals, and it is difficult to assess this application without a proper Historic Landscape Character Assessment. In the absence of this, from our scrutiny of the documents submitted, we object to the introduction of a boundary fence in this position which detracts from the setting and the relationship between the listed building, the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) at Stockgrove and the wider landscape.</p> <p>We concur with comments made by the 20th Century Society who note the lack of a proper heritage statement, and we would also be happy to reassess the proposals once one has been supplied.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E22/1079	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>New garage with home office over and single storey extension to kitchen (Resubmission of 21/03788/FUL)</p> <p>6 Garden Lane Tyringham</p> <p>Newport Pagnell MK16 9ED</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022</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 and we would be grateful if you could please take our comments into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>We note that this application is a resubmission of 21/03788/FUL to which we provided comments to dated January 20th 2022.</p> <p>Tyringham Hall is by Soane in 1793-7 (Grade I) and sits within a late 18th century park (Grade II*), probably laid out by Repton with later works by CF Rees (c 1910) and Edwin Lutyens (1924-28). The main approach to the house is from the South under Soane's stone gateway and across Soane's simple stone bridge along the lime avenue and straight forward to the south-east front of the house. To the north-east of the house is the stable block also by Soane and the rear north-eastern wall forms one of the walls of the seven-sided kitchen garden.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement (HS) submitted as part of this revised application does acknowledge the presence of the listed structures associated with Tyringham Hall but notably still fails to identify and acknowledge the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Tyringham Park which wraps around the rear of the property. The HS is therefore incomplete, fails to assess the heritage assets in their entirety, and is insufficient to enable us to fully appreciate what impact the proposals will have upon the RPG.</p> <p>The application site, 6 Garden Lane, backs on to The Shrubs. The historic significance of this part of the parkland is identified in the Grade II* listing as follows : "North-east of the house, partly surrounding the walled garden, is an area of woodland known as The Shrubs, containing various paths and ornamental trees and shrubs, which may have been part of Repton's pleasure grounds, and leading north from this Long Plantation, along the west side of the northern section of the Filgrave Lane."</p> <p>We have reviewed the revised proposals for a rear kitchen extension with a lantern roof and the construction of a two-storey garage with an office over and compared them to previous application.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed garage, we note that the proposals have been revised to include a reduction in the ridge height of the roof, the omission of the glazed gable window and, instead, the introduction of a window to</p>
-----------	-----------------	----------	-----	---	--

					<p>match the form and scale of the windows in the main house.</p> <p>Whilst we welcome both of these revisions, we note that that the footprint of the garage still constitutes a substantial increase on the existing structure which appears incongruous with the surrounding properties. The ground floor of the proposed new garage is substantially larger than the existing garage and, in our opinion, would result in overdevelopment of this site. We also remain concerned with the proposed introduction two rooflights into the rear elevation and roof of the two-storey garage which will result in light emittance and reflection which would be detrimental to the setting of the RPG.</p> <p>As we are not familiar with the site, it is not clear whether it would be visible from the RPG. However, we do note that the housing development was constructed to include single storey garages which create a sense of space and separation between the properties and allowing views into The Shrubs behind the houses. The introduction of two storey structures into the 'gap' between the properties will result in a more continuous built form which is not appropriate in this setting and we do not consider the reduction in height to mitigate this impact.</p> <p>With regard to the kitchen extension, we cannot see any alterations to the previous application. We still note the proposed lantern roof and extensive fenestration in the form of large French doors in both open sides of the structure which, again will result in both light emittance and reflection which would be detrimental to the setting of the RPG. Whilst we have no objection to the principle of the kitchen extension, we strongly object to the lantern roof and would ask that this is removed from the proposal. The French windows do continue the form of fenestration as seen in the rear elevation of the house and would provide ample light ingress into the kitchen.</p> <p>Therefore, the Gardens Trust objects to this application. The proposed garage is much too large in this setting and rooflights would result in detrimental light emittance and reflection. The kitchen extension is more acceptable subject to the removal of the lantern roof.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Ashridge	Buckinghamshire	E22/1192	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The removal of an existing 8m monopole and installation of a</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.11.2022</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</p>

				<p>replacement 18m monopole, supporting 6 no antennas, 1 no wraparound equipment cabinet at the base of the monopole, 2 no equipment cabinets, 1 no meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including removal of redundant equipment.</p> <p>Land At Ringshall Road Dagnall Buckinghamshire COMMUNICATION/CCTV</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire Gardens Trusts and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and whilst the applicant stresses that this proposal is allowed under Operators' Permitted development Rights as the column does not exceed 25m, there is a caveat which requires the prior approval for siting and appearance by the local authority. The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, Policy 16 requires applicants to demonstrate that all reasonable alternative sites to avoid or mitigate impacts have been considered. The applicant has failed to do this, and there is no reference to the impact of the setting or significance of the Grade II* Ashridge House registered park and garden (RPG) or indeed other heritage assets. Indeed, the applicant has even named the RPG incorrectly, referring to it on p24 of the Supplementary Information Document thus : 'it will not appear unduly prominent within the streetscene or setting of Ringshall ... setting of the Grade II* listed Ashleigh (sic) Historic Parks and Gardens, setting of the conservation area' We suggest this indicates a lack of understanding to the sensitivity of the application site.</p> <p>In our opinion, this proposal for an 18metre monopole and associated cabinets to replace an existing 8 metre pole and cabinets represents a poorly considered application for planning approval in what is a sensitive and significant site. It would have a detrimental impact on views to and from the surrounding land and the recently extended Grade II* registered landscape of Ashridge Park. The proposed site also sits within Green Belt land and is within the Chilterns AONB. It would also be close to parts of the Chilterns Beechwood SAC within the Ashridge Estate managed by the National Trust.</p> <p>It also fails to take into account the considerable visual impact on the adjacent Hall Farm to the north or the prejudicial visual impact on the surrounding listed buildings. These include the Grade II Brownlow Gate immediately to the south, (formerly Ringshall Lodge, the entrance to Ashridge Park from the north) and the row of houses, all Grade II on the eastern side of Beacon Road. Views of the proposed mast would also be seen from the gardens of the row of cottages on the western side of Beacon Road.</p> <p>The harm to heritage assets is also identified by Buckinghamshire Council's heritage officer Stephanie Parsons whose comments we strongly endorse :</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>'The areas surrounding the application site, and which could be impacted by an 18m monopole, are varied and highly sensitive in terms of heritage significance. Protected Historic Parks and Listed [buildings] both encompass and surround the location. Of primary significance are the designed landscapes and views within the Grade II* registered Ashridge Estate) The parkland was designed to create a setting for the Grade I listed Ashridge House.... . It is important to remember that views into a Registered Park as well as out of it are also important and merit consideration. The proposed location is highly sensitive in heritage terms falling at a key junction within the village and could not be supported due to the negative visual impact of an 18m monopole on the setting of the assets listed above. The mast would negatively affect how the nearby heritage assets could be read and appreciated. ... It is regretful that measures to mitigate the impact of the development within this highly sensitive historic and natural landscape have not been better explored within the application.'</p> <p>As for the proposal being required for the improvement and increased capacity of wi-fi provision this should not be a material consideration as it has been noted in the Dacorum BC Local Plan 2020-2038 that any further development would not be granted in this area around Ringshall (Part of Ringshall is in Little Gaddesden PC and therefore under DBC, and some under Edlesborough Parish and therefore under Bucks Council).</p> <p>The GT, BGT and HGT strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wadhurst Castle	East Sussex	E22/0417	II	PLANNING APPLICATION CONSTRUCTION OF 18 NO. NEW DWELLINGS (INCLUDING 6 NO. AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS) WITH ASSOCIATED HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING. LAND WEST OF STYLES LANE AND SOUTH OF HIGH STREET, WADHURST TN5 6DZ. RESIDENTIAL	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Sussex Gardens Trust (SGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Representatives of SGT have carefully reviewed the documentation submitted with this application and note that the development is immediately adjacent to Wadhurst Park, which is designated as a Grade II Registered Park by Historic England. The documents submitted claim that</p>

					<p>the impact on the Registered Park is neutral. The image below (taken from Google Streetview) shows the view in Sept 2018 from the lawn in front of the Ha-Ha at Wadhust castle looking towards the site.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Landscape and Visual appraisal document does not include a photomontage to show whether the new houses would be visible from this point after construction. Without such a photomontage it is unclear whether the proposals would cause any visual harm to the Registered Park and for this reason we suggest the Planning Authority should request such an image before determining the application.</p> <p>Kind regards Jim Stockwell Trustee On behalf of Sussex Gardens Trust</p>
Layer Marney Tower	Essex	E22/1093	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Application to determine if prior approval is required for proposed: Excavations or deposits of waste material reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture - Two (2) livestock drinking ponds to be excavated on the agricultural grassland at Layer Marney Tower, Roundbush Road, Layer Marney Colchester CO5 9US</p> <p>AGRICULTURE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have looked at the online documentation accompanying this application and endorse the comments made by HE, in particular that the proposed ponds are not enclosed by any raised embankments and that spoil from the creation of the livestock drinking ponds is ideally deposited outside the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Layer Marney.</p> <p>As we have not been involved in any pre-application discussion about the creation of these new features, we wondered why the ponds are necessary and why two are sought rather than just one? Is there a practical reason or is for aesthetic purposes?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wivenhoe Park	Essex	E22/1117	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of a replacement marketing board advertising the availability of office/research and development space permitted under application ref. 192457.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p>

				(Resubmission of 221626) Land adj to Clingoe Hill & Boundary Road, Colchester CO4 3SQ MISCELLANEOUS	We are pleased to note that two of the three signs proposed in application 221626 have had permission refused. The resubmission just for the sign by the entrance to the development (Ref : 222650) is for a period of two years. We have considered the information provided in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in Gardens Trust. On the basis of this, we confirm we do not wish to comment on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Mount Olivers Meadow Hartpury	Gloucestershire	E20/1687	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use from agricultural (i.e. forestry) to outdoor leisure activities (i.e. shooting and archery). Agricultural Shed, Mount Olivers Meadow ,Blackwells End, Hartpury GL19 3DB CHANGE OF USE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022 Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have looked at the additional information provided and wish to maintain our original objection dated 5th March 2021. We have no further comments to add. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Church House, Lechlade	Gloucestershire	E22/1149	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building Consent for Erection of single storey extension with internal and external alterations (amendment to 21/02731/LBC) at The Malthouse Shelleys Close Market Place Lechlade Gloucestershire BUILDING ALTERATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022 The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has again notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf. The current amendment and EDP's analysis of the comments on the previous submission has resulted in a scheme that answers most of the perceived problems of development in this very sensitive location. The massing of this current approach does result in a relatively dominant of traditionally pitched roof; therefore its detailing and colour are very important. At present there seems to be a divergence of view in the application between a thatched roof and one that uses slate. If slate is being proposed, depending on the type of slate, it could appear overbearing in this setting. Finally, as a rather pedantic observation, the scheme might be improved by widening the gap between the existing Malt House and the new pitched

					<p>"barn".</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Berkeley Castle	Gloucestershire	E22/1167	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Solar Park and Energy Storage Facility together with associated works, equipment and associated infrastructure Land At Woodlands Farm, Woodlands Lane, Clapton, Berkeley.</p> <p>SOLAR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might have an adverse impact on Listed and Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>As a Statutory Consultee, I find it very difficult to make a focused response to proposals such as this solar park with on- site energy storage.</p> <p>The Government's supportive position on renewables, and a very competent technical submission by the applicant, is judged against the lack of local policies that define areas of search for solar parks based on their impact on landscape aesthetics, ecological and habitat constraints and their impact on local built heritage. The mass of quoted planning statute and guidance to be taken into account is formidable, but it feels as if rather more subjective comment is taken as superfluous.</p> <p>GGLT's stance is that the Vale landscape and views from the Cotswold Scarp are important to the character of Gloucestershire. However, there seems no serious policy development to measure capacity for changes in landscape character. Similarly heading towards more detailed matters, like the possible impact on migratory birds, this is avoided in the comprehensive Glint and Glare Study. The landscape enhancement issues are swept up by growing out the hedges to 3.00m, and the land management is dealt with by its being "managed as grassland following a low intensity regime..." There are opportunities for some gain. But in terms of a practical grasp of the specific mitigation measures and the net gain to this piece of the Severn Vale-- what does it really mean?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, David Ball (on behalf of GGLT).</p>
Victoria Park	Greater London	E22/0655	II*	<p>FORESTRY COMMISSION</p> <p>Woodland Creation/Planting Victoria Park east and west, Bow East and Tower Hamlets</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 03.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above application and providing revised proposals.</p> <p>Whilst we note that our original objection to planting on the paths has been largely resolved, we remain concerned about the proposals provided. As stated in our previous response, the Trust believes that the Urban Tree Challenge Fund would have a far greater environmental and social impact by planting in truly urban areas, such as streets and public squares, where</p>

					<p>there is much hard standing. Whilst we acknowledge that the range of trees in the park contributes to the significance of the site and that the planting of some additional trees will help to ensure the continuity of planting, we believe this could be achieved with a far more conservative planting scheme; the current proposals are for 106 new trees.</p> <p>We welcome the decision to concentrate new planting in ‘clumps’ but believe there remain some inappropriate choices as follows.</p> <p>Firstly, in our original consultation response, we noted that there are three designated heritage assets on the path adjacent to Cadogan terrace – 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. The proposal to plant London Plane Trees in this area has not been revised and therefore our original concerns about the impact of such planting on the setting of and access to these monuments remain. Revised proposal GIS screenshot of area showing placement of designated heritage assets</p> <p>Secondly, we have reservations about the areas circled in red below. The trees circled on the left are on a pathway, and as previously mentioned, the Conservation Management Plan for the park states 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.’ The three trees on the right are proposed to be planted near an area which the Conservation Management Plan isolated as obscuring views of the lake, noting that trees were to be removed from this area:</p> <p>Thirdly, the Conservation Management Plan also isolates an area of planting in the ‘toe of the boot’; noting that this avenue retains historic Holly planting. Whilst the plan advocates interplanting in this area, clearly the species must be carefully selected to ensure continuity with the existing scheme:</p> <p>We therefore continue to object to the planting scheme proposed. We would welcome a wider discussion with the Urban Tree Challenge Fund about proposals in parks across London; we hold regular online meetings and you would be welcome to meet with us if that were helpful to you. Please do advise of your decision, and keep us informed of any further information submitted.</p> <p>Martha Bailey For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Canons Park	Greater London	E22/0713	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Installation of 2.1m high non-climb metal-grid boundary fence to rear. 4 Rose Garden Close, Edgware, Harrow HA8 7RF. BOUNDARY	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in relation to the above planning applications. I write as a member of the Planning & Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks & Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and Gardens LPG). LPG is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Inclusion of a site in the Historic England (HE) Register is a material consideration in determining a planning application. LPG is the gardens trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). In this instance we are aware that the Rose Gardens address is within the Canons Park Conservation Area and the property backs onto the Seven Acres Lake, within Canons Park which is on the National Heritage List of Registered Parks and Gardens for England, Grade II, and on the LPG Inventory (https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=HRW007). LPG has considered the information given and is concerned that the proposed new boundary fence, described as 'metal grid security type' would be industrial in appearance. This would have a negative impact of views from the lake area and detract from the character of the registered landscape. A fence of a more traditional or sympathetic design and material would be more appropriate in this area. Therefore, LPG wishes to object to this application. For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group
LB Sutton Local Plan Review "Call for Sites 2022"	Greater London	E22/0921	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation https://www.sutton.gov.uk/-/callforsites	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2022 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)

					<p>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 and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). The Trust has compiled a list of sites in each borough, including Sutton, which can be accessed here.</p> <p>The LPG inventory is compiled selectively with reference to particular criteria such as the preservation of historic landscapes and settings (both designed and natural), importance to local communities and the protection of wildlife and biodiversity (please find the full criteria attached.) Many of London's parks and gardens, churchyards and squares are very well known but there are a myriad of open spaces known only to their local communities, and tracking these down has been part of the remit of the Inventory. This resource, and its associated maps for each local authority, shows the spaces we consider a vital resource for London and Londoners. Our response to this consultation is framed by a desire to ensure that the allocation of new sites and the treatment of current allocations in the existing Local Plan does not reduce or remove the benefits these sites bring to the borough.</p> <p>As is recognised in the London Plan and Sutton's Draft Parks and Open Spaces Strategy, London's green spaces and public parks are a vital resource. They offer crucial health and wellbeing benefits for individuals and communities, mitigation against air pollution, noise pollution and resistance to the effects of climate change such as flooding. Despite this, they are undervalued and under-resourced.</p> <p>Research by the Greater London Authority has shown that many areas of Sutton experience 'Open Space Deficiency', meaning access to even very small areas of open space falls below acceptable levels:</p> <p>The London Plan has clearly set out a response to tackling Open Space Deficiency in Policy G4, 'Open Space.' Amongst other requirements, this policy requires that development plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that open space, particularly green space, included as part of development remains publicly accessible • not result in the loss of protected open space • where possible create areas of publicly accessible open space, particularly in areas of deficiency
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Likewise, Policy 25 in the Sutton Local Plan states that ‘it is important that we protect our existing parks and open spaces as the projected level of growth over the plan period up to 2031, as well as additional demand from outside the borough, will place increasing pressure on existing open space, as the number of users increase.’</p> <p>Our Response</p> <p>Existing Local Plan</p> <p>We would like to take this opportunity to make some comments and recommendations on the treatment of heritage sites and open space in relation to site allocations in the current Local Plan.</p> <p>The Trust welcomes the statement in Policy 40 on Site Allocations that ‘the council will grant planning permission for development [...] subject to the proposed development meeting the other policies in the Local Plan.’ This confirms that any new developments must meet policies 25 (Open Spaces), 28 (Character and Design) and 30 (Heritage). However, since the potential threat posed to open space by development is so acute, we would encourage the LPA to include specific statements on heritage and open space within Policy 40 itself.</p> <p>Potential wording can be found in Policy 28 which states that new developments must ‘[maintain] the setting and visual amenity of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, Public Open Space and Urban Green Space.’ To this we would like to see the addition of a requirement that new developments ‘demonstrate that, where relevant, they have sought to retain the existing level of open space in the borough and where possible support the improvement, enhancement and management of existing open spaces.’</p> <p>We also welcome the statement in Policy 28 that Areas of Taller Building Potential ‘will be expected to [...] protect the setting of any designated heritage assets and the overall historic character that makes an area distinctive and special’ but would recommend that wording is added either in Policy 28 or Policy 40 to make clear that this should include ‘giving careful consideration to potential impacts on important local views and the availability of natural light.’ At the very least, we believe Policy 40 should draw specific attention to the necessity of meeting policies 25, 28 and 30. The Trust welcomes the ‘Policies Map Designations’ section included for allocated sites in the Local Plan, which sets out whether the site is for example an Archaeological Priority Area, Urban Green Space or Adjacent to Public Open Space. We recommend this information be retained in the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>revised Local Plan. We would however ask the LPA to consider expanding the detail given in this area to include, for sites in Areas of Taller Building Potential, an indication of proximity to open space where appropriate, since taller buildings can of course affect sites which are not immediately adjacent to them. The impact of taller buildings is most relevant for designed parks and gardens but should be a consideration for all open spaces. Flagging proximity to open spaces potentially affected by taller buildings will aid decision makers in meeting the Local Plan's objective for '[protecting] the open feel of the borough'.</p> <p>The Trust welcomes references to 'respecting and enhancing the setting' of open spaces/heritage assets in some existing site allocations (STC2 and STC19), 'respecting the open character' of adjacent sites (S3, S5, S98) and 'respecting the integrity of the surrounding Metropolitan Open Land/Public Open Space' (S55). However, we would recommend more specific wording is used in these instances to note the importance of conserving the availability of natural light and respecting, conserving or enhancing views into and out of the site in question wherever possible.</p> <p>Where developments are expected to provide open space as a condition of the development (S56 for example) we recommend the LPA stipulate that this space should be 'high quality' and where possible, 'green', in accordance with paragraph 3.3.13 of the London Plan which states that Local Authorities should '[maximise] urban greening and [create] green open spaces'.</p> <p>Designation of New Sites</p> <p>We recommend that the LPA take the impact of taller buildings on views in and out of open spaces and the availability of natural light into account when reviewing and allocating new areas for development, for example around Rosehill and North Cheam. The screenshots below are taken from the Policies Map, the purple areas indicating Areas of Taller Building Potential.</p> <p>We would discourage the LPA from designating any existing open space for development, in accordance with the London Plan's guidance in paragraph 2.0.2 that new development should be concentrated on 'previously developed land.' If open space is allocated for new development, as for example in S90:</p> <p>Land to the West of Carshalton Athletic, we would encourage the LPA to attach conditions to ensure that any damage to natural habitat is mitigated, for instance through planting in areas of hardstanding</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>elsewhere in the borough.</p> <p>As part of our response to this consultation, we have conducted an analysis of the current protections in place for the sites included on our Inventory, with respect to national and local listing, Conservation Areas, Metropolitan Open Land, the Green Belt, Archaeological Priority Areas etc. We have compiled this analysis in the attached appendix, which shows the distribution of protections across the sites. We hope this resource will be used to help inform decisions on new site allocations. The appendix also gives a (non-exhaustive) list of sites previously been used for landfill, making them potentially unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Many local green and open spaces are not designated heritage assets and are often at risk if not identified in Local Plans. The Trust through its Inventory has been working hard to research and document the historic importance of these spaces as well as their social value. We endeavour to encourage local authorities to include these spaces in their Local Plans and would encourage the London Borough of Sutton to make use of this resource when designating new sites for future development.</p> <p>Martha Bailey and John Phillips For and on behalf of the Planning & Conservation Working Group</p>
Syon Park	Greater London	E22/0939	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and structures and the erection of a five storey Ambulatory Diagnostic Centre including plant enclosure, associated vehicular and cycle parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure</p> <p>LAND TO THE EAST OF THE MARJORY WARREN BUILDING WEST MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL TWICKENHAM ROAD ISLEWORTH TW7 6AF</p> <p>DEMOLITION, HOSPITAL</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>We have studied the online documentation relating to the proposed new 5-storey Ambulatory Diagnostic Centre (ADC) building and accept the need for improved provision of facilities for elective ambulatory imaging, medical oncology and haematology treatments, renal dialysis as well as training and education. We do however, have concerns with five different areas : the proposed height of the new ADC situated very close to the edge of the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Syon Park just across Park Road, impact upon the World Heritage Site, failure to conform with either the London Plan, the Hounslow Local Plan and the NPPF. These matters are expanded upon below.</p> <p>The new building will be taller than the perimeter tree belt when looking south-west directly down Lancelot Brown's (2nd) ornamental water from Fowler's early C19 bridge. HE's listing quoted in the Heritage Statement (HS) (4.32) states : 'The park is dominated by Lancelot Brown's pond with</p>

					<p>an iron bridge(listed grade II) designed by Charles Fowler c 1827'. The importance of this view is not in question. Figure 15 in the HS also shows the proximity of Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area immediately to the east and south of the application site, which includes Syon Park and Gardens, separated by the River Thames from Kew Gardens, a World Heritage Site (WHS). The Verified Views (No5) shows the wireframe outline of the ADC taken from the western side of Fowler's bridge, and even the discrete thin red outline is a noticeable and distracting presence from the existing vista currently devoid of any man made structure.</p> <p>Kew Gardens are 'included on the list of World Heritage Sites ... for the landscape and architectural design of the gardens and the structures they accommodate. These include designs by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown, William Chambers, Charles Bridgeman, and William Kent.' (HS 4.3.5) Together, Syon Park and Kew Gardens create a continuous parkland landscape character across the River Thames. The designated buffer zone to the WHS covers Syon Park to the east of the application site. The HS acknowledges this (5.3) : 'the Outstanding Universal Value Statement identifies how Syon Park contributes to the setting of the World Heritage Site' by : "i. Providing a largely unbroken skyline above the walls and boundary planting hence strengthening and maintaining the historic and continuing design intent of the WHS's sense of being a world apart, separated from the wider, urban world outside ... with 'a largely unbroken skyline' and ... 'iv. Providing visual and physical relationships westwards over the River Thames and to the wider Arcadian landscape beyond, including the designed relationships with Syon Park, which enables modern visitors to appreciate the rus in urbe that Kew Gardens provides, and to see the landscape through a similar lens as the historic designers who worked there, and their royal patrons.'</p> <p>The importance of the landscape is also recognised in the Hounslow Local Plan (HLP) (2015) within their Heritage Policies (10.12) and even the Foreward (Lines 3-4) requires '.. high quality sustainable development that protects the unique characteristics and historic assets of the borough that our local communities value'. Policy CC4, p143, 6.12 and 6.13 are particularly relevant here, dealing with Syon Park as part of the WHS buffer zone, and p140 '(d) Working with Royal Botanic Gardens Kew World Heritage Site, London Borough of Richmond and Historic England to conserve and enhance the outstanding universal values of The Royal Botanical Gardens Kew World Heritage Site, its buffer zone and its setting,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>including views to and from this asset.’ (our emphasis).</p> <p>The London Plan (LP) also stresses the value and importance of both London’s waterways and RPGs (Fig 7.3), and Para 7.1.7 states that ‘Development that affects heritage assets and their settings should respond positively to the assets’ significance, local context and character to protect the contribution that settings make to the assets’ significance. In particular, consideration will need to be given to mitigating impacts from development that is not sympathetic in terms of scale, materials, details and form.’ We do not feel that the proposals meet these criteria and disagree with the HS (10.6 (4)) that ‘the heritage values of the application site and its context and proposals are composed to ensure that these values are sustained and enhanced.’ In our opinion, the presence of a large 5 storey building, would not only compromise but harm one of the key views of Syon Park, the buffer zone for Kew WHS. That impact would, in our opinion, be major and detrimental upon the setting and significance of these priceless heritage assets and we do not consider ‘that impact will be minor and beneficial.’ (HS 10.6(4)).</p> <p>The Marjory Warren complex is a low-rise building set on higher ground some distance back from the RPG and a visitor to Syon Park is already aware of it on the western side of the park when the leaves have fallen. The proposed new block is closer to the RPG and considerably taller. It will be above the tree line and visible at all times of year, of a solid and bulky form, and would become a feature which would in our opinion, undoubtedly adversely affect the setting of the RPG and buffer zone for the WHS. HLP has a Tall Buildings Policy (CC3) which defines a tall building as ‘any building or structure which is over 20m in height and/or which is significantly taller than the surrounding townscape and/or which recognisably changes the skyline’. Based on the definition included within the Local Plan, the building should be considered a ‘Tall Building’ and therefore, will need to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy CC3. The GT/LGT were not included in pre-application talks with the LPA, which undoubtedly covered the layout and footprint of the proposed ADC. We are therefore unclear why if the renal unit is to be demolished, that area is now to be used as car parking rather than as part of the new ADC, particularly as the PS only mentions provision for 20 parking spaces, (9 of which are disabled and 4 electric car spaces). We wonder whether this relatively small provision could not have been accommodated elsewhere in order to enable the ADC building to be spread over a wider area and thus</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>be lower?</p> <p>We do not feel that the application complies with the NPPF Para 197 (c) and is relevant to Para 195 as far as 'the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset'. Whilst acknowledging the public benefit of the hospital facilities, we consider that the harm to the setting and significance of such highly graded heritage assets has been underplayed, as per NPPF Para 200.</p> <p>In conclusion, whilst we appreciate the need for better hospital facilities, we consider that the impact of the tall new ADC building on the Grade I RPG of Syon and buffer zone of a WHS will be negative and cause harm. Especially since this application forms only part of a multi-phase redevelopment of the wider WMUH site, we consider that this harm has been understated.</p> <p>The GT/LPGT object to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Borough Triangle	Greater London	E22/0967	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Phased mixed-use redevelopment of the site comprising: - Demolition of all existing buildings/structures and site clearance, except 82 and (part) 83 Borough Road which are to be retained, altered and refurbished for flexible commercial, business, service and learning and non-residential institution uses (Class E / F1); - Construction of basement structure and vehicular access; - Construction of buildings to provide dwellings (Class C3), flexible commercial, business, service and mixed food/drink/leisure uses (including drinking establishments with expanded food provision, hot food takeaways, live music</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2022</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).</p> <p>Based on the information that the applicants have provided, LPG is concerned by the likely impingement on the view of the Palace of Westminster from the Serpentine Bridge. We note that the Southwark 2022 Plan implies that London View Management Framework</p>

				<p>performance venue and cinema) (Class E / Sui Generis) and public toilets; and - Provision of associated car and cycle parking, open space and landscaping, means of access and highway alterations, installation of plant and utilities and all other associated ancillary works incidental to the development.</p> <p>Borough Triangle Site At 18-54 Newington Causeway 69 Borough Road 82-83 Borough Road London Southwark SE1 6DR</p> <p>MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>considerations do not apply to the site, and that there are a number of tall buildings (e.g. Strata SE1) in the Elephant & Castle area already. However, the supplied Planning Statement (pages 42-43) shows a large mass poking above the tree-line as a result of this proposed building, which in our view would detract from the protected view of the Palace of Westminster from the Serpentine Bridge.</p> <p>On this basis LPG objects to these proposals.</p> <p>The submitted Environmental Statement (para 11.7.27) estimates an increase in population of 1,726 residents. LPG believes that this increase, given the already dense population in the area, will put significant additional pressure on local open spaces, especially Newington Gardens: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=SOU062. While the documentation (e.g. paras 11.7.47-11.7.48) asserts that this pressure will be mitigated by the proposed piazza, it is far from clear in our view that this will indeed be the case.</p> <p>Should approval for a development of this size be given LPG urges Southwark Council to insist on a significant contribution of s.106 or CIL funds to be ringfenced for the purposes of upgrading the facilities within the gardens, in consultation with existing local residents. Any funding should also allow for ongoing maintenance of new planting for a minimum of 25 years from the start of building works.</p> <p>Should new information come to light the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these matters.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Mark Davies LPG Borough Planning Volunteer</p>
Cannizaro Park	Greater London	E22/1038	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION erection of a single storey extension and installation of roof lights. Keir Cottage, Camp road, Wimbledon, London SW19 4UW. BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022</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 must apologise for the late response but the application arrived by post and was considerably delayed. We have liaised with our colleagues in the London Parks & Gardens Trust (LPGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We were surprised that despite the application site lying entirely within the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Cannizaro Park, there was no mention whatsoever of this in any of the very sparse application</p>

					<p>documents. We would have expected a Heritage Statement at the very least, and an indication of what impact the proposals would have upon the RPG. The plans give no indication of whether or not there is any screening of the new additions from the RPG and whether the new windows will cause glare in the parkland and walled garden.</p> <p>Your officers will need to satisfy themselves that the proposals will not harm the setting of the RPG as we are unable to do so from the documentation provided.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lambeth Palace	Greater London	E22/1049	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of the majority of existing buildings on Plots A, B, C & D including Canterbury House, Stangate House, 10 Royal Street and 20 Carlisle Lane; part retention of existing buildings on Plots E and conversion of the railway arches (Plot F); comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed use development of buildings 12-16 storeys in height containing commercial floorspace (including lab enabled floorspace), residential, retail and community floorspace; enhanced public realm and pedestrian routes; re-location of listed sculpture; servicing, ancillary plant and storage, cycle parking and other associated and ancillary works. REASON FOR RECONSULTATION: - Financial viability assessment submitted - Amendments made to Plot B dwelling layout, mix and lift cores</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2022</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 county 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).</p> <p>Your statutory consultation failed to notify the Gardens Trust and LPG which is unacceptable given the potential impact on Lambeth Palace Gardens (Grade 2) and the associated Archbishop's Park. Both of these sites feature on our inventory:</p> <p>Lambeth Palace: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=LAM027</p> <p>Archbishop's Park: https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/siterecord/?ID=LAM004</p> <p>These sites are intrinsically linked both in location and historical</p>

			<p>This application is a DEPARTURE APPLICATION: The proposed development is a departure from Policy Q26 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021). The proposed development to which the application relates is situated within 10 metres of relevant railway land.</p> <p>Royal Street Site, South Bank London SE1 7LW DEMOLITION, MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>development forming a vital sense of open greenspace in a highly urbanised area. The public park provides vital amenity to the diverse community of residents, existing workers and patients and their carers visiting St Thomas's hospital. Both landscapes are within the Lambeth Palace Conservation Area.</p> <p>The designs for Plot A and Plot B are proposed to be significantly taller than those nearby. The Non-Technical summary statement notes in para 151: "The Proposed Development will case a small amount of additional shadow on Archbishop's Park..."</p> <p>LPG disagrees with the conclusion that this is not significant. Whilst we note that there is additional public space planned (2,289 sqm additional space) in the form of pocket parks and other public realm the quantum is disproportionate to the likely population increase given the size of the development (133 residential units; 158,858 sqm GIA and 4,792 sqm retail etc. and 372 sqm for community use). Further the additional space is not 'green space' in accordance with the London Plan but will be primarily made up of hardstanding. On this basis, one of the few truly public green spaces in the area should not be undermined by overshadowing and therefore we conclude that the significance of this impact has been underplayed.</p> <p>The conclusions on the townscape impacts are unsatisfactory. The Non-Technical summary statements relating to Townscape Heritage and Visual Assessments paras 194 and 195 only consider the built heritage. Para 200 refers to certain views as being Moderate Neutral or Minor to Moderate Neutral. This conclusion is incorrect in relation to the local views from within Archbishop's Park which will wholly alter the nature and feel of this public park and to a lesser extent Lambeth Palace Gardens. The open space is described as "rural character" (see ES Vol 2 THVIA 72), though this is unreasonably dropped when referring to the public park (see subsequent ES Vol 2 THVIA descriptions). ES Vol 2 THVIA Part 80 and 81 exaggerate the 'cluttered' nature of the existing and underplay the overbearing nature of the buildings given their height and modern design. Creating effectively a giant built wall adjacent to this space will detract from its amenity value as a rare respite from the urban environment. This site is likely to set a further precedent for more high-rise and overly dense development in the area. LPG therefore supports WCDG in its objections, especially in relation to the density of the development. Additionally, LPG notes that Oasis Farm has existed on the site as a</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					<p>meanwhile use providing a wonderful educational resource for many who may not otherwise have the opportunity to experience food growing in the local area. The farm has participated since 2019 in our Londonwide celebration of greenspace, featuring over 100 gardens, allotments and historic squares, known as London Open Gardens. Last summer during our event they recorded 55 adults and 15 children visiting in one afternoon (on Saturday 11 June 2022).</p> <p>Therefore, LPG objects to this application on account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inappropriate height and massing of Plots A and B so close to Archbishops' Park leading to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Inappropriate overshadowing o Unacceptable visual intrusion on local views, in particular within the park but to a lesser extent from within the Grade 2 Lambeth Palace Gardens • The quantum of development being disproportionate to the available quality public green space <p>Yours sincerely, Helen Monger</p>
Embley Park	Hampshire	E22/1336	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of land as a travellers caravan site consisting of 3 pitches, each containing 1 mobile home, 1 utility dayroom and 1 touring caravan, sewage treatment plant and associated development</p> <p>Land At Embley Lane, Embley Lane, East Wellow, Hampshire</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Hampshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the sparse accompanying documentation, which makes no mention that the application site lies immediately to the north of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Embley Park. There is an existing travellers site nearby and we have objected to previous applications to extend it.</p> <p>It is not clear from the information provided whether the proposals will intrude visually on the listed landscape. Whilst the application appears to be reasonably sympathetic in its approach and does not in itself seem to present any problem, we are not able to tell at this stage whether it will be visually intrusive. Subject to that caveat we do not wish to comment further on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Holme Lacy	Hereford and Worcester	E22/1181	II*	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Birch Grove, Brick Kiln Wood, Apostle wood woodland SE of village	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.11.2022 Dear Ms Waller, Felling Licence Application: Birch Grove, Brick Kiln Wood, Apostle Wood woodland SE of village Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust on the above application some compartments of which lie within the boundary of Holme Lacy, 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 Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust and understand that most of the plantations have been turned over to commercial forestry, since the agricultural college that occupied the park for many years ran forestry courses. Recently there has been quite a bit of thinning, which has enhanced the parkland and we hope this application, which largely involves thinning of Ash, will have the same positive effect. We have no further comments to offer. With kind regards, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Hertsmere Call for Sites	Hertfords hire	E22/1134	n/a	LOCAL PLAN	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust, statutory consultee for historic designed landscape, of which HGT is a member. We do not wish to identify potential sites nor to comment on the HELAA methodology. We would , however, suggest that one of the criteria for assessing such sites should be the effect on historic parks and gardens in Hertsmere; not only those on the Historic England Register but also those of local historic importance and interest. These are an irreplaceable part of Hertsmere's heritage and contribute to the local community character. The NPPF states that the these be conserved and enhanced (where possible). Hertsmere contains many such historic landscapes and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust would be interested in commenting on any proposed development sites in regard to possible impact on historic parks and gardens or their setting.
Chequers Streetworks Chequers Welwyn	Hertfords hire	E22/1179	N	PLANNING APPLICATION	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust of which HGT is a member. Chequers is the major gateway into Welwyn Garden City from Mill Green

Garden City Peartree				Prior approval for the installation of 15.0m Phase 9 slimline Monopole and associated ancillary works Chequers Streetworks Chequers Welwyn Garden City Peartree AL7 4SJ COMMUNICATION/CCTV	and Hatfield and has retained its semi-rural character with development well screened from the wide green margins flanking the road. The proposed elevation shows the pole screened by a tall tree, which is taller than the applicants stated average height of 10m. Further, most of the trees in this area are deciduous and will not afford screening in the winter months. We consider this application inappropriate in this situation where Garden City Principles have to date ensured the semi-rural nature of this transition zone from country to town centre. We therefore object to this proposal.
Hexton Manor	Hertfords hire	E22/1183	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of two attached 4-bed dwellings following demolition of existing barns together with associated car parking, detached car barn and relocated vehicular access. Model Farm, Mill Lane, Hexton, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG5 3JE DEMOLITION, RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. Hexton Model Farm lies immediately adjacent to the Registered parkland of Hexton Manor and also contributes to the character of Hexton village and of Mill Lane. The historic Home Farm is currently in a poor state of repair and re-furbishment and re-use would be the ideal solution. However, if the condition of the barns is so poor that refurbishment is not an option we would not object to rebuilding with the external appearance kept as the original. The illustrations in this application show the general outline and elevations to be acceptable but the fenestration should be altered. The northern elevation, where the open sheds are currently, contains a large quantity of glass which could harm the views southwards along Mill Lane towards the Registered Park. The windows on the west elevation are also out of character and could be adjusted.
Stevenage Borough Council Brownfield Land Register Consultation	Hertfords hire	E22/1186	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Call for sites	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust on the review of this Register. Hertfordshire Gardens Trust has researched several of the designed landscapes within Stevenage, such as the historic Shepall Bury and the Town Centre designed by Gordon Patterson. We do not wish to put forward any sites for the Register but would like to alert SBC to the heritage assets of some of the sites already on the Register and to note that development of these should not harm the heritage assets which currently exist. Best wishes Kate Harwood
Northaw Place	Hertfords hire	E22/1190	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a part-single, part-two storey side extension and part	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. This property lies within the Locally Listed Northaw Place historic parkland

				<p>subterranean extension The Lodge 2 Northaw Place Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NQ BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>and is part of the setting for the Grade II* listed mansion, with views east/west across the parkland between the two properties and within the Green Belt. We consider that the proposed extensions are not appropriate for this site but if permission is given then further screening from the rest of the parkland should be planted.</p>
The Willows	Lancashire	E22/1045	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Alterations and works of restoration, repair, landscaping, and disabled adaption of a historic garden formerly known as The Willows focusing on the existing and historic landscape assets of the garden including: walkways; flower garden; shrub and herbaceous plant borders; lawns (including the Tennis Lawn); and tree planting The Space Centre, 10 Pedders Lane, Preston, PR2 2TH LANDSCAPE, REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022 Thank you for your consultation letter advising the Gardens Trust (GT) of the above application. As previously notified to you, GT as the statutory consultee on matters concerning registered parks and gardens, is now working closely with County Garden Trusts, and the responsibility for commenting on planning applications in this context has now passed to the County Trusts. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) therefore responds in this case. The Grade II Registered garden at The Space Centre was created by Thomas Mawson for W W Galloway, a director of Horrockses, Preston's famous largest cotton business. He was a keen art collector and was praised by Mawson for his culture and taste. The garden was created in conjunction with Dan Gibson, the Arts & Crafts designer; its layout and details reflect the early style practised by the pair and retain some of Gibson's decorative ironwork. The garden was considered by Mawson as 'rich in detail' and one of his most favoured and interesting commissions where he was allowed a free hand by his client. As one of Lancashire's own garden designers (the first to style himself 'landscape architect') it is particularly important to LGT to ensure that Mawson's work is recognised and protected. It is exciting to look forward to the restored beauty of this private garden. It is remarkable that features survive such as the tennis lawn with its double-arch loggia, Mawson's signature feature in the Italian Renaissance style; the quarter-circle fan-shaped steps leading down to the sunken lawn are exquisite and intact. Paving along the herbaceous walk, in the seating bays and in front of the tennis loggia remain, and follows the patterns in Mawson's book The Art & Craft of Garden Making. His conversion of a solid wall into a pierced arcade demonstrates his skill in creating rich detail and a light and airy atmosphere. Lancashire Gardens Trust was consulted at pre-application stage by The Space Centre and their consultant in May 2021 during which we visited the site and discussed the site and the proposals in some detail. We indicated</p>

					<p>support in principle to restore the Thomas Mawson designed garden, which is an exciting and timely opportunity. We support the 'light touch' approach to the proposals. However, the drawings which comprise the current planning application are schematic and have not changed appreciably from those we saw in 2021. It is of particular concern that details have not been developed further to indicate precisely which areas of the surviving features will be altered. This is important in the case of the extent of repairs and restoration, details of proposed timber planters, and for the proposed ramp from the Herb Garden to the Tennis Lawn, currently only shown schematically at Figure 15 in the D&A Statement.</p> <p>The fine and rich detail of the original design has not been adequately demonstrated in the new work. There are no planting details which should have been submitted as part of this application. In addition there are significant areas of horticultural management required to invasive vegetation, such as fuchsia colonising walls, and elders overwhelming yew hedging, which were discussed during our site visit, not all of which are addressed in the current proposals.</p> <p>The rich detail described above is seen in the surviving paving notably the Terrace Walk.</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement paragraph 4.2 indicates the intention to 'take up and [relay] natural stone slabs', although the General Arrangement drawing appears to indicate this is for the paving closest to the building. Any work proposed to paving on the Terrace Walk requires great care. It will be a challenge to secure the skills required to replicate the original pattern and construction, which survives virtually intact over large areas. We urge great caution in undertaking any work on these sensitive features and recommend limiting repairs to those areas which are broken and unsafe. We made these comments following our consultation in 2021, but it is not clear how this has been taken on board as far as can be judged from the application drawings as no notation now appears on the General Arrangement plan for the Terrace Walk. Minimal repair should be the guiding influence, not complete reconstruction.</p> <p>Further details are required to support this application and these should be provided as early as possible. If the Council is minded to approve the proposals, then as a minimum, conditions must be imposed to ensure that no works commence without fully detailed drawings being approved by the Council, for instance indicating clearly which areas are to be affected in relaying and repairs. A method statement of the works as well as</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>providing the details listed above is also required.</p> <p>In the layout of the Herb and Parterre Garden the alignment of the beds appears to be to relate to the face of the building, resulting in oblique angles where these meet the northern principal path. We suggest that the beds and the space divisions are aligned at right angles to this path, achieving closer orientation to Mawson's original layout (Figure 7 in the D&A Statement). Two of the planting beds abut the adjacent box hedging which appears unsatisfactory.</p> <p>We note that the extent of the planning application excludes areas which were considered as part of the earlier restoration scheme, notably the exclusion of the roofless Summer House east of the Tennis/Activity Lawn. It is hoped that this feature will be part of a later phase of repairs.</p> <p>In conclusion, we support in principle this project which incorporates a light touch approach, using self-supporting structures making minimal impact on the existing features and which are reversible in the long term. However the matters raised above remain to be addressed.</p> <p>If there are any matters arising from this letter please contact me, by email conservation@lancsgt.org.uk.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson</p>
Lynford Hall	Norfolk	E22/1053	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Planning permission for the retention of 6 holiday lets includes a store, garage and carport (Retrospective)</p> <p>Lynford Gardens, Lynford Road</p> <p>HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the proposed development at Lynford Gardens, which lies within Lynford Hall, a site listed by Historic England (HE) on the Register of Parks and Gardens (Grade II). The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>This is a retrospective planning application for six holiday accommodation dwellings (and 10 parking places) within the walled kitchen garden, which is under separate private ownership from the hall and other parts of the estate. We understand that the old bothy was converted in 2016 but the owners failed to seek a new planning consent for its use as holiday accommodation.</p> <p>However, since the renovation of the bothy was done sympathetically and to a high standard, and does not negatively impact the wider historic landscape, we do not wish to lodge any objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

					Susan Grice Planning Officer Norfolk Gardens Trust
Raynham Park	Norfolk	E22/1067	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion and extension of farm buildings to form: i) farm shop, ii) retail units and iii) cafe/restaurant; use of land as an outdoor plant centre; and erection of bin/cycle store and garden retail building. Formation of new access onto Swaffham Road (A0165), creation of car park and associated hard/soft landscaping Lodge Farm , Swaffham Road, East Raynham, Fakenham CHANGE OF USE, RETAIL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on this application. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The Trust welcomes these proposals which will introduce new uses for this group of buildings, which includes an important barn. The development should enable the conservation of the important buildings within the group. The site is outside but within the setting of the registered parkland around Raynham Hall. The proposals include an extension and an area of car parking which would be quite close to the walled gardens within the registered site. Nevertheless, subject to careful control of materials and design harm to the parkland setting would be avoided.
Narford Hall	Norfolk	E22/1145	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Conversion of estate storage to three dwellings. The Kennels Access Road To The Estate House RESIDENTIAL	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on this proposed development. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The site is within the setting of the registered parkland of Narford Hall. The Trust does not object to the conversion of these buildings, which is likely to secure a viable use for the. However, it supports the position of the Council's Historic Buildings Officer that timber rather than UPVC windows should be required.
Bayfield Hall	Norfolk	E22/1215	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Biomass boiler, fuel Store, flue & associated equipment. Location: Bayfield Hall, Bayfield Park, Bayfield, Holt, Norfolk, NR25 7JN ENERGY	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) on this application. The Norfolk Gardens Trust (NGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered and other important sites. NGT is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The boiler shed is small in scale. While it partly masks some attractive windows the effect is not sufficient to be harmful to the character of the

					wider parkland. The proposal would be improved by the reduction of the height of the tallest chimney to below the building's ridge height.
Bolton Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/0335	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Full Planning Permission to Create a New Avenue from Bolton Hall to Lords Bridge by Converting a Corridor of Intensive Dairy Grassland to Low Intensity, Species Rich Grassland, a New Avenue of Trees, a Drive Down the Centre and a Carriage Sweep in Front of Bolton Hall Bolton Hall Wensley Leyburn North Yorkshire DL8 4UF TREES, LANDSCAPE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 07.11.2022 Thank you for reconsulting the Gardens Trust following the submission of further information we requested in our response of 15 June and sending us the necessary images which were inaccessible on your website From this we understand, the width of the drive will be typically 3.65m with the edge treatment and colour the same as for the existing track over Lord's Bridge and the treatment of the carriage sweep will match the existing frontage of Bolton Hall. This allays our fears about the use of tarmac. Further, cattle will access grazing to the East of the avenue using cow tracks, in a similar fashion to the system currently in place On this basis and on the understanding that your Conservation Officer also satisfied with the proposals, the Gardens Trust is happy to support the application. We would however advise that in terms of the archaeology, a condition to granting any planning permission should be a requirement that the estate keeps a photographic and written record of the excavation during the construction of the new drive and access to the front of the Hall. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager
Eagle Hall	North Yorkshire	E22/1153	N	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of an ancillary woodland management building/workshop. Nanny Knowles Wood North Of Track Beverley North Yorkshire AGRICULTURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & 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. With our local knowledge we also on occasion comment and give advice on sites that are not listed on the HE Register of Parks and Gardens. The designed woodland garden at Eagle Hall is not registered but is significant as a relatively unchanged example of a Victorian woodland garden. Historically lead mining has been continuous in the Greenhow area since Roman times but on a large scale since the 17th century and it is as a result of the lead mining activities – the Eagle Level from 1825 - and problems with the water that led to the lakes/fish ponds that are the focus of the woodland garden laid out later in the century. Eagle Hall woodland is

					<p>important in views from all approaches to Pateley Bridge and particularly for walkers along the Nidderdale Way.</p> <p>In the 1990's I undertook research on Eagle Hall's designed landscape and was privileged to have access to the Mountgarret family archive and photographs from c.1900. The study was copied to the then owner Mr Paul Garforth and I subsequently contributed to the Eagle Hall Heritage Centre Feasibility Study in 1999.</p> <p>At that time, I thought that the woodland at Eagle Hall designated as ancient woodland appeared to have been continuously replanted with the oldest existing trees probably not earlier than the 19th century, with the exception of some of the beech, that could have been planted in the 18th century. See Appendix.</p> <p>The woodland garden was probably laid out in the 1880's and complements the house that was rebuilt by William Atkinson of York for the Hon H.E. Butler (later 13th Viscount Mountgarret) between 1876 and 1879, the estate having been bought for him by his great-aunt, Miss Rawson of Nidd Hall. The woodland garden incorporated the lakes, cascades, bridges, woodland walks, the drive and more open park area below the house and between the two fish ponds/lakes. The park was a large area of mown grass with groups of exotic conifers, shrubs and ornamental heathers. Further exotic conifers and deciduous trees were added to the existing woodland as accents in the composition.</p> <p>Comparisons can be made with Titus Salt's Milner Field laid out by Robert Marnock in the 1870's.</p> <p>We would like to draw your attention to our letter dated 22nd September 2015 in response to the planning application:</p> <p>15/03345/FUL : Erection of 1 dwelling with associated access (Site Area 0.32 ha), formation of lake and installation of package treatment plant, to include treeworks. Eagle Hall Woods To The South Of West Lane Red Brae Bank Beverley, N.Yorkshire.</p> <p>In our letter we recommended that a detailed tree survey, down to the level of species, should be prepared for the whole site and that the position of specialist rhododendrons that are not <i>R. ponticum</i> should be identified in order to inform a woodland conservation management plan, which should ideally run for 25 years and be tied to any approval by a Section 106 agreement. We also noted that further details were needed of the proposed works to repair and reinstate the historic bridges and the historic ironwork on the site.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Since 2015 we have not had any further communication about any of the works at Eagle Hall so were unaware of the current situation until being notified by the Nidderdale AONB of a new application for a woodland management building/workshop in the woods following the owner's decision to withdraw a similar application earlier this year (not notified to GT/YGT).</p> <p>Nanny Knowles Wood, the site of the current application, lies to the south-west of the new house, 'Stillwater', on the side of the valley that rises south above Eagle Level. The OS 6 inches:1mile map sheet 135 NE, published 1910 indicates this woodland as mixed coniferous and deciduous. It will undoubtedly have ecological value and is part of the setting of the historic designed landscape.</p> <p>We understand the applicant's requirement for a building to carry out woodland management work listed in the submission but strongly query whether the very extravagant building proposed, similar in morphology to 'Stillwater', really is necessary. Its' massing and specification with its glazed balustrades and concrete columns are suggestive of another dwelling. Such a large building also suggests more activity than managing 14.89ha of woodland long-term. We also have concerns that such a development will potentially cause more damage to the historic access drive through the woodland and could result in more light and noise pollution.</p> <p>Overall, the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have concerns for the Victorian woodland garden design of Eagle Hall woods which we consider to be quite unusual. We trust that a Conservation Management Plan is being implemented for the whole of the historic designed landscape/woodland and work will be completed to restore the planting and design particularly to the area to the east of the sloping drive and below/south of Eagle Hall around the larger lake/fish Pond.</p> <p>As submitted the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust consider that the proposed management building/workshop will potentially cause harm to the heritage and ecology of the site.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Blenheim Palace	Oxfordshire	E22/1203	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of a temporary orangery structure with associated kitchen and toilet facilities.	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2022</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</p>

				<p>Land South Of Blenheim Palace Oxford Road Woodstock GARDEN BUILDING</p>	<p>above application.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation. Our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) are familiar with the site and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The proposal is for a temporary Orangery with associated kitchen and toilet facilities. The proposed structure is a large marquee 35m long by 16m wide, with 6.5m height to ridge. The kitchen and toilet facilities would be accommodated in an attached structure, 25m long by 10m wide. The facilities are required whilst the existing Orangery restaurant is closed for repair next year, substituting for the existing facilities rather than providing new ones.</p> <p>The application site is of the utmost heritage sensitivity, being located within the Blenheim Place World Heritage Site designated by UNESCO, and within the Grade I Registered Park & Garden. It is also within the setting of the Grade I Listed Palace. The proposed structure would be sited on the South lawn at Blenheim, but a considerable distance from the Palace itself and set to one side of the lawn against a backdrop of trees. The application states that there would be no impact on trees. The location has been changed from a previously approved scheme (19/02818) to avoid impact through root compaction.</p> <p>The GT/OGT raise no objection in principle and recognise the importance of maintaining the viability of Blenheim as a visitor attraction. We note that the requirement is expected to be for an 8-month period, however permission is sought for two years. We would request that your officers attach a planning condition ensuring that the facilities are promptly removed once the existing Orangery is returned to use, and that the application site is restored to its existing appearance.</p> <p>We would encourage a method statement to be submitted to the LPA prior to the works commencing, in accordance with Historic England's guidance on temporary structures: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/guidance-on-temporary-structures-for-events/</p> <p>In particular, the method statement could clarify such matters as temporary roadways, pathways, screening of the 'back of house' service area and disposal of rainwater, as these matters are not explained in sufficient detail with the submitted application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Christ Church	Oxfordshire	E22/1242	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Demolition of existing pavilion and storage shed. Erection of new pavilion and storage shed. Merton Field Merton Street Oxford DEMOLITION, MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING, GARDEN BUILDING	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2022</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 Oxfordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We must apologise for the late submission of this response.</p> <p>The proposal is to replace the existing timber sports pavilion and timber shed with larger and more modern facilities for school sports and grounds maintenance. The application site lies within the Grade I Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Christ Church: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1000441. The application is submitted on behalf of Christ Church Cathedral School, and is located on the Merton Field, next to the Broad Walk which crosses Christ Church Meadow. The new pavilion building will be sited close to three trees (one Plane tree, one Ash and one Horse Chestnut) on the south side of Merton Field, used as a school playing field. The impact on views and archaeology is explained in the Heritage Statement and the impact on the trees in the Arboricultural Report.</p> <p>The location is in a sensitive and prominent location and in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) the fact that the building was screened was identified as important. The Heritage Statement clearly draws on the CMP which is good (although it does not reference it which would have been helpful) and states that the landscape as a whole is of the highest (international) significance. However, in the CMP, within the RPG, Merton Field was assessed as less than the highest significance; it was not a designed landscape, although is part of the Grade I site. Merton Field has quite a colourful past and has had many uses: containing at times from the C17 into the C19 a timber yard, tenements with gardens and stabling for eight horses, a victualing house, cheesecake house, and an ale house or house of common entertainment! So there is historic precedent for quite extensive structures. For many years it was leased to Corpus Christi College and was fenced from the rest of the Meadow; later illustrations show areas were grazed. Late in the C19 it became an open field used for sports and has probably been levelled. The whole area was allotments in WWI. Nevertheless, it is a prominent part of the wider landscape, and is very</p>

					<p>sensitive for its impact on well-known views and adjoins the highly significant Broad Walk. We therefore have some concerns that two of the screening trees are horse chestnut and ash. Both are species facing severe disease issues and Christ Church has recently felled diseased ash and is dealing with bleeding canker in the famous Cheshire cat tree in the Deanery Garden. We would suggest that there is a requirement for reinforcement planting to future proof against losses.</p> <p>The application statement explains the need for these facilities and how the proposed location and design have been arrived at. The principle of this development appears uncontentious, even though the new pavilion will be considerably larger than the existing one. On the basis of this, we confirm we do not wish to comment further on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Nuneham Courtenay	Oxfordshire	E22/1315	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Opinion for a proposed Solar Energy Development and Associated Infrastructure Land west of A4074 North-west of Nuneham Courtenay Oxfordshire SOLAR</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2022</p> <p>The Oxford Preservation Trust has brought this Scoping Opinion to our attention. It is disappointing that you failed to consult the Gardens Trust about these major proposals even at this scoping stage, as we are statutory consultees for applications which affect all grades of registered parks and gardens. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Oxfordshire Gardens Trust (OGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint initial response. We will be commenting fully when the more detailed planning application comes out. We would appreciate confirmation that that we will not be left off the list of consultees for this.</p> <p>The OGT attended the exhibition outlining the proposals, and it is clear that the solar farm will be directly in line with views of the Oxford skyline from the Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) of Nuneham Courtenay. Even without full details, it is apparent that the proposals will have a highly damaging impact upon the setting of this extremely important and sensitive RPG.</p> <p>The GT/OGT strongly object to the proposals and will write more fully in due course.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Chetwynd Park	Shropshire	E22/1146	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of 1no external flue Meese View, 7 Chetwynd Park, Chetwynd, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8AE</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Shropshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have looked at the online documentation for the installation of an external flue. There is no mention in the online information that the application site lies within the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Chetwynd Park. We would suggest that the external flue, described as stainless steel and silver in colour, would be less noticeable if it were a darker colour, ideally black.</p> <p>Apart from that, we do not wish to comment further on the proposals at this stage. We would however emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Lilleshall Hall	Shropshire	E22/1163	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of a new archery training facility comprising indoor and outdoor shooting ranges and associated amenity/storage provision, disabled car parking, drainage, landscaping and other works</p> <p>LOCATION: Lilleshall Hall, Archery GB, Lilleshall, Newport, Shropshire.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Shropshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the online documentation and agree that the proposed new archery training facility is in an area of the Grade II registered park and garden of Lilleshall Park which is reasonably well hidden. We are glad to note that the building which replaces the temporary facility is of a dark, recessive colour and is less visible within the landscape. We accept that the positioning is dictated by the requirement for paralympic athletes to access all the facilities without the necessity of distant outdoors travel from one site to another. We are unfamiliar with the requirements of elite archery and have to assume that the size of the building is driven by the needs of the sport. Should it be possible to somewhat reduce the size we would however, welcome that.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Beauchief Hall	South Yorkshire	E22/1135	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Beauchief Park, Gulleys Wood, Old Park Wood	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.11.2022</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 Beauchief 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>Beauchief Abbey was founded in c.1175 and surrendered as part of the dissolution of the monasteries being granted in April 1537 to Sir Nicholas Strelley. The estate descended through marriage to Edward Pegge who built a new mansion in 1671 on a site to the south- west of the abbey described as 'a gentle descent on the brow of the hanging wood, the bellum caput or Beau Chief.' (Ref 1 below). Beauchief Hall is significant for its formal gardens and pleasure grounds mainly to the south of the Hall. The Abbeydale Golf Course occupies Beauchief Park which is immediately beyond the south/south-west registered boundary and is bisected by the historic approach Beauchief Drive. The south of the historic Hall grounds (now Abbeydale Golf Course where the land is undulating but generally rises gently to the south) is enclosed at its southernmost by a deep belt of trees which include and extend parts of Old Park Wood, some of which have been developed for housing in 20th century. Beauchief Hall (Listed Grade II*) is positioned to command long views out over the former estate and distant countryside but there is a woodland belt running inside the southern boundary of the registered park and garden that separates the land in front of the hall from the golf course.</p> <p>Thank you for answering my queries about this consultation. That has been most helpful as I found the maps confusing with their very geometric/angular compartments overlaying what appears to be the more 'natural' woodland and the grassland of the course. I was also able to visit Sheffield and walk the public footpaths from Beauchief Abbey Lane towards Nether Wood (along the footpath that skirts the southern registered boundary) and then along Beauchief Drive yesterday. I was unable to view all the compartments, but the visit was helpful for my understanding.</p> <p>I understand from your helpful advice that the proposal is for thinning of a number of compartments on the golf course and which I could see from my</p>
----------------	--------------------	----------	----	--	---

					<p>visit is needed. I understand that often thinning is over 100% of that particular compartment's area and thinning is defined as tree removal not exceeding 30% of the standing volume of timber. (Interpreted as being 30% of the standing trees.) In terms of this particular felling licence application, a very light thinning is proposed, probably less than 15% of the standing trees.</p> <p>Looking at early OS 25 inches:1 mile maps from 1892-1914 it is apparent that the majority of the golf course compartments are woodland laid out for the golf course on what had essentially been open parkland with only compartments 13, 14 and 15 on older woodland, in this case Old Park Wood. The western side of Beauchief Drive has an avenue of trees marked on an early map and I noted some mature Quercus petraea (Sessile Oak) in that area and other parts of the landscape with young oak growing in hedgerows. There was some mature Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore). Generally, the woodland layout, species and lack of understorey appears fairly typical for a modern golf course. Compartments 1,2,5, 9 are nearest the reg boundary with compartments 3,4 west of Beauchief Drive and 13, 14, 15 and 16 at the most southern end adjacent to the 20th C housing with 6 and 17 near the western housing.</p> <p>The proposed work should have little further impact on the setting of the registered park and garden.</p> <p>It would be aesthetically pleasing to continue to have undulating and naturalistic compartment edges.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to this thinning proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
99 Dore Road, Sheffield	South Yorkshire	E22/1159	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of detached garage</p> <p>99 Dore Road, Sheffield</p> <p>MAINTENANCE/STORAGE/OUTBUILDING</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2022</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 included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & 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>99 Dore Road, Sheffield also known as Moorwinstow, is a small country house, built and designed by Norman Doncaster for himself in 1912, with</p>

					<p>additions around 1950. It is Listed Grade II, as are the gateway and walls. The layout was altered slightly by the second owner, Mr Seaman in 1924 but the layout and planting remain essentially characteristic of an Arts and Crafts movement domestic garden. The gardens are on the local list of Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>We have not been able to visit the site but Sheffield City Council UDP Policy Background Paper No 4. 1997 (Sheffield's Historic Parks and Gardens) describes the gardens as virtually unaltered and the house and gardens together as good examples of Arts and Crafts style:</p> <p>The front of the house has a flagstone path leading from the wrought iron entrance gates (by Mr Matthews of Canon Company, Phoenix Factory, Sheffield) set in the stone wall with railings to circular Lutyens-esque steps up to a circular pattern of York stone paving, round a flush millstone feature before the front entrance. There is mature structural vegetation on either side and an orchard beyond to the west. There are areas of cobbled paving to the east side of the house and to the northwest side. A rose garden with rope pergola runs down the western boundary of the garden with topiary between it and the house.</p> <p>To the south of the house – the area of this planning application in the paddock – are rectangular sunken lawns with perimeter walks and stone troughs with a vegetable garden to the east. To the south is a long cross path formerly the site of a pergola. This part of the garden is bounded by a well-established holly hedge with a semi-circular recess containing a sundial, formed from part of a balustrade from Holyrood House. Beyond is a formal lawn with a cottage studio, pond, tennis courts and paddock. The applicant has previously constructed both attached and detached garages which were approved in 2115 under applications 15/02157/FUL and 15/02009/LBC. The current application is to store additional cars in secure garages on the site, located immediately to the south- east of the existing detached double garage, and accessed from the same gate as existing on Ashfurlong Road.</p> <p>Photographs of the location for the proposed additional garage and existing garages, would have been helpful particularly as the drawings have virtually no notation and we have not been to visit the site. We note on the Proposed Elevations Plan that boundary hedges are removed, but trust that is for the drawing only as hedge removal is not noted on the Application Form.</p> <p>99 Dore Road, Moorwinstow is a significant heritage asset. We trust that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>the historic garden is being sensitively maintained and will not be harmed, in which case we have no objection to the additional detached garage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Wortley Hall	South Yorkshire	E22/1205	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of ground mounted solar panels on land to side of dwelling and associated works</p> <p>Park House, Road adjacent to Wortley Park, Wortley, Sheffield, S35 7DE</p> <p>SOLAR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Wortley Hall, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Park House Cottage lies within Wortley Hall's registered park towards the south- eastern boundary. Park House and its associated agricultural buildings are shown on the OS 1st Edition map published in the 1850's and were possibly built as part of the development of the Wortley Estate during the 18th Century.</p> <p>Wortley has been associated with the Wortley family since the time of King Stephen and significant architects and landscape designers have worked there from Ralph Tunncliffe in the 1730's, and over the further course of the 18th Century, Giacomo Leoni, Matthew Brettingham and John Carr of York – the latter was responsible for the stable block and outbuildings. At the beginning of the 19th Century the south front garden terraces of the Hall were completed and also the laying out of the park. William Sawrey Gilpin (1762-1843) is said to have worked 'in a Pricean spirit' (alluding to the important picturesque landowner/writer and designer Uvedale Price) at Wortley (Gardeners Magazine, Vol 16 1840 pp105-08) although the extent of his work is not clear.</p> <p>Immediately to the north of Park House and Park House Cottage is the historic drive from West Wood Lodge to Wortley Hall but which now only serves Park House, Park House Cottage and farming access. However, it is the route of the Trans Pennine Trail. We understand that the parkland is in agricultural/arable use.</p>

					<p>We understand from the Heritage Statement that the proposal is for two rows of ground mounted solar panels of elevation less than a metre in a paddock east of the dwellings. The paddock is bounded by a hedge to its north alongside the historic drive. The other boundaries are not described but there is woodland at some distance across the former parkland to the south of the site.</p> <p>The proposed ground mounted solar panels should have very little impact on the registered park and garden and the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Patshull Hall	Staffordshire	E21/2101	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 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 Patshull Park Hotel Golf And Country Club Patshull Park Burnhill Green WV6 7HR DEMOLITION, HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 17.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the SGPT and The Gardens Trust on the additional information submitted by the applicant. As in our previous consultation responses of 16 March and 20 June 2022 SGPT is commenting on behalf of both trusts in accordance with working arrangements agreed between the two organisations.</p> <p>It is unclear from the three new documents posted on your Council's planning website on 19 October which elements of the original submission are still in contention (e.g demolition of the existing hotel, restoration of the grade II listed Temple); which may have been deleted from the scheme (e.g. the boathouse suite); and whether the description of the application has now been or should be varied? In responding to the present consultation the Trusts are assuming that the information shown on the revised masterplan now represents the totality of the proposal but that the submitted business plans, heritage statement and other supporting documents on which we have previously offered adverse comment are still current. Our previous critique of those documents still stands.</p> <p>Our previous representations have drawn attention to the significance of the heritage asset comprising the grade II Patshull Registered Park and Garden and the degree of harm that would result from the proposed development within its curtilage. There is nothing in the amended masterplan drawing which would cause the Trusts to vary or withdraw their objection in principle to this application. While the amended site plan reduces the intensity and concentrated visual intrusion of the originally proposed chalet layout redistributing the accommodation, car parking and access roads throughout the application site merely spreads</p>

					<p>their harmful effect more widely and further diminishes the openness of the historic landscape. There is no indication any effort has again been made to protect and respect surviving historic trees within the new arrangement.</p> <p>Deletion of the formerly proposed clubhouse is welcome but it is unclear if this is a permanent change to the scheme or whether it is intended to reintroduce the facility at a later date if permission is granted for the residential accommodation first. The Trusts would vigorously oppose any future submission along these lines.</p> <p>The siting of the newly proposed Central Building will be visually intrusive at the south western entrance to the site and will look out of place in the historic landscape. Its eccentric massing will detrimentally emphasise its harmful presence. This proposed new building will not enhance its landscape setting either in design or location.</p> <p>In short the amended scheme as shown in the three new drawings will still (in association with information previously submitted) cause substantial harm to the grade II Registered Park and should be refused planning permission.</p> <p>Your sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Chilton Hall	Suffolk	E20/0087	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Outline Planning Application (some matters reserved, access to be considered) - Erection of up to 190 residential dwellings, purpose built care home for up to 60 bedrooms, and associated infrastructure including landscaping, public open-space, car parking and means of access off Church Field Road. Land On The North Side Of, Church Field Road, Chilton Industrial Estate, Chilton, Suffolk. MAJOR HYBRID</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 28.11.2022</p> <p>We have read the Review of the Heritage reports by Babergh's independent consultant, Roy Lewis (RL) within the (Public Pack) Agenda Document for Babergh Planning Committee.</p> <p>We must apologise that our responses did not make our assessment of the level of harm sufficiently clear (See RL paras 4.47 & 5.9). To clarify, we concur with RL's summing up in Para 5.13 and consider that 'the proposed development would cause a considerable amount of less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade II* listed Chilton Hall, its grade II listed garden wall, and its grade II registered park and garden, and a level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade I listed Church of St Mary not far short of substantial.'</p> <p>We continue to object strongly to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Office</p>

Hampton Court	Surrey	E18/1384	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Development to provide 97 dwelling units, a hotel (84 bedrooms) and retail units (within use classes A1, A2 and/or A3) together with access, station interchange, car parking, servicing, new public realm, landscaping and other associated works following demolition of some existing buildings and structures on site including Hampton Court Motors. Jolly Boatman and Hampton Court Station Redevelopment Area, Hampton Court Way, East Molesey, Surrey KT8 9AE. MAJOR HYBRID</p> <p>Appeal Ref APP/K3605/W/22/3291461</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 10.11.2022</p> <p>I understand that the above planning application has been referred to you under the provisions of the South Western Railway Act 1913. As you will be aware, the SWRA requires that proposed buildings on railway land in the environs of Hampton Court Palace and Windsor Castle that exceed 50ft are referred to the Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport.</p> <p>We objected most strongly to this application and our members have engaged very closely with this issue during the planning application process and at the subsequent planning inquiry. We are dismayed at the outcome of the inquiry. The purpose of this communication is to introduce ourselves as the Government's statutory consultee on all grades of historic landscapes of national significance on the Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest, and to notify you of our particular interest in this issue on which we wish to make representations.</p> <p>Please advise us as to when you expect to receive representations from us. Could you advise us as to whether you intend to make a site visit, whether that will be accompanied and whether we might have the opportunity to accompany your representative?</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
North and South Marine Parks and Bents Park	Tyne and Wear	E22/1032	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of a Covid memorial statue. The memorial will be constructed in granite and is mid-grey in colour. The memorial will be square base plinth, the sides will be weaving cut. Upon the plinth is a cuboid. The top and sides of which will be weaving cut. The front and rear of the memorial will be polished granite. Toward the top of the cuboid is a cut out hole.</p> <p>South Marine Park, Beach Road, South Shields</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2022</p> <p>Dear Ms Thomas,</p> <p>ST/0778/22/LAA Installation of a Covid memorial statue. The memorial will be constructed in granite and is mid-grey in colour. The memorial will be square base plinth, the sides will be weaving cut. Upon the plinth is a cuboid. The top and sides of which will be weaving cut. The front and rear of the memorial will be polished granite. Toward the top of the cuboid is a cut out hole: South Marine Park, Beach Road, South Shields</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects North and South Marine Parks and Bents 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 Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The following comments are therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations.</p> <p>Having studied the documents submitted we are disappointed by the lack</p>

					<p>of information included in the application, in particular any assessment of the impact on the historic layout of the park. In addition, this is a very prominent location and as the rockwork cascade and pool will form the backdrop to the memorial, we would hope that as part of the application, a condition is set that these are maintained in working order to act as such. Unfortunately, in its current form the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust cannot support this application and wish to lodge a Holding Objection until further information about the above concerns are obtained. We look forward to receiving this information in due course</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.11.2022 Thank you for the additional information provided in response to our letter of 31 October, further explaining the relationship of the proposed memorial to the cascade and steps within the layout of the historic Grade II South Marine Park. On this basis the Gardens Trust and Northumbria Gardens Trust are happy to lift the holding objection to this application and hope that the memorial does help to attract further use of this area of the park. We confirm that we have no further comments at this stage. Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Roker Park	Tyne and Wear	E22/1094	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Proposed development at Roker Park including earthworks to facilitate the creation of a new amphitheatre and viewing platform, construction of single storey building for a café (including detached bin store), felling / pruning of trees and associated landscaping (including paving, benches / seating and replacement railings). Roker Park Roker Park Road</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.11.2022 Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee on the above application which affects Roker 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 Northumbria Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this response. The following comments are therefore submitted on behalf of both our organisations. Having studied the documents submitted in support of the application we welcome the on-going programme of improvements underway in Roker Park. However, two points which we wish to highlight are:</p>

				Roker Sunderland MISCELLANEOUS	<p>· Whilst we appreciate that the proposed café wishes to benefit from views to both the bandstand and waterfall/dell, it is essential to ensure that the scale and location of the building does not result in it intruding on the setting of the Grade II Bandstand (which we understand is to be restored as part of the next phase of the improvement works).</p> <p>· And, that any recycled logs to be used as a feature between the forecourt of the new building and pond should only be hardwood to prevent their rapid deterioration.</p> <p>We have no further comments to add at this stage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alison Allighan Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Kenilworth Castle	Warwicks hire	E22/1156	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Erection of 5no. new stables (wooden in structure) and laying of new footings/base. (Resubmission of application W/21/1734).</p> <p>Hammonds Barn, Purlieu Lane, Kenilworth, CV8 1PQ</p> <p>MISCELLANEOUS</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Warwickshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>The application documents are insufficiently detailed, in particular the revised Heritage Statement (HS) and Design & Access Statement (D&A) making it extremely difficult to fully appreciate just how visible the site is from the Grade II* Registered Park & Garden (RPG) of Kenilworth Castle or the Grade I Castle itself. For a site of such sensitivity we would have expected wire frame visualisations of the proposals from the elevated position of the Castle as well as from various areas of the RPG. All photos of the site refer to Hammonds Barn as it formerly was, and there are no current site photographs showing just how the proposals would sit in the more exposed landscape. There are also no heights given for the stables except to say that they are single storey. The amended HS states that 'visually the new stables will only be visible from Purlieu Lane and fields that are either outside of Historic England's park/garden or not part of the grounds owned by Historic England ... therefore the impact of the stables should not be deemed to be detrimental from Kenilworth Castle.' This is directly contradicted by Historic England's letter which states : 'The site is clearly visible from the castle, one of England's premier castles.' HE's letter also makes clear that the barn is now almost entirely gone. The setting is therefore negatively affected due to the intervisibility of the application site, the RPG and Castle.</p>

					<p>Your officers will no doubt be aware of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) pub, 2nd Dec 2017 Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). Page 2 states that 'Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage' which is contrary to the applicant's statement quoted above concerning the impact of the proposals on the Castle. We would also suggest that the following statements from p5 of SHA are relevant : 'While many day-to-day cases will be concerned with development in the vicinity of an asset, development further afield may also affect significance, particularly where it is large-scale, prominent or intrusive. The setting of a historic park or garden, for instance, may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance but which need not be confined to land visible from the site, nor necessarily the same as the site's visual boundary. It can include: land which is not part of the park or garden but which is associated with it by being adjacent and visible from it.'</p> <p>We concur with the comments made by both HE, Warwick DC's own Conservation Officer and Kenilworth Town Council. We consider that the proposals would impact upon the setting of Kenilworth Castle and its RPG negatively, altering the openness of the long-distance views, and introducing a new, unwelcome element into the landscape. We object to the above application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mid Sussex DC District Plan	West Sussex	E22/1313	N/A	LOCAL PLAN District Plan consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2022</p> <p>This site is adjacent to Borde Hill Gardens which is included on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens maintained by Historic England with a Grade II* Designation. Any planning application at this site should include a Statement of Significance for Borde Hill Gardens together with an assessment of the impact of the proposals on that significance.</p> <p>Re DPN5: Historic Parks and Gardens</p> <p>The Gardens Trust is a Statutory Consultee under the NPPF and Local Planning</p> <p>Authorities must notify all planning applications affecting registered parks to the Gardens Trust (Grades I, II* and II) (Contact conservation@thegardenstrust.org). Mid Sussex has sometimes omitted to do this in the past and we would ask that this</p>

					<p>requirement is observed for future applications.</p> <p>In the case of applications affecting parks and gardens Graded I or II*, but not those at Grade II, there is also a requirement to consult Historic England.</p> <p>We therefore ask that the "Indicator" for the DPN5 Policy be extended to read: "Number of applications permitted contrary to advice received from the Conservation Officer or Historic England or the Gardens Trust." We are content for the "Target" to be Zero.</p>
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E22/0995	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use and alterations to Clock Tower to form one Residential unit</p> <p>Clock Tower High Royds Fold Menston</p> <p>CHANGE OF USE, BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 08.11.2022</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 Historic England (HE) Register of Parks and Gardens – High Royds Hospital, at Grade II (HE ref 1001469). High Royds is also a Grade II Listed Building, (HE ref 1240191). 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 internal alterations to refurbish the Clock Tower of the former hospital creating a new dwelling. The Clock Tower is a prominent feature on the south front of the main hospital building fronting High Royds Drive.</p> <p>We understand that there will be limited or no changes to the external building envelope. However, as the Clock Tower is such a key feature of High Royds, we suggest that should any changes be proposed for the external elevations, that your authority's conservation officer is consulted for further advice.</p> <p>We have no further comments. However, we emphasise that this does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

					Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Harewood House	West Yorkshire	E22/1054	I	PLANNING APPLICATION Additional parking spaces to car park Harewood Village Hall Church Lane Harewood PARKING	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Harewood House Registered Grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Harewood Village Hall, within Harewood village, is located immediately outside the eastern part of the registered boundary that skirts the village. It also lies within the Harewood Conservation Area. We understand that there are continuing problems re parking in the village and this proposal is for an additional seven spaces to add to the existing twenty- nine spaces around the Village Hall. The existing car park is surfaced in tarmacadam. The proposal should not have any impact on the registered park and garden, and we have no objection, however in view of our on-going climate conditions which result in episodes of very heavy rainfall, we advise that permeable paving would be preferable to tarmacadam, particularly as grass areas will need to be removed. Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth
High Royds Hospital	West Yorkshire	E22/1091	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Change of use and alterations to block 6 (former mortuary) to form three residential units including new bike shed and bin store Former High Royds Hospital Site- Block 6 Bradford Road Menston CHANGE OF USE	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Listed Building, HE ref 1240191; and set within the grounds of High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469 (now known as Chevin Park). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. High Royds Hospital was built as a mental hospital by West Riding County Council, and it was opened in 1888. It had been designed by the County Surveyor, Vickers Edwards. Edwards adopted an “echelon” layout for the

					<p>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 all set within the listed park. This application concerns the proposed change of use of the hospital Mortuary, to form three dwellings, each with a garden and car parking. We do not object to the applications in principle. But we do not support several aspects of the current detail design and we consider that the current applications are inadequate. For instance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the three proposed private gardens are to have no boundaries – neither walls, nor fences (see Application Form) · the proposed bin shed is to be located hard up against the windows of Dwelling 1 (see Proposed Site Plan) · the roofscape of the Mortuary is to apparently lose several existing features including patent ventilators and chimney stacks, without justification (see Roof Plans) · and the roof finish is to change to “grey slate” - currently it appears to be a “blue slate” (see Application Form) · access to the rear garden of Dwelling 2 · the existing tarmac park to be repaired and made good. The Application Form for vehicle access and hard standing notes ‘existing’ tarmac, but ‘proposed’ none. In view of current climate conditions, we suggest that the parking surface should be permeable. · etc. <p>We support the comments made by Leeds City Council Landscape Team, in so far as many details need yet to be developed and presented. In the meantime, we confirm that we object to these current applications.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Temple Newsam	West Yorkshire	E22/1161	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Listed Building application for installation of blinds to Miss Scot's Room, the Domestic Corridor, the Little Gallery, the	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 23.11.2022</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 Temple Newsam registered grade II with the house listed grade I. The</p>

				Gentleman's Passage, the bathroom and the office Temple Newsam House Templenewsam Road Halton BUILDING ALTERATION	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. The application is for blinds where lux levels are damaging objects in the rooms and the interior. We support this proposal and are pleased that the design of the blinds specified include an inner vision blind with a perforated fabric that allows people to see through the blind to the gardens and landscape as in earlier applications. Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning
Shibden Hall	West Yorkshire	E22/1201	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Outdoor 12 hole woodland themed Adventure Golf with the construction of a building as a refreshment area Shibden Park Godley Lane Halifax Calderdale SPORT/LEISURE	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 25.11.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens. In this case Shibden Hall/Park at Grade II. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. The location of this submission is on land immediately north of the northern boundary of the Registered Park and Garden and north of the access drive to the lakeside car park. It is in the area of a previous pitch and putt course. Shibden Hall/ Park is a very significant park for Calderdale and is much used and loved by the community and visitors. We note however that there is no reference to the registered landscape in the Heritage Statement and it should also be noted by the applicants that Shibden Hall is Listed Grade II*. ShibdenHall/Park is a landscape park with formal and informal gardens and pleasure grounds surrounding the 15th century and later manor house (Shibden Hall). The gardens, pleasure grounds, terrace, lake and drives were laid out from the 1830's by William Gray, John Harper, Joshua Major and Son and William Berry. Although the Heritage Statement suggests that the views of the proposed site 'can't be seen from the house', this is due to the belt of deciduous trees so the site will potentially be visible in the winter and if there is any trees loss. There is no mention of the historic designed landscape which is

					<p>the envelope for the Hall and although the proposed site is just outside the registered landscape in our view the development would harm the setting. It would introduce incongruous built structures into what currently appears as open field and would be more intrusive than the previous pitch and putt course with possible damage to tree roots and loss of habitat.</p> <p>We advise that should the application be determined as suitable for the setting of Shibden Hall/Park that all the trees in the area of the proposed development are protected by TPO's and there is a condition to maintain and enhance the tree cover.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
St Ives Estate	West Yorkshire	E22/1209	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Two storey side extension, with new roof construction. Front single storey boiler room extension.</p> <p>1 Golf Cottages Cross Gates Lane Harden Bingley West Yorkshire BD16 1AT</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 30.11.2022</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 – St. Ives Estate, HE ref: 1001707, 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 of St Ives Estate, previously called Harden Grange, was developed by the Ferrand family from the beginning of C19, including the replacement of the C17 mansion. In 1824 Adam Mickle, whose father and grandfather had worked with Lancelot (Capability) Brown, stayed as a guest of the family and advised on the further development of the landscape. (The Mickle dynasty played an important role in the landscaping of parks and gardens of Georgian Britain.) Between 1803 and 1837 Walker Ferrand, the younger brother of its owner Edward Ferrand, undertook extensive revisions and extensions to the design. When Edward died in 1837 his nephew William managed the estate creating the outstanding example of a romantic and wild setting which largely survives today. The estate contains more than a dozen individually listed buildings and features and it provides the setting for an important listed mansion. Although it is acknowledged that Golf Cottages are not individually listed, the applicant provides no information about the existing building's history. It appears to be a symmetrically designed golf clubhouse (OS 1:25,000 1937-1961), and its style might indicate a date around the second quarter of C20. (The Bingley and St Ives Golf Club now has new clubhouse.) The</p>

					<p>existing building is set close to its own site boundary amongst bushes at the side of the existing golf course. It appears from the application that the property ownership has subsequently divided the building into two, splitting ownership along the central line of symmetry – awkwardly splitting the centrally featured dormer window. The building's existing design addresses with dignity the golf course to its south-west, from which it is visible.</p> <p>The applicant has failed to submit any Heritage Statement or Design Statement. Considering the listed setting of the property this is a significant omission from the application.</p> <p>The proposed development totally destroys the symmetry of the existing design as seen from the front ie as seen from the central area of the estate. This appears to be an inappropriate, and unnecessary, level of damage to the dignified design of the existing building and its setting at the centre of the St Ives Estate.</p> <p>The current design proposes inappropriate materials, and they are used in an inappropriately gaudy style.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
WALES					
Gwrych Castle	Clwyd	W22/0016	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Allotments on the Gwrych Castle parkland next to Manorafon Farm Llanddulas Rd, Abergele LL22 8ET</p>	<p>WHGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2022</p> <p>WHGT objects to this planning application on a grade II* listed landscape in the Register of Landscapes Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales. The proposed allotments would fragment the site and introduce adverse visual impacts to the site. The proposed scheme fails to take account of the fact that the allotments are in the direct view lines from the terraces of Gwrych castle as shown on the 1995 Clwyd Register.</p> <p>The Statutory Register of Parks and Gardens in Wales of Special Historic Interest came into force on 1 February 2022. The listing of this site should protect it from any development which would have adverse impacts and that fails to enhance or restore the site.</p> <p>Gwrych castle, built by Lloyd Hesketh Bamford Hesketh between 1819 and 1833, is a very important landscape where the mansion is almost subordinate to the amazing array of Picturesque towers, turrets and terraces which dominate the landscape and are designed for views from within and without the site. A most important feature of the Gwrych</p>

					<p>design is the wide and far-reaching view over the parkland and the sea. Its modest sized parkland has an impressive and listed enclosing wall and the individual lodges are also listed, so these settings within the views should also be respected.</p> <p>Whilst there is an insatiable demand for allotments it would be a catastrophe if they were placed on the nation's few remaining intact historic parklands. Instead, they should be designed within new developments creating new holistically planned and self-sustaining new settlement garden communities as in Ebenezer Howard's original idea of the garden city.</p> <p>The process of establishing new allotments requires that the land must have planning permission for agricultural use. The term 'agricultural' is broadly defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and includes horticulture and fruit growing. The proposed site has no such planning permission as it lies within the curtilage of a grade I historic asset and is part of the parkland, never a cultivated or agricultural part of the estate. The Regency mansion relied on the already established productive gardens of Hen Gwrych, sited on a more sheltered part of the estate below the house just some 100 yards from the sea.</p> <p>The historic environment is rich and a finite resource to be preserved and protected by PP Wales for the wellbeing of present and future generations. There is a presumption against development which fails to enhance or conserve a site. There is no public interest, save for the potential allotment holders, served by the proposed development as it is not an enabling development which aims to improve or conserve the heritage asset.</p> <p>Gwrych Castle, its lodges and surrounding parkland wall contribute to a sense of place for the area.</p> <p>The proposed 45-60 allotments with their myriad of sheds communal centre, machinery store, toilets and carparking will all have an adverse visual impact. The dividing boundary features: hedges, fencing and new planting reshapes the heritage landscape and destroys the original open arcadian parkland design.</p> <p>There have already been encroachments on the Gwrych parkland so it is essential that what remains should be properly protected and conserved. The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes over time affects the significance of the heritage. The proposed development and changes to the landscape are not in keeping with the original stone designs of the estate's listed buildings as the materials are alien and the form of</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the buildings are of no architectural merit; they fail to preserve the character and appearance of the site. The proposed campervan parking is not a normal allotment feature; it is a concern that this is considered a financing arrangement for the allotments and sets a precedent of the site eventually becoming a campervan park. Such detrimental development on a grade II* listed parkland is entirely unacceptable and disregards the purpose of listing sites of special historic interest in Wales.</p> <p>The significance of Gwrych is dependent on the aesthetic qualities of the site as a whole and the vision of Lloyd Hesketh Bamford Hesketh. WHGT supports allotment developments in the right place. A site for allotments should be found which will not cause harm to Gwrych, one of the most remarkable Picturesque heritage assets in Wales.</p>
Soughton Hall	Clwyd	W22/0017	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Lodges at Northop Country Park HOLIDAY ACCOMODATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 24.11.2022</p> <p>The Welsh Historic Gardens Trust objects to this planning application at Northop Country Park for a lodge development which was previously refused in Sept 2020. This is not a redevelopment of the footprint of the property Springfields but a considerably larger footprint with the development of a 24-unit Lodge Park. WHGT considers that this development will materially change the character of this site.</p> <p>It is noted that the site and situation within the setting of the listed grade II* Soughton Hall remain the same as to that which was previously refused, although there has been a small reduction in the proposed number lodges to be developed on the open semi-improved grassland and scrub.</p> <p>The Statutory Register of Parks and Gardens in Wales of Special Historic Interest came into force on 1 February 2022. The listing of Soughton Hall should protect its setting from any development which would have adverse impacts and that fails to enhance or restore the site.</p> <p>The original outline planning for this site in the 1990s for a hotel has long since lapsed. Today it is recognised that the historic environment is rich and a finite resource to be preserved and is protected by PP Wales for the wellbeing of present and future generations. There is a presumption against development which fails to enhance or conserve a site. There is no public interest in this lodge development, save for the potential lodge holders and the developer, as it is not an enabling development which aims to improve or conserve the heritage asset.</p> <p>The proposed development is not in keeping with the original estate's designated listed buildings; the materials are alien and the form of the buildings have no architectural merit; they fail to preserve the character</p>

					<p>and appearance of the site.</p> <p>The visual impacts on this essentially rural area, the setting to Soughton Hall, with the depressing uniformity of the one and two storey lodges within their palings (as shown in the design statement) arranged in suburban cul de sacs, will be more than negligible. As well as the lodges, the hard landscaping of tarmac roads and the associated lighting together with the proposed planting and boundary features of the so called 'three character areas', all add to a fragmentation and the suburbanising character of the site. This development will erode views from without and within the park from the public footpaths as well as the listed landscape itself.</p> <p>The larger two storey units are not reflective of short stay holiday accommodation. The screening of these units by vegetation and tree cover cannot be relied upon as this is ephemeral and there are increasing tree losses due to climate change. Furthermore, the development of the site requires some felling of trees, whilst the remaining mature oak trees on the site will be likely compromised as several of the units lie in the tree root protection areas.</p> <p>The ecology report with this application was done in 2015 so is certainly out of date. The tree condition survey is even older, done in 2012. The storm damage over the past few years is certain to have affected the tree landscape of the site. The development alongside the small watercourse on the site is likely to impact a fragile environment. The site plan shows a pond but there is no indication as to how this might be enhanced or protected.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of incremental changes over time at Northop Country Park affects the significance of the site, and its heritage and ecological value.</p> <p>A Placemaking Wales Charter September 2020 has been developed to engage local people and community in new developments and maximising environmental protection and limiting environmental impact. There is no indication that this has been considered. The Charter prioritises walking, cycling and public transport to provide a choice of transport modes and avoid dependence on private vehicles. This lodge development seems excessively car orientated with the Springfields Reception Unit, which is poorly integrated with the rest of the site, having a large area of parking as well as a parking space for every lodge. There is a lack of information on any safe active travel routes to connect to the site. The Increased vehicular</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>access would have a detrimental impact on the peaceful quality of the site. There have already been numerous encroachments on the Northop Country Park so it is essential that areas that have remained undeveloped should be properly protected and conserved. The continued haphazard development and increased urbanising of this Country Park is undesirable as it fails to contribute to the aesthetic value of the site and certainly fails to enhance or protect the setting of a heritage asset.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---