



## GT AND CGT CONSERVATION CASEWORK RESPONSES DECEMBER 2022

The GT conservation team received 164 new cases and re-consultations for England. Written responses were submitted by the GT and/or CGTs for the following cases. In addition to the responses below, 48 'No Comment' responses were lodged by the GT and/or CGTs.

SITE	COUNTY	GT REF	GRADE	PROPOSAL	WRITTEN RESPONSE
Leigh Court	Avon	E22/1361	II	PLANNING APPLICATION New landscaping within courtyard of stable block including installation of statue, new wall mounted name plates, erection of freestanding arched sign to entrance of courtyard. Stable Block Leigh Court, Pill Road, Abbots Leigh	CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust [GT] in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Leigh Court. The Avon Gardens Trust is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of designated sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations. Avon Gardens Trust note that the existing use of traditional materials across the hard landscape and building detailing would be enough to provide a reminder of the historic context. A more confident and modest approach would be stronger and more appropriate, and would not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding Registered Park and Garden. Summary: The Avon Gardens Trust have considered all of the information that you have provided Including the previous unsuccessful application history in 2016. On the basis of this we object to any development which detracts from the existing modest character of the stable block and surrounding area. Yours sincerely,

					Kay Ross MA Chair, Avon Gardens Trust
Flitwick Manor	Bedfordshire	E22/1304	II	PLANNING APPLICATION Development of a 162-unit Integrated Retirement Community (IRC) providing Extra Care housing (Class C2) including 30% affordable housing in the form of 29 bungalows and 20 apartments, and a 66-bed Care Home with ancillary community and service space, garden and leisure areas, car parking, circulation space, internal access ways, principal access, and ancillary landscaping. Access only, all other matters reserved. Land South of Church Road, Flitwick, Bedfordshire	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.12.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Bedfordshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have studied the online documentation and our colleagues in the BGT have made a site visit. The development proposals are fairly substantial, especially the main care home, and although there is some tree cover between the adjacent Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) of Flitwick Manor immediately to the east of the application site, it is not particularly dense. The tree cover towards the northern end of the proposed site is also less tall. The visual intrusion from within the RPG increases substantially closer to, and especially from within the pinetum, which directly abuts the development site. There is little new planting proposed along the eastern boundary of the new development, particularly the northern section near Old Farm. The proposals, if allowed, will alter the setting of the western area of the parkland which has been agricultural ever since the creation of the estate. The development site makes an important contribution towards the setting and appreciation of the RPG and other heritage assets. The proposals also include extensive hard standing across the site adding to the detrimental impact. The Wixams development locally always has pools of freestanding water after a heavy downpour, and we would be concerned that the extensive hard standing across the application site would only add to these problems. The various LVIA viewpoints do not include any taken from within the RPG which we consider to be a serious omission. We also have concerns about light pollution affecting the RPG in this previously agricultural setting. The GT/BGT object to the above development and consider it will have a negative impact upon both the setting and significance of the RPG. Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer
Luton Hoo	Bedfordshire	E22/1335	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Remodelling and extension to golf course. Erection of a new	GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2022 Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by

				<p>clubhouse and office Luton Hoo Hotel Golf And Spa, Luton Hoo Estate, Hyde, Luton, LU1 3TQ</p>	<p>Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>This is a complex application on land held by the Arora Group, purchased from Elite Hotels, within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) of Luton Hoo, designed with the ambition to host the Ryder Cup in 2031. The application site is the majority and northern area of the RPG. Only the area of the Kitchen Garden, parkland to the southwest and Lady Bute's Lodge lie outside this (and within the separate ownership of the Luton Hoo Estate). The proposals would extend the existing golf activity across the northern area of the RPG, creating significant and notable change to the character of the historic designed landscape. The addition of a large new club house would further alter the landscape by expanding the suburban edge and urban character of Luton into what has until now remained a distinct unit of rural landscape.</p> <p>John Phibbs, the Capability Brown expert, originally prepared a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) which informed the conversion of the house to a hotel c.2002. This was a highly contentious enabling development case which saw the building-out of part of Brown's Flower Garden and the creation of a new golf course in the west of the RPG. This golf course was, however, concentrated in its extent. Mr Phibbs has again been involved as a heritage consultant to the current scheme and has (re) confirmed the significance of the RPG within the red line boundary and the difficulty of accommodating some of the proposed holes within the landscape. The present proposals seek to increase the size of the golf course from c.76ha to c.155ha (across character areas 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18). We acknowledge these proposals will remove existing golf holes from the area of The Plain close to the mansion and this needs to be recognised as a heritage benefit.</p> <p>However, we do not feel that the application documents contain sufficient information to enable us to ascertain how the golf course will actually look and sit within the landscape, despite the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) claiming at 1.1.7 that the majority of Brown's landscape "remains unaltered" and that "the majority of key views will remain intact". Figures in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) indicate the club house, but none seem to show any of the actual course. While the documents insist the course will follow the topography with minimal cut and fill, and that the development will be designed to sit "naturally" within the landscape, some cross sections suggest a notable</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>level of cut and fill of at least c.1m – c. 2m forming subtle but discernible terracing within the landscape and sometimes within key views (Golf Course Cross-Sections dwg. 1375.109.01).</p> <p>The DAS refers to an “intended comprehensive restoration scheme” of the “Registered Brownian Park and Garden”. Given the complexity of this proposal, we would have expected this document to have least been drafted to support the application and not to be secured (presumably) by condition.</p> <p>It is evident that given the significance of the site and the extent of the proposals, harm will be caused. Before we are able to comment in greater detail, we need to be able to understand how the golf course in particular, will look in the landscape, how sympathetic it will be to the existing parkland and wood pasture, how it effects Brown’s design intent and how it may compromise the future conservation of the landscape design. We would ask that the applicant provides this information so that can comment further.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2022</p> <p>In consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee, we as the local County Gardens Trust are always asked to comment and the following are our thoughts 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>There are some crucial points which need to be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The built new club house is of inappropriate design, having far too much glass, including a clerestory.</li> <li>2. It should not be placed where they propose. It shows total lack of understanding of a Capability Brown landscape which was carefully designed with a few eyecatchers to look at. They have sited it so it takes in a Brown view. The original seat would have been very much more discreet and not impinged on the landscape. They have not considered the view to the clubhouse which is a totally alien introduction to the 'natural' Brown design.</li> <li>3. The bunkers, tees and other paraphernalia of the Golf Course are also alien to the idea of a 'natural' landscape. The regrading where necessary</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>would destroy Capability Brown 's careful sculpting of the landscape and would draw the eye away from the designed long views across the site and to the horizon. and make for a bitty foreground instead of the balanced composition of foreground, middle-ground and background all of which appear natural which is a Capability Brown landscape.</p> <p>We suggest the applicant should be looking into – and adhering to - the HE Advice on Golf Courses – pertinent on principles but slightly outdated on legislation – our Hertfordshire counterpart in the Conservation team sends this to owners of Golf Courses when looking to illustrate why an offensive is necessary to a development. One of the things it would be interesting to find out is the level of detailed survey which went on before they laid out the first golf course. If not detailed enough, how do they know what to restore it to? And that is totally irrelevant to wrecking the other half. We would like to know the conditions given with the original planning permission but have not tracked them down.</p> <p>Central Bedfordshire policy states that:</p> <p>'Proposals that will degrade the character and appearance of a Registered p&amp;g, or which will cause substantial harm to the significance of these assets, will be refused, unless it is demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit'. Comments have been received that indicate that there are no public benefits here - just the owners commercial profit. And also there appear to be no convincing justification of the need of this development vis a vis the harm it will cause.</p> <p>Comments on the Golf course:</p> <p>An early hole impacts on an area adjacent to the Palladian gateway painted by Sandy and probably part of the entrance drive from the west designed by Brown for Herne (and on the polo ground where the King inspected the troops in WW1).</p> <p>Later holes down by the side of the lake are on an area Brown landscaped for Bute as part of the entrance driveway from Luton to showcase the lakes.</p> <p>Practise areas by the new clubhouse:</p> <p>These are adjacent to the column shown in several Sandby paintings and probably designed and positioned by Brown for Herne.</p> <p>Overall, we think they have tried to avoid areas they think are important but have not fully understood the historical significance of other earlier areas associated with Brown and Herne.</p> <p>It is evident that given the significance of the site and the extent of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>proposals, harm will be caused. Before we are able to comment in greater detail, we need to be able to understand how the golf course in particular, will look in the landscape, how sympathetic it will be to the existing parkland and wood pasture, how it effects Brown's design intent and how it may compromise the future conservation of the landscape design. We would ask that the applicant provides this information so that we can comment further.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Kevin Levitt Chair and Conservation Bedfordshire Gardens Trust</p>
Bearwood College	Berkshire	E22/0646	II*	<p><b>PLANNING APPLICATION</b></p> <p>Full application for the proposed erection of a sports hall and new pool building following demolition of existing ancillary buildings. Creation of new landscaped permeable parking area on the site of an existing car park.</p> <p>Reddam House, Bearwood Road, Sindlesham, Wokingham, RG41 5BG</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2022</b></p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.</p> <p>The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Bearwood Estate comprises Reddam House and the surrounding Registered Park and Garden both listed at GII*. The application is for demolition of parts of the college buildings with development of a new sports hall and swimming pool affecting both historic fabric of the main building and its setting. The proposed new buildings are inevitably larger in size and bulk than existing due to their functions.</p> <p>The proposed new buildings will be located on the north side of Reddam House and whilst will be highly visible on the trades and service approach to the school, as the existing outbuildings already are, will have an improved appearance over the existing buildings. The proposals should not detract from the adjacent parkland setting on this rear side of the school. It is considered that overall even though the large size and bulk of the new buildings will be impactful, their scale can be accommodated within the confines of the rear side courtyard of the large 19th century main building without harming the setting of the surrounding parkland. Traditional and appropriate materials should be used for the new structures in colours that do not outcompete the fine red and polychrome brickwork of the main school building.</p>

					<p>Wellingtonia Avenue along the main approach to the front of the school, comprising many well established Sequoiadendron Giganteum Glaucum trees are a significant feature within the park landscape. This dense tree cover acts to obscure views to the proposed development from the main approach to the school.</p> <p>The RPG is on the Heritage at Risk register and has become fragmented in ownership resulting in lack of management for trees affecting the designed views to and from the House and lake. It would be pertinent to restore the historic view from the House to the Lake and advice should be taken on some tree removal to open up the view. Conservation of the Terrace would also be welcomed.</p> <p>To conclude we have no objection to the revised application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin Planning Advisor of the Berkshire Gardens Trust</p>
Bearwood College	Berkshire	E22/1426	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to the Clubhouse with additional balcony space over and associated alterations to the existing balcony stairs and dining room fenestration, plus removal of existing external stairs and infilling of stairwell to form an extension to the existing balcony</p> <p>Bearwood Lakes Golf Club Bearwood Road Sindlesham Wokingham RG41 4SJ</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for bringing this application to our notice as consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) was overlooked. The GT has a role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. The Berkshire Gardens Trust (BGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Bearwood Lakes Golf Club is located within a GII* RPG of the Bearwood Estate. The fragmented ownership of the estate has resulted in non-cohesive management of the parkland and now lies on the Heritage at Risk register.</p> <p>We have no comment to make on the clubhouse extension proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Helen Parvin BSc (Hons)</p>
Hall Barn	Buckinghamshire	E22/1283	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 17 (approved plans) of planning permission PL/19/1268/FA (Demolition of a garage and erection of 3 two and a half storey dwellings with basements</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as statutory consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust who are familiar with the site and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p>

				<p>and integral garages. Formation of a vehicular access with associated hardstanding and landscaping.) to allow changes to size of basement and ground floor and minor alterations to appearance on all plots, and boundary adjustment between plots 2 and 3 (part retrospective)</p> <p>Land To Rear Of Wycombe End House, Wycombe End, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire</p>	<p>We have been consulted on this application due to its close proximity to Hall Barn.</p> <p>Hall Barn is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) with the first landscape park and woodland created by the poet Edmund Waller between 1651-1687. Further works were carried out by his grandson Edmund between 1715-30 with influence from John Aislabie.</p> <p>However, we note that this application is for yet more variations to the planning application 16/01506/FUL which has already been granted planning consent along with a number of subsequent revisions and amendments.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust notes that both the original D&amp;A statement and Case Officer reports do acknowledge the proximity to the RPG but that at no point has the Gardens Trust been consulted on this original application despite the fact that the application site directly abuts boundary of the RPG. The Gardens Trust has been previously consulted on the adjacent plot at Bradbury House which is already developed but not on this plot which, until these applications remained undeveloped garden land.</p> <p>We find it deeply regrettable that the approved plans have already allowed the proposed development to come so close to the northern boundary of the Old Park. We find it all the more unfortunate that the planning consent allows for rooflights and a substantial glazed ridge detail on Plot 3 which is the 3 storey proposed structure nearest to the RPG boundary. The Gardens Trust would have preferred to discourage such interventions which will result in light emittance and reflection into the RPG.</p> <p>We were consulted back in September 2022 on the previous application PL/22/2837/VRC for 'Variations of conditions'. Our response to that consultation was as follows: "However, as consent has already been granted and this current application concerns variations, we can only state that we object to any further development, alteration or intervention that brings the proposed development even nearer to the RPG." We note that planning consent was granted to that application.</p> <p>With regard to this elevation, we note the proposed yet further extensions will introduce yet more glazing and rooflights into this development. We therefore wish to reiterate that we object to any further development, alteration or intervention that brings the proposed development even nearer to the RPG.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the LPA are minded to approve these further variations to</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---



					<p>the approved scheme, that the LPA ensures that there is no further detrimental impact on the RPG from the introduction of the large French doors to rear elevation of plots 1 &amp; 2. We very much hope that this will be the last of the amendments and we would ask that your officers put a time limit on how many more will be allowed.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Tyringham	Buckinghamshire	E22/1285	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>The erection of a rear and side ground floor extension to form new attached garage, sun lounge and utility rooms 2 Garden Lane Tyringham Newport Pagnell MK16 9ED</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2022</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>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 submitted as part of this revised application does acknowledge the presence of the listed structures associated with Tyringham Hall but notably fails to identify and acknowledge the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) at Tyringham Park which wraps around the rear of the property.</p> <p>The application site, 2 Garden Lane, sits within the RPG and 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 proposals for the erection of a rear and side ground</p>

					<p>floor. We have no objection in principle to the proposed extension, but the large lantern roof and extensive fenestration in the form of large French doors will result in both light emittance and reflection which will in our opinion, unacceptably harm the RPG. As with similar applications in this area on which we have commented, damaging features such as the lantern roof should not be permitted nor the extensive glazing on the rear elevation of the proposed sunroom.</p> <p>The proposed roof form of the garage and the room behind is also unacceptably damaging as it is at the end of the development and abuts the sweep of The Shrubs as it surrounds the development. A continuous pitch roof form or a continuous flat roof form would be preferable rather than the flat roof of the rear extension visible beyond the pitched roof of the garage.</p> <p>In conclusion, the GT/BGT object to the proposed lantern roof, excessive glazing to the rear elevation of the extension and to the lack of a continuous roof form along the proposed extensions to the side elevation.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
West Wycombe Park	Buckinghamshire	E22/1299	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed 5G telecoms installation: H3G 18m street pole and additional equipment cabinets   Opposite Kittys Lodge High Street West Wycombe Buckinghamshire HP14 3AA</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust (GT) was alerted to this application by our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust (BGT). We are very surprised that you failed to consult us in our 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, as we have responded to applications relating to this site before. As you will note from our comments below, it is doubly worrying given the highly inappropriate and damaging nature of the proposals. I am therefore attaching copies of our planning leaflet and guidance for LPAs and would be very grateful if you could please make sure that we are always consulted in future. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>With reference to the above application, the Gardens Trust are writing to object in the strongest of terms to the proposed erection of a 18m telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure at the application site.</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposals and note that the proposed mast is 3</p>

					<p>metres higher than permitted under the special rights and sits immediately opposite the north-western boundary of the West Wycombe Park (National Trust) Grade I registered park and garden (RPG) along with both Daphne's Temple and Kitty's Lodge (also both National Trust) which are both listed grade II* and which frame the original entrance to West Wycombe Park. It is also likely to be in views to and from the Grade I Mausoleum and the Grade I Church of St Lawrence at the top of West Wycombe Hill. Grade I RPG West Wycombe Park is described as "A complex, well-preserved C18 landscape park and pleasure grounds around an C18 Palladian villa. Some later advice by Humphry Repton, 1790s. The site's significance can be summed up as 'one of the most perfect and masterly expressions in England of the Natural Landscape school of gardening, with many fine garden buildings in an exquisite designed landscape'". The listing goes on to state that "This entry is a summary. Because of the complexity of this site, the standard Register entry format would convey neither an adequate description nor a satisfactory account of the development of the landscape.'</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed application site is within the West Wycombe Conservation Area and in the setting of the AONB. The proposed application site is one of the most significant positions in this landscape where the four Chilterns valleys meet and described in the RPG listing as 'The setting to the west is still that of the pastoral and sylvan Chiltern Hills, encompassing the dominant mass of West Wycombe Hill, with its church and mausoleum, to the north.' The proposed monopole would be extremely prominent in views from roads and footpaths coming to the top of the West Wycombe Road, heading south from West Wycombe Village and also coming down the A4010 from Princes Risborough.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Conservation Area map identifies the application site as being precisely in the key views looking up to West Wycombe Hill and looking down from West Wycombe Hill, St Lawrence Church and Church Tower and the West Wycombe Mausoleum to West Wycombe Road and High Wycombe beyond. The West Wycombe Conservation Area Assessment identifies the following key issues with regard to new development :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special care must be taken to ensure the views looking into and out of the conservation area are not spoilt. Those of particular importance are marked on the survey map</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the conservation area higher standards of design are required, as it is the function of the planning authority to consider all applications as to whether they preserve or enhance the special character as identified in this appraisal.</li> <li>• Given the landscape and historic designations, and the land ownership patterns in the conservation area, it is unlikely that any sites for new development will come forward.</li> </ul> <p>The significance of this landscape is further emphasised in the RPG which states “The church tower of St Lawrence (tower 1751, nave and chancel 1765, listed grade I), and the mausoleum (John Bastard the Younger 1765, listed grade I) on West Wycombe Hill are eyecatchers in views north and west towards and beyond the pleasure grounds.”</p> <p>It is difficult to imagine a more inappropriate choice of setting for such a modern intrusion.</p> <p>We note from the applicant’s Planning Statement what appears to be a total lack of understanding or a wilful disregard of historic significance and heritage designation. Their Figure 1 on page 3 shows a row of trees with no context whatsoever as to the setting and only accompanied by the misleading statement “Proposed location of a new mast shown above will assimilate well into the immediate street scene and not be detrimental.”</p> <p>Page 2 of their Planning Statement states “It is our opinion that the proposed design presents a better ‘fit’ within the local community and immediate street scape, offering a reduced visual impact upon an area of adopted highway identified, as situated out with a conservation area or other such restrictive designation.”</p> <p>The proposed application site is not the ordinary ‘streetscape’ that the planning statement would suggest but the centre of some of the most significant and iconic views in this part of Buckinghamshire as shown in the photograph below.</p> <p>We are incredulous that there appears to be no reference or regard for the numerous heritage designations and historic significance affecting this site. This is truly one of the poorest planning applications that we have ever had to respond to and negligent in its assessment of the enormous detrimental impact of these proposals.</p> <p>We note that the National Trust have already strongly objected to this application.</p> <p>The GT/BGT wishes to OBJECT to this planning application in the strongest</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>possible terms. If there is any remote possibility that the planning authority is considering this application, we insist that the applicant is required to prepare and submit a full Historic Impact Assessment alongside Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments before any further consideration of this application is made. In the absence of this, we strongly urge the LPA to refuse this application entirely.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Stowe	Buckinghamshire	E22/1398	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Variation of condition 1 (Approved plans) attached to planning permission 18/04234/ADP (Application for reserved matters pursuant to outline permission 16/02745/AOP for layout, scale, external appearance, the access, and the landscaping of the site) required alterations to the facility to suit tenant use of the building Silverstone Park, Unit 1504, Silverstone Motor Racing Circuit Silverstone Road Biddlesden Buckinghamshire</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022</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 looked at the above 'variation of conditions', seeking alterations to suit a specific tenant. There is limited information relating to the alterations, and in order to respond we have had to refer back to earlier iterations, in this case attached to planning permission 18/04234/ADP (Application for reserved matters pursuant to outline permission 16/02745/AOP.</p> <p>The application site lies to the northwest of Grade I listed Stowe park, which itself lies immediately adjacent to the southern tip of Silverstone Park. The Historic England register entry describes Stowe as an : 'Extensive and complex pleasure grounds and park around a country mansion. Main phases C18 and early C19, utilising late C17 base, with early C18 work by Charles Bridgeman, Sir John Vanbrugh, James Gibbs and William Kent, and mid C18 work by Lancelot Brown. Stowe was supremely influential (our emphasis) on the English landscape garden during the C18.' When we responded back in 2018 we commented that it was surprising that a Heritage Statement had not been submitted as the Silverstone Golf course lies between the application site and the RPG. It is very disappointing that there is still no trace of such a report as far as we can tell.</p> <p>The application site is intimately related to the Stowe registered area and its setting even though it is some distance away. There is considerable potential for damage from large scale buildings in the circuit area. We</p>

					<p>would like to know how the proposals relate to the topography or whether there are any interconnecting views, particularly north from the ridings in Stowe Woods. One of the key axial views is already marred by an insensitively placed building. We feel that your officers cannot make a decision on these variations until they can be satisfied that they will not further detract from the setting and significance of Stowe.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Park House 3 Colepike Hall, Lanchester	County Durham	E22/1277	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Retrospective planning permission for existing garden walls and pillars.</p> <p>Park House 3 Colepike Hall  Lanchester Durham DH7 0RW</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 14.12.2022</p> <p>The Northumbria Gardens Trust works with the Gardens Trust which is a statutory consultee on Registered historic parks and gardens. This retrospective planning application has appeared on the weekly list circulated by the GT, who have asked us to respond as it is not a Registered Park &amp; Garden. Colepike Hall is on the local list of the county's historic parks and gardens. The Hall itself is also a Grade II listed building and the proposed works lie within its listed curtilage.</p> <p>The planning application is retrospective and is intended to rectify unauthorised works close to the listed house, namely the erection of two lengths of Gothic stone balustrading and two brick and dressed stone gate piers.</p> <p>The position of the two features, stone balustrading to the south and gate piers to the east complement the existing brick garden walls to the north and west, evidently suggesting there is a plan to create a broadly square formal enclosure here. One imagines that the balustrading and the brick piers in particular, would not remain sitting in splendid isolation but would be bound into the formal geometry of the space with some hedging planting or other form of soft landscaping enclosure. However, from the proposed site plan, this formality does conflict with the soft tree and shrub edging to the curved approach drive. How will that design issue be resolved?</p> <p>All of the previous paragraph's speculation, for that is all it can be, is due to a complete absence of any overall landscape plan proposed in this application. The CAD plans are unhelpful in the extreme, the proposed site plan clearly demonstrates design conflicts that are not resolved, and the heritage statement is so minimal that the whole application appears to demonstrate a reluctance to offer serious proposals, seeming only to be 'going through the motions' of seeking retrospective consent.</p>

					<p>Despite there being no historical precedent for a formal design element to the south of the house frontage, within its approach drive, the Northumbria Gardens Trust are prepared to believe that the situation can be redeemed by a clear professional landscape design statement that integrates these seemingly random structures into a coherent formal garden plan with added planting proposals, paths, etc. shown and fully explained in a new heritage statement and plans. It would also be important to know of the provenance of the Victorian stone balustrading too?</p> <p>As submitted, the two brick and stone garden structures, already built, have no purpose and form no part of any integrated landscape design. As such they are detrimental to the setting of the listed building and the application should be refused.</p> <p>If much better documentation can show that they are part of an overall landscape design that is sensitive to their location close to the listed house and can resolve design issues close to the approach drive, then they may be acceptable. We would suggest the applicant must greatly improve the submitted plans and produce a meaningful heritage statement that sets out a coherent landscaping scheme if this planning application is to be successful.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Martin Roberts On behalf of the Northumbria Gardens Trust</p>
Hylands Park	Essex	E22/1288	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of Go Ape high ropes adventure course and reception cabin</p> <p>Land West Of North Car Park</p> <p>Hylands Estate Greenbury Way</p> <p>Writtle Chelmsford Essex</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2022</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. Hylands Park is a Grade II* Listed Registered Park and Garden (RPG) located to the South of Chelmsford. It comprises late C19 gardens with a serpentine lake, orchestrated vistas and pleasure gardens, set within an early C18 park. Humphrey Repton produced a Red Book for the park in the early C19.</p> <p>The proposal is to establish a Go Ape course within the boundary of the RPG at Hylands Park, within the north-west boundary in the woodland belt. It is considered that further details and information are required at this stage to fully understand what is being proposed.</p>

					<p>The heritage statement contains no assessment of the significance of the RPG or the impact of the proposal to the RPG. Therefore, we suggest that the Heritage Statement should be rewritten to acknowledge the RPG and the impact/potential harm to it.</p> <p>The Supporting Statement and Arboricultural Statement could also be enhanced, as currently they are generic, and the Supporting Statement makes reference to a site in Kent. The Arboricultural Statement also refers to storage buildings which are then not referred to elsewhere within the application. Confirmation as to whether these will be constructed as well as the cabin would be useful to fully assess impact to the RPG. Detailed plans of the trees would also be expected.</p> <p>The Supporting Statement suggests that the site would be gated, however, there is no mention of fencing. Details of this will be required, along with details of proposed surfacing and materials.</p> <p>In principle, the location is appropriate, as there are other recreational uses here and there is screening from tree cover (although less so in Winter months). Consideration should given to exploring scope for planting conifers to help hide the Go Ape equipment. We also have concerns that the proposal may lead to the damage of historic trees through the added infrastructure and heavier use of the park here as a result. We would therefore also recommend that budget for parkland restoration is included within the proposal to restore the RPG at the end of the life of the Go Ape structure.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Harlow Town Park	Essex	E22/1455	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Installation of footgolf course on former pitch and putt course</p> <p>Site Of Former Pitch And Putt, Town Park, Park Lane, Harlow, Essex</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2022</p> <p>Harlow Council failed to notify the Gardens Trust so we were not aware of this application until the afternoon of 21st December, the cut-off date for responses. We are disappointed that it leaves us very little time to consider the application in the run up to Christmas and staff holidays. We have consulted our colleagues in the Essex Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the sparse, poorly-prepared and repetitive online-documentation. There is no indication of what the course will look like, there is no statement of significance and the Heritage Statement (HS), Design &amp; Access statement (D&amp;A) and Arboricultural Assessment (AA) all repeat the sentence : 'it is felt that this change of use will fit in with the</p>



					<p>heritage of the site' without any clear reasoning or explanation. We would have expected professional reports outlining the necessary information, and the Tree Survey mentioned in the AA should have been included with the documentation. The lack of rigour in the documentation does not reassure us that the applicant has appreciated the sensitivity of the Grade II registered park and garden (RPG) and what impact the proposals may have on the RPG. We would for example have expected the applicant to show where the site lies within the RPG, and it is apparent that as a proportion of the park, its area is quite considerable and possibly occupies as much as a fifth of the entire RPG. This will have an intrusive and negative impact upon the appreciation of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Your officers will 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). It is apparent that the ground slopes down towards the housing in Arbour Mews which is adjacent to the boundary of the RPG. SHA p2 states : 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity.' This is expanded upon on p11, where consideration must be given to the experience of the asset which can be negatively affected by factors such as : 'Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset; ... Busyness, bustle, movement and activity.' All these apply in this instance.</p> <p>We consider that the poor documentation fails NPPF para 194 as the application does not 'describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.'</p> <p>The GT/EGT object to the above application for the impact it will have on the setting and significance of the RPG, and its failure to comply with the NPPF.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Frampton Court	Gloucestershire	E22/1017	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Section 73 Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of Application Reference Number:	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might impact on Listed or Registered parks ,gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond to</p>

				<p>S21/0465/FUL (The construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning for a renewable energy scheme of up to a 49.9 megawatt (MW) solar farm and up to a 49.9MW battery storage facility). Variation to consist of two point-of-contact masts required to connect solar farm to electricity grid Supersede the approved Landscape Strategy Plan with amended version illustrating the location of proposed masts</p> <p>Land Parcel A, Moreton Valence, Gloucester, Gloucestershire.</p>	<p>this variation on its behalf.</p> <p>It is worth noting that GGLT was less than enthusiastic about the impact of this scheme on the heritage assets of Whitminster.</p> <p>The Trust proposed moving the arrays and associated kit further north-east and reinforcing the planting at a time when the additional masts were not in evidence. This second variation does little to help the situation; and from the Pegasus Groups letter of the 15th December, only seems of benefit to the client and contractor.</p> <p>The District Council has to make up its mind between Government policy to promote solar energy; and its commitment to the management and conservation of the District's historic and aesthetic heritage.</p> <p>The drawing by JBM of the "looped in POC mast connection" showing the NE and SW elevations of the cumulative masts, demonstrates quite clearly the this will be of substantial visual detriment to the sensitive historic and aesthetic importance of the area.</p> <p>This issue should have been addressed from the outset.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>David Ball (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Stancombe Park	Gloucestershire	E22/1326	I	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration &amp; renovation and the rebuilding of existing single storey link addition</p> <p>Parkers Lodge, Stancombe, Dursley, Gloucestershire.</p> <p>REPAIR/RESTORATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2022</p> <p>The Garden Trust, as Statutory Consultee for planning proposals that might adversely impact on Listed or Registered parks, gardens and landscapes, has notified The Gloucestershire Gardens and Landscape Trust (GGLT) to respond on its behalf.</p> <p>Having considered works to this group of buildings in the past, these revised proposals do not have an adverse impact on their immediate setting, nor on the wider park and gardens of Stancombe.</p> <p>The detailed proposals that blend both traditional and contemporary construction will enable these important buildings within the wider setting of Stancombe to once more have a beneficial use.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>David Ball, (on behalf of GGLT)</p>
Yard Land adjacent to Larkwood Leisure Centre	Greater London	E22/0881	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site including the erection of a new residential building of up to 7 storeys to provide up to 72 new homes (Use Class C3); together</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2022</p> <p>The Gardens Trust has been notified about the above planning application pertaining to the Landscape Contractors Yard, adjacent to Larkwood Leisure Centre, and the potential impact on Larkwood Park.</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks and Gardens LPG). LPG is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the</p>

				<p>with associated access, landscaping, disabled parking and public realm. Landscape Contractors Yard, Land adjacent to Larkswood Leisure Centre, E4 9EY</p>	<p>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 <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a>) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). Having read the documentation and checked the position on the map, it is noted that there is one green space that is adjacent to the development site: Larkswood Park, which although not a Registered Park and Garden features on the LPG Inventory : <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=WAL023">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=WAL023</a>.</p> <p>On reviewing the Waltham Forest Draft Local Plan earlier this year, the LPG had noted the following site allocation, which is relevant in this case. It is understood that the present application is seen as a first stage of development of this larger site.</p> <p>"SA61 - Larkswood Leisure Centre and Nursery and the Land to the Rear of Larkswood Leisure Centre – site includes land designated as 'Local Green Space' within the site boundary; the Site Requirements (LP2 3.61.1) include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Safeguard land to the rear/south of the site as Local Green Space (LGS). Nothing can be built on this part of the site.</li> <li>· Development proposals should protect and enhance the adjacent Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) of the Larks Wood and Larkswood Playing Field that bound the site.</li> <li>· Development proposals should reference and respond to the conclusions and recommendations of the 2021 ecological appraisal on the Local Green Space.</li> </ul> <p>The Development Guidelines (3.61.2) give the following as key considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Existence of sensitive edges on sides of the site with the ancient woodland of the adjacent Larks Wood and Larks Wood Playing fields, which are designated Metropolitan Open Land · Designated Local Green Space</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>(LGS) to the rear/south of the site is defined as a Priority 1 Habitat.”</p> <p>Although Larkswood Park dates from 1936 as a public amenity provided by the then Chingford Borough Council, the long history of the woodland as part of Epping Forest is of considerable heritage value. In addition to the historic interest and the site’s designation as MOL, we note that Larkswood is designated as a Nature Conservation Area of Borough Importance. As a result we would urge that in-depth investigation into the effect of adjacent development on the woodland and contiguous public open space should be undertaken as part of all planning applications here in order that these important green spaces are safeguarded for the future.</p> <p>In addition to objections relating to concern for the preservation of the historic woodland expressed by a number of local groups (including the Friends of Ainslie and Larkswood) and which we would support, we understand that objections have also been made to the proposed development on the grounds of building height and massing, impact on local services, parking availability and incompatibility with the suburban character of this part of Waltham Forest, which retains a semi-rural atmosphere.</p> <p>On the basis of the above LPG objects to the current proposal as presented, which in our view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· fails to take sufficient account of the heritage importance of this site adjacent to MOL;</li> <li>· fails to provide sufficient evidence of heritage value and biodiversity interest of the adjacent Nature Conservation Area of Borough Importance in accordance with the Local Plan and supporting guidance.</li> </ul> <p>I would be very grateful if you could keep the LPG updated on the decision and any changes to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Sally Williams</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group</p>
Bromley Town Centre SPD	Greater London	E22/1158	N/A	LOCAL PLAN Submission consultation	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2022</p> <p>I write as a member of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks &amp; Gardens Trust (trading as London Parks &amp; Gardens; LPG). LPG is affiliated to The Gardens Trust (TGT, formerly the Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts), which is a statutory consultee in respect of planning proposals affecting sites included in the Historic England (English Heritage) Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest.</p>

					<p>LPG is The Gardens Trust for Greater London and makes observations on behalf of TGT in respect of registered sites, and may also comment on planning matters affecting other parks, gardens and green open spaces, especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). The Trust has compiled a list of sites in each borough, including Bromley, which can be accessed <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>The LPG inventory is compiled selectively with reference to 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 <a href="#">here</a>).</p> <p>Many of London's parks and gardens, churchyards and squares are very well known but there are a myriad of smaller open green 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 treatment of open spaces in the Urban Design Guidance SPD maintains and enhance the benefits these sites bring to the borough.</p> <p>Our Response</p> <p>We would like to take this opportunity to make some comments and recommendations on the treatment of the historic environment and open space within Chapter 5 – Design Guidance.</p> <p>Character and Identity</p> <p>Policy DG1 notes that 'All development proposals should make a positive contribution to the setting and seek to reinforce local character and identity by:</p> <p>c) Preserving and enhancing the positive aspects of Bromley's unique character by referencing and taking cues from the surrounding context to inform an appropriate architectural language which is sympathetic and responsive to the existing or emerging context. The introduction of new building forms may be appropriate in areas which have an inconsistent character or limited qualities in order to create a more positive identity.'</p> <p>While the Trust welcomes the requirement that development proposals should respect the setting and character of the environs, we suggest that more precise language be used to reduce the risk of misinterpretation. The following wording is suggested:</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>c) Preserving and enhancing the positive aspects of Bromley's unique character by referencing and taking cues from the surrounding context to inform an appropriate architectural language which is sympathetic and responsive to the existing or emerging context setting. The introduction of new building forms may be appropriate in areas which have an inconsistent character or limited qualities in order to create a more positive identity where this may enhance or improve the coherence of a character area.</p> <p>Heritage and Conservation</p> <p>We welcome the statement in paragraph 5.9 that 'understanding and responding to the historic environment is key to creating successful and sustainable places.' However, we would recommend that the following sentence be removed -</p> <p>'Achieving the right balance between conservation and development requires careful management in order to enable rather than preclude opportunities for positive change.'</p> <p>The correct approach to balancing conservation and development is set out clearly in the NPPF, Chapter 16, where it is discussed in the specific context of 'proportionality' and 'public benefit'. It is our opinion that this section of the SPD should be concerned only with how developments should conserve and enhance the historic environment. However, if balance between conservation and development is to be addressed in this section, we would recommend that readers be signposted to the existing policies where the established approach is set out in detail.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to conservation areas, statutorily and locally listed buildings in paragraph 5.10. We would recommend this paragraph be expanded to include the historic open spaces. Alongside several Registered Parks and Gardens, the LPG Inventory provides a list of other historic open spaces which could be referenced here.</p> <p>LPG welcomes the statement in paragraph 5.11 that 'applicants should provide a detailed Heritage Statement describing the significance of any heritage assets impacted by development proposals, including the contribution made to their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance for an informed assessment to be made.'</p> <p>In accordance with paragraph 195 of the NPPF we would suggest that this paragraph also include the requirement for applicants to 'identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.’</p> <p>Policy DG2: Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets</p> <p>LPG is concerned that the wording of the introduction to this policy risks mis-construing the NPPF guidance on justifying harm and loss to heritage assets. ‘All development proposals should seek to preserve and enhance existing heritage assets unless it can be demonstrated that the wider public benefits decisively outweigh any harm or loss.’</p> <p>We recommend this be re-worded as follows:</p> <p>‘All development proposals should seek to preserve and enhance existing heritage assets.</p> <p>Harm or loss may only be justified where detrimental impacts are outweighed by wider public benefits, in accordance with paragraphs 199 – 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.’</p> <p>We recommend that point a), which requires proposals to ‘demonstrate an understanding of the significance of heritage assets[...] including their evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value’, signpost the reader to English Heritage’s Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance, where further information on assessing significance is given.</p> <p>Tall Buildings</p> <p>Overall LPG welcomes the discussion of taller buildings in paragraphs 5.24 to 5.34. We note however that within Policy DG4 there is no specific reference to the impact of tall buildings on the settings of heritage assets and open spaces more generally.</p> <p>We recommend that point a) be expanded to read</p> <p>[All development proposals should] consider the visual, functional, environmental, and cumulative impact on both the immediate setting and the wider surrounding context in accordance with Policy D9 of the London Plan (March 2021). Proposals should take account of, and avoid harm to, the setting of heritage assets including registered parks and gardens and other noted historic landscapes as defined by your Open Green Spaces policy.</p> <p>Open Green Spaces</p> <p>LPG welcomes the inclusion of paragraphs 5.218 - 5.220 on Open Green Spaces, particularly the reference to the range of spaces including leisure gardens and allotments, sports facilities, playgrounds, cemeteries, churchyards and woodland as well as formal parks. We recommend that a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>reference to the LPG inventory is included here to give further information on the public space currently available in the borough. We recommend however that paragraph 5.219 is amended to state that 'the borough also contains areas where the provision of and access to open green space falls below acceptable levels'. The current wording, which says that provision of access in areas of deficiency 'could be improved' does not accord with the urgency afforded to Open Space Deficiency in the London Plan, policy G4.</p> <p>Further Information</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 PriorityAreas etc. We have compiled this analysis in the attached appendix, which shows the distribution of protections across the sites.</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 works 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 hope this resource will be used to help inform supplementary planning documentation in the future.</p> <p>Martha Bailey</p> <p>For and on behalf of the Planning &amp; Conservation Working Group</p>
Beddington Park	Greater London	E22/1289	N	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing extension and erection of a single storey side/rear extension with a new window on the west elevation. Grange Lodge London Road Wallington SM6 7BT</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2022</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 &amp; Conservation Working Group of the London Historic Parks &amp; 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,</p>



					<p>especially when included in the LPG's Inventory of Historic Spaces (see <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/</a> ) and/or when included in the Greater London Historic Environment Register (GLHER). In this instance we are aware that the site is adjacent to and formerly part of Beddington Park and the Grange which is locally listed, within a conservation area, and on on the LPG Inventory: <a href="https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=SUT004">https://londongardenstrust.org/conservation/inventory/site-record/?ID=SUT004</a></p> <p>LPG has considered the information that you have provided and on the basis of this there are no comments on these proposals. This does not in any way signify either our approval or disapproval of the proposals and should new information come to light that may have an impact on the heritage asset the Trust reserves the right to alter its observations.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, John Phillips</p>
Kennington Park	Greater London	E22/1333	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of 2 existing toilet blocks (1 to the south and 1 to the north east of the playground area) and replacement of the southern toilet block with a new public toilet block, together with the provision of additional paving, a new gate and associated planting. (Please note: The reference number for this Listed Building Consent application is 22/03787/LB, but there is also an associated application for Full Planning Permission related to these works with reference number: 22/03786/RG3)</p> <p>Kennington Park St Agnes Place London</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2022</p> <p>This is the second time in recent weeks that Lambeth has failed to notify the LPG or more importantly the GT as Statutory Consultee in a timely manner. In this instance it was only because the Friends of Kennington Park notified the LP&amp;G that we discovered these omissions. LP&amp;G also notified us of application 22/01206/EIAFUL which (again they found out through local contacts rather than direct from Lambeth Council) and a separate letter has been sent on that case.</p> <p>We have previously sent you a copy of our Planning Leaflet with guidance for Local Planning Authorities and I am attaching it again. The leaflet has not been amended to take account of the most recent NPPF changes but the precepts hold true regardless. We would welcome confirmation that your officers will make sure that this does not happen again and that the GT will be notified as a Statutory Consultee in relation to all developments that may affect designed landscapes within Lambeth.</p> <p>The lack of consultation gives us extremely little time to respond. We have considered the information provided in support of the application and liaised with our colleagues in LP&amp;G. Fortunately, in this instance we believe the proposals are likely to be beneficial to the park and we do not wish to comment further at this stage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>

Sale and Brooklands Cemetery	Greater Manchester	E22/1232	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of the former lodge building to a residential dwelling, erection of single storey side extension together with alterations to existing outbuilding, new sliding gates and boundary treatment</p> <p>Sale Cemetery, Marsland Road, Sale, M33 1UN</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2022</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 Cheshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We responded to a previous iteration of this application in May this year (107448/FUL/22). That application was withdrawn and this new one differs slightly. The lodge house lies within the Grade II registered park and garden of Sale &amp; Brooklands Cemetery and together with the existing gates and adjacent railings, forms one of the main entrances to the cemetery. As before, the GT has no objection to the conversion of the lodge to a residential dwelling and the extension has been married sensitively into the original building. We are pleased to note that the existing entrance has now been retained in the current application.</p> <p>Although the application description above still refers to sliding gates, the photograph and diagram showing Gates and Post Details, drawing MC-DET04 appears to show the original swinging gates operated by an electrical opening mechanism attached to a steel post. By contrast, drawing MC-DET03 illustrates a new, far simpler gate design with the gate profile repeated for adjacent fencing proposed for the rear garden area north of the lodge. The gate and fencing in this area is of a contemporary functional design, subservient to the main entrance gates as is appropriate to their purpose.</p> <p>The proposed physical separation of the Lodge from the Cemetery is however, of concern. The area between the Lodge and Marsland Road should be retained in its current open form. The previous application had a hedge to the boundary between Lodge and Cemetery which would be preferable if division is absolutely required. Gardens of cemetery lodges were quite commonly defined in this way.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Minley Manor	Hampshire	E22/1228	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Change of use of Minley Manor and ancillary land and buildings from C2A to a hotel, restaurant and wedding venue use, erection</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.12.2022</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</p>

				<p>of an extension to the Manor following demolition of existing structures, erection of an extension to the orangery, extension and alteration of former swimming pool buildings, extension, alterations and change of use of stable buildings to form 8 hotel suites, demolition of garages adjacent to stables, demolition of garages adjacent to Arch Cottage and erection of 7 hotel suites, erection of an extension to the officers annexe, erection of a spa building, swimming pool and function suite in the North Walled Garden, erection of a forestry building, creation of a new parking area, alterations to the internal road layout, alterations to Kennel Cottage, erection of new entrance lodge, walls and gates and alterations to the vehicular access onto the 4327 Minley Manor, Minley Road, Blackwater, Camberley, Hampshire GU17 9JT</p>	<p>Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Although the application is very large, since the original application back in 2016 the impact upon the historic landscape has been given greater consideration and early comments from the Hampshire Gardens Trust and HE have been taken on board in the most recent iteration. We are glad to see a CMP which will guide future developments at Minley. 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>
Poles Park	Hertfords hire	E22/1368	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>2 Replacement windows to South elevation.</p> <p>North Lodge Hanbury Drive Thundridge Hertfordshire SG12 0GQ</p> <p>BUILDING ALTERATION</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 11.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member. North Lodge occupies a key position at the entrance to Grade II registered Poles Park and the two specified windows overlook the main drive. On the basis of the information in this application we have no objection to the works as proposed.</p>
Chartwell	Kent	E22/1276	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of three outbuildings and associated hard landscaping.</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 15.12.2022</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 with single storey raised platform treehouse. Moorcroft Place Mapleton Road Westerham Kent TN16 1PS</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 Kent Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. Please accept my apologies as we appreciate that comments are due in by close of play on 13th December and this will be a little late.</p> <p>The application site is adjacent to the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG) of Chartwell, and as such any proposals which may affect this highly graded heritage asset, must be sensitive to the constraints this brings. The site already has planning approval under 19/01165 for a single storey structure with basement. This planning approval was subject to several conditions, one of which (condition 5) states "no development shall take place until the summerhouse, playroom and stables block has been demolished". To date only the stable block has been demolished, and a new elevated structure has already been constructed on the site of the former stable block. This directly contravenes the plans approved under condition 13 of 19/01165.</p> <p>Whilst the treehouse is surrounded by woodland which limits visibility, the current application seeks to gain approval retrospectively for the unconsented structure. The Planning Statement produced by Lichfields lists the planning history for the site (item 3.1). It is apparent that in the past on various occasions the applicant has sought to gain planning approval either retrospectively or by appeal. The current application is a further example of the applicant's disregard for the planning process.</p> <p>For these reasons the GT/KGT object to this application and request that your planning officer requires the single storey raised platform treehouse to be demolished for contravention of the conditions imposed in planning application 19/01165.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Waldershare Park	Kent	E22/1396	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of fencing Waldershare Park And Gardens, Waldershare Park, Waldershare, Kent</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Kent Gardens Trust (KGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and the GT/KGT do not object to this application for the construction of 2.37 km of deer fencing</p>

					<p>around Waldershare Park.</p> <p>The GT/KGT request that it is done to respect the existing boundary which varies from hedges, trees, woods to the absence of any existing boundary. This will ensure that the fence will be sited to avoid or reduce the harm to the landscape in accordance with Core Strategy 2010 Policy DM16, as mentioned in Section 5.3 of the Planning Statement produced by Finns in support of this planning application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Worden Park	Lancashire	E22/1245	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Restoration, repair and improvement of Worden Park infrastructure with ancillary works</p> <p>Worden Park, Worden Lane, Leyland, Lancashire, PR5 2DJ,</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 09.12.2022</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. The Lancashire Gardens Trust (LGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>We have reviewed the application documents in relation to this planning application and visited the site. Worden Park is a Registered Park and Garden (RPG) Grade II, comprising a C19th parkland and formal pleasure grounds amounting to approximately 60ha. The Park includes numerous listed buildings, all Grade II: Worden Hall (surviving parts), North Lodge, Barn, Brewhouse, Stable block and Icehouse, and Wade Brook archway. LGT supports the principle and objectives in the Council's continuing investment in Worden Park, in the enhancement and extension of the circulation network which is justified. The recently completed refurbishment of Worden Hall buildings are particularly noteworthy giving a significant upgrading and making this park a very important focus for visitors. However, we express caution in the siting of commercial and intensive events which would be to the detriment of the more sensitive parts of the historic designed garden. In particular the organisation, planning and operation of such events need to have regard to the protection of the more decorative areas of the RPG It is regrettable that the current proposals include removal of some significant features such as the Rose Garden which are scarcely 30 years old, although the reasoning for the approach appears sound. However, we have concerns on a number of issues as explained below.</p>

					<p>Bitmac Footpaths and impact on Trees</p> <p>Our main concern is the selection of footpath materials. The predominance of bitmac material for new and reconstructed footpaths is inappropriate as a choice of material within a heritage site. We would recommend a wider use of resin bonded gravel finishes which are already proposed in more limited areas. New paths which start with resin bonded gravel after a short distance are then allowed to continue after approximately 20m as plain bitmac (Drawing P-003). The pedestrian paths should be in resin bonded gravel unless they are shared use with vehicles.</p> <p>Numerous trees lie within the vicinity of the proposed works and will unavoidably suffer adverse effects. This is recognised on the detailed drawings. However, the precise number of tree losses, which must also include those which are initially retained but then are likely to decline over the medium term is not clear. We note that mitigation tree planting is proposed, but this is in such modest scale which is unlikely to address the actual adverse impact on trees resulting from these works. A more ambitious tree planting programme is required as part of this application.</p> <p>Heritage Assessment</p> <p>The consideration of heritage is covered within a single document which includes Heritage Design and Access Statement October 2020. Heritage is dealt with in less than two pages out of nearly 20 and comprises only a very superficial historical summary.</p> <p>The Historic England List Entry is not appended, and some listed buildings are not mentioned. There is no assessment or analysis of the historical significance of the Park, its progressive changes evidenced through all the various published and archived maps nor any attempt to assess the impact of the proposed works on the heritage. The document is dated October 2020 and would justify revisiting. There needs to be a reasoned explanation giving confidence that the proposals will not affect the significance of the RPG. It may not be possible to determine this application in accordance with NPPF without this assessment. The very thorough Heritage Report (Purcell) which supports the Worden Hall Restoration application 7/2020/01064 goes some way to address this around the buildings, but does not cover all the works over the wider Park covered by the current application.</p> <p>Conservation Management Plan</p> <p>There is no mention in the Heritage Design and Access Statement or references to the Worden Park Conservation Management Plan, which we</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>understand was prepared in 2008. We have not had sight of this document. However we acknowledge the very thorough masterplan process and consultation which was undertaken through 2021 and has informed the current proposals.</p> <p>Woodland Management</p> <p>This is beyond the scope of the current application, but we would expect this to be part of later programmes of work. Recent work on woodland restoration noted near the Hall is welcomed and is giving good results, but has covered only limited areas to date. The woodlands in the vicinity of the private car park are particularly in need of thinning and management. In summary we look forward to the works progressing, with some reconsideration of the choice of footpath materials and a more ambitious mitigation planting scheme. If there are any matters arising from this please contact LGT on <a href="mailto:conservation@lancsgt.org.uk">conservation@lancsgt.org.uk</a></p> <p>Yours faithfully Stephen Robson</p>
South Ormsby Park	Lincolnshire	E21/0963	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Planning Permission - Change of use, conversion of and alterations to existing stables, outbuilding and part of the existing house to provide 7no. self contained holiday apartments and extension and alterations to the remaining existing owner's accommodation. Alterations to provide a new roof to the main house. Erection of a bath house, lean-to spa, maintenance building, car ports, kennels, boat house, elysium, plant room, bird hide and gates. Provision of additional parking areas, access roads, tennis court and flood alleviation channel. Use of land for temporary events including erection of a marquee. Opening of principal rooms in the main</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.12.2022</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 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the substantial body of information contained in the application documents, and broadly speaking consider the final proposals as indicated, sound. The applicant has clearly gone to great trouble to protect and enhance the important historic fabric of South Ormsby Hall, including its respective Listed interests. They have taken into consideration the integrity of the original plans and aspirations of James Paine's original designs as also the subsequent cultural significance of the Hall and its environs. The proposed solutions found for the turning-circle in front of the house would seem to be both practical and appropriate for the setting. We do however, have two concerns :</p> <p>The first relates to the East Stables where we query whether the use of shutters on the east stables either side of the window casements are in keeping with an original 18C elevation. They add unnecessary clutter and draw attention to what is not the principal building on site. Will cars be parked in garage doors or residents urged, for the most part, to keep their vehicles in the garage?</p>

				<p>house as a visitor attraction and use of room in the house for events. Alterations to existing bridges and construction of new bridges. Demolition and rebuilding of a retaining wall. Restoration to existing Lion gates. Demolition of part of existing building.</p> <p>SOUTH ORMSBY HALL AND PARKLAND, BRINKHILL ROAD, SOUTH ORMSBY, LOUTH, LN11 8QS</p>	<p>Our second concern relates to The Elysium, which by definition should be designed as 'a place or state of perfect happiness'. The proposed elevations of this new octagonal building seem somewhat heavy and monumental, and are not as attractive as both Paine examples of eye-catcher buildings as shown in the proposals. At this time, curvaceous rotundas, summerhouses, and mausoleums often effectively mirrored classical forms with rounded vaults. Vanbrugh had introduced the first rotunda in England at Stowe by the time the summerhouse was built at South Ormsby in the principal view south from the hall. It seems likely that a version of this would have been deemed the height of fashion to be appreciated by the ladies of the house as both a classical destination and shelter from sun or rain. From a distance, this 21C eyecatcher with its flat roof and cladding would have the overall effect of a depressing, ominous war-time pillbox not at all in keeping with the 18C parkland.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Doddington Hall	Lincolnshire	E22/1243	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Relocation of existing (previously re-used) agricultural building and use for general storage and housing of Biomass Boiler</p> <p>Doddington Hall Hall Yard</p> <p>Doddington</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2022</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 Lincolnshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We have considered the sparse documentation accompanying this application and our comments are therefore predicated by the absence of some information. We have read the Design &amp; Access (D&amp;A) statement where it explains the rationale behind the siting of the agricultural barn to house the new Biomass boiler. The D&amp;A mentions (p6) that 'many of the above facilities to be located within the volume of the existing building.' It is unclear whether those facilities unable to be located in the building will require additional storage in this location or whether they are to be accommodated elsewhere. Currently the application site is an open field without any structures on it. Although not visible from the Hall, this relocated cattle barn will be visible as an agricultural building from other areas of the park, which will slightly change the setting of the Grade II* registered park and garden (RPG). It would appear that consideration was given to the siting of the barn but we would appreciate knowing which other areas were considered and why this one was chosen. For example,</p>



					<p>there would seem to be a sizeable plot of what appears to be unused land by the access lane just to the south of the existing biomass boiler and Giant Store Lincoln. Development here would not detract from parkland views. Was this site considered and rejected, and if so why? The D&amp;A also mentions that there will be a complimentary landscaping scheme to soften the appearance of the structure within the RPG. We would welcome further details of this as any mitigation planting should be sympathetic to the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Pickenham Hall	Norfolk	E22/1321	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed Development to cut and fill Excavation to create of Winter Storage Reservoir Land at Valley Farm South Pickenham Road</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2022</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Trust's view is that the Environmental Assessment should include an assessment of the likely effect on Pickenham Hall registered park and garden.</p>
Felbrigg Hall	Norfolk	E22/1337	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Single storey building to replace the existing temporary cabin building used as office and rest facility for the garden staff and garden volunteers working at Felbrigg Hall</p> <p>Felbrigg Hall, Felbrigg Park, Felbrigg, Norwich, Norfolk, NR11 8PR</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 06.12.2022</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Trust supports this proposal. It will provide an improved and more suitable building while also facilitating facilities for staff and</p>
Fawsley Hall	Northamptonshire	E22/1237	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Renewable energy generating station comprising ground mounted photovoltaic solar arrays with primary substation, inverter stations, cabling, access gates, site access, internal tracks</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust (NGT) and their local knowledge informs this joint response. We must apologise for the delay in responding.</p>

				including infrastructure, security fencing, CCTV, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements Land at Fawsley Estate, Fawsley, Northamptonshire	<p>We would like to point out a few inaccuracies/omissions in the documentation. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment states that Fawsley is a Grade II Registered Park &amp; Garden (RPG), but it is in fact Grade II*. In addition, it states that the parkland was Capability Brown's concept, overlooking the fact that there was a medieval deer park (mostly in Badby Wood) for the Grange of Evesham Abbey at Badby, and that this park was extended in the Tudor period, during which time the Scheduled Dower House/hunting lodge within Fawsley Park was extended and improved for hunting visitations by Elizabeth I. Thus, the parkland's history goes back long before Capability Brown's important landscape improvements, a fact which serves only to increase its historical significance. Furthermore, visible features within the parkland preserve elements of an important Saxon boundary dating to 944 AD.</p> <p>The NGT has been able to walk along the north-western boundary of the proposed solar farm. From this we were able to see that the existing hedge-line is very thick and contains quite a few trees. The westernmost part of the site slopes away to the south, so away from the direction of the park. Where the array abuts the Registered area at its eastern end, we would like your officers to ensure that should the application be granted, that the boundary hedge-line in this area is adequately reinforced to minimise any visual impact on the southern part of the parkland. Such niggles aside, as long as the hedge-line is reinforced as suggested, should the application be permitted, we do not think that the solar array will have much negative impact upon the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Wicksteed Park	Northamptonshire	E22/1353	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Planning Permission: Roof extension to create second floor. Detached outbuilding to rear comprising storage room, office and library/studio. Construction of boundary wall and creation of a vehicular access (Resubmission of KET/2019/0325)</p> <p>34 Paradise Lane, Kettering.uk</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 20.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have liaised with our colleagues in the Northamptonshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation, and looking at Google Earth images it would suggest that No 34 Paradise Lane is one of a pair of art deco-style semi-detached houses which do not appear to have a direct relationship with the laying out of the Grade II registered park and garden</p>

					<p>(RPG) of Wicksteed Park. It looks as if, following the construction of the workers' housing on Spinney Lane c.1921, plots of land along Paradise Lane and Spinney Lane may have been separately sold off to individual developers in the 1930s and 1940s. Our sole concern about the impact of the proposed development is that we ask that your officers satisfy themselves that the additional storey should not be visible above the existing rooflines and be visible from the RPG.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/0586	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conversion of existing Greenhouse to Annex. Gardeners Cottage Allerton Lane Allerton Park North Yorkshire HG5 0SE</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. (List Entry Number 1000402). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The area for this proposal lies in the south-west corner of the estate within the registered boundary and close to Allerton Grange which is immediately outside the registered boundary. The c.3ha rectangular brick-walled kitchen garden is of c. 1770 and Listed Grade II with the accompanying Gardeners Cottage on the north-western boundary of a triangular section of the walled garden immediately north of the main kitchen garden. The greenhouse range that is the subject of this application lies opposite the Gardeners Cottage on the north-eastern wall and is included on the OS map of 1893. The western portion has been repaired whilst the eastern portion is now dilapidated. The latter is the subject of the planning application.</p> <p>Further to our letter of 11th August 2022 we are pleased that the application now includes an informative Heritage Statement (November 2022) and Listed Building Application.</p> <p>It is clear from the application that the greenhouse is completely separate, and a distance away from the Gardeners Cottage. It is not an annex. The proposal is for a totally self-contained dwelling for family use. We also would not describe it as a conversion – only the base wall remains and that has two new double door openings formed and two end doors infilled. The</p>

					<p>slope of the roof is radically altered in gradient and the glazing removed to form a natural slate roof with two rooflights. The elevations are completely altered to form what is in essence a new bungalow as we noted in our previous letter.</p> <p>The proposal in appearance totally destroys that of a greenhouse in a walled garden.</p> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no further comments on this revised application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Allerton Park	North Yorkshire	E22/1224	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing orangery and day room. Erection of two storey rear extension , single storey extension and front porch. Alterations to fenestration. Gardeners Cottage Allerton Lane Allerton Park Knaresborough North Yorkshire HG5 0S</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting Allerton Park, a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks &amp; Gardens, as per the above application, at grade II. (List Entry Number 1000402). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>The area for this proposal lies in the south-west corner of the estate within the registered boundary and close to Allerton Grange which is immediately outside the registered boundary. The c.3ha rectangular brick-walled kitchen garden is of c. 1770 and Listed Grade II with the accompanying Gardener's Cottage on the north-western boundary of a triangular section of the walled garden immediately north of the main kitchen garden. This application follows 22/03196/FUL.</p> <p>Following our letter of concern and objection to 22/03196/FUL dated 30th September 2022 the GT/YGT appreciates the 28page Heritage Statement by Humble Heritage and notes the numerous alterations and extensions in the life of this Gardener's Cottage. The Gardener's Cottage is shown with a T-plan footprint straddling the north-western boundary wall on the OS 1st Edition 6 inches: 1 mile map of 1853 and the current central block is the surviving portion of this building notated as 'The Garden House'.</p> <p>Particularly since 1950 there have been many changes to the original, 'The Garden House', extending it considerably and especially on the walled garden 'rear' side, forming a modern-looking large, detached house.</p> <p>We note the confirmation that every effort will be made to match the</p>

					<p>traditional roofing and brickwork materials.</p> <p>We regret that the overall massing and design has gone way beyond that of a 'Gardeners Cottage' even a traditional Head Gardener and repeat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The new windows should be timber to match existing and not in upvc/aluminium.</li> <li>· The two-storey extension is very close to the northern boundary of the rectangular walled garden and the first floor will overlook the walled garden.</li> <li>· We are not clear about the new access route to the highway. What sections are new and where is the old route?</li> </ul> <p>The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust consider that this continues an out of character design in a historic park and garden and recommend that advice is sought from your Authority's Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Annesley Hall	Nottinghamshire	E22/1281	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full Application for a B2/B8 Unit with Associated Access, Parking, Drainage Infrastructure and Landscaping; and Outline Application for up to 4no. B2/B8 Units (With Point of Access and Scale Included)</p> <p>Land Adjacent to Junction 27 of the M1, Mansfield Road, Annesley, Notts</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2022</p> <p>Although this application has been current for some time, Ashfield DC failed to consult the Gardens Trust (GT) so we have only recently become aware of this large and damaging application. We would be very grateful if you could please ensure that in future any applications which might affect any grade of Registered Park and Garden within your area, are notified to the Gardens Trust as statutory consultees and also to our colleagues in the Nottinghamshire Gardens Trust (NGT) whose local knowledge informs our joint response. I am attaching a copy of our planning leaflet with advice for LPAs plus consultation guidelines. Although our planning leaflet contains references to NPPF paragraphs which do not reflect the most up to date NPPF, the precepts still hold true.</p> <p>We have considered the online documentation and it is clear that this sizeable application site with its tall factory units situated immediately to the west and adjacent to the boundary of the Grade II* Annesley Hall registered park and garden (RPG), will have a negative impact on the setting and significance of the RPG. Despite its high grading, the park is on the Heritage at Risk register, exacerbated by development pressures, so these proposals are doubly unwelcome. We were not able to find any indication within the documentation as to what alternative sites were considered for this large development.</p> <p>The ridge height of the proposed structures is 14m at its maximum, and</p>

					<p>even though the buildings are to be partially sunk into the ground, especially on the North-Eastern edge where the land rises, and trees planted on a new bund, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) confirms (11.156 &amp; 11.157) that there will be views to some of the built development from the RPG. We also have concerns that light emittance from such a large industrial area will harmfully affect the RPG as well as the various other highly graded heritage assets whose setting is negatively affected by this application. The impact of the proposals upon all the heritage assets and their significance has been clearly outlined in Historic England's (HE) letters relating to this application, which we completely endorse. We will not repeat HE's comments for brevity. Policy EV14 in Ashfield DC's Local Plan (adopted 2002) relating to historic parks and gardens states categorically that 'Development which would adversely affect historic parks and gardens or their setting will not be permitted.' That is manifestly the case in this instance. It is also contrary to NPPF para 197c. The application site is also within the Green Belt and encroaches into the openness of the countryside, contrary to the NPPF para 138c. Again, the relevant NPPF paragraphs are outlined in HE's first letter dated 13th May 2022.</p> <p>The GT/NGT strongly opposes this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Cricket House	Somerset	E22/0083	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Demolition of existing Cottages and part of the existing factory and the erection of two extensions to provide additional Production and Warehouse space</p> <p>Manor Farm, Lubborn Cheese Ltd Windwhistle Cricket St Thomas Chard TA20 4BZ (GR:336619/107886)</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 01.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application. We have again liaised with our colleagues in the Somerset Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint second response.</p> <p>We wish first to congratulate Lubborn Cheese on their robust and successful business and would love to be able to work with them to find a solution acceptable to all. The options appraisal strongly suggests that if the preferred solution is not adopted the whole enterprise will have to move, losing numerous jobs locally. If this were to occur, what would become of the already inappropriate factory modern buildings on site? The options appraisal, written by Mr Thelwell, whose many years of food processing experience has enabled him to outline alternative commercial</p>

					<p>solutions, does not successfully consider the potential impact that the loss of some/all of these buildings will have on the Grade II* at risk registered park and garden. The failure to address such heritage concerns raised by various consultees regrettably does not advance the solution. There are also no offers of compensatory restoration of parts of the at-risk landscape which might mitigate the harm slightly, should this application be allowed and the buildings partially or entirely demolished.</p> <p>We concur with the comments of our colleagues in HE : 'The proposed demolition of the farm complex raises significant concerns due to the irreversible loss of a component element of the registered landscape. It would erode not only evidence of the parkland's evolution but also the picturesque aesthetic experienced along the main drive. The demolition is irreparable and finite, and therefore would result in significant harm to the significance of this important grade II* registered park and garden.' The Council for British Archaeology also articulates similar objections.</p> <p>The landscaping suggestions for the south-western corner only contain deciduous plantings and will do very little to mitigate the harm. We do not feel that these modest suggestions meet our earlier suggestion of a planting conservation plan.</p> <p>We are unable to support the loss of these important buildings, so crucial to the setting and significance of the Cricket estate and continue to object strongly to the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Mells Park	Somerset	E22/1394	II	FORESTRY COMMISSION Woodland Creation	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 21.12.2022</p> <p>Your email to the Somerset Gardens Trust (SGT) has been forwarded to me as the Conservation Officer for 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. I must apologise for the delay in getting back to you but I have been trying to get the map that you sent without success. If you were please able to send it to me that would be very helpful as without it I am unable to see where it is you are proposing to plant. All I have managed to ascertain is that the area you are thinking about is in an area which has always been free of planting. SGT are clear that they feel that the new woodland should not be within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPG) at Mells as they have concerns that it could damage the integrity of the RPG.</p>

					<p>There are I believe extensive surviving accounts in the Mells Estate office that includes a section headed 'Park Improvements up to 1799' and a scrapbook containing design ideas for the park. Tim Mowl, author of 'Historic Gardens of Somerset' says "these archives are rare and important survivals which give a fascinating overview of how the 18th C parkscape at Mells developed".</p> <p>If you were able to forward me the map I can look at it further.</p> <p>I apologise again for the delay in responding.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p> <p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022</p> <p>Since I wrote a few days ago I have been able to find a copy of the 1839 Tithe map showing the area within the RPG which you are proposing for tree planting. In the mid 19th century this enclosed parcel was an area of arable land, in contrast to the pasture of the other areas of 'Park' (Middle Park, Mells Park, etc). Most of the areas you propose for planting outside the RPG would have the capacity to accommodate planting without harming the heritage significance of the asset.</p> <p>With regards to the enclosed southernmost parcel within the RPG, lying beyond the areas of parkland shown on the mapping, it could accommodate some planting as long as a set-back of open land on the eastern side was retained to keep the legibility of the historic division between the Middle and Upper Park areas (see the pink annotations on the attached plan).</p> <p>As you will appreciate, in order not to compromise the setting and significance of this historic designed landscape, planting sensitively with appropriate species etc, is a specialised process. Climate change, through increased extreme weather and rising temperatures, is going to be an enormous issue to tackle. Should you require any further help and advice with regard to the scheme we would be more than happy to help.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Margie Hoffnung Conservation Officer</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/0934	II*	PLANNING APPLICATION Erection of beaver proof fencing within the Estate and associated	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 05.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about the amended Design Statement (Rev D) for this application within the designated</p>



				landscaping. Trentham Gardens Stone Road Tittensor	<p>conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The revised proposals as set out in the amended Design Statement were fully discussed at the site meeting on 2 November attended by representatives of the applicant, officers of the Borough Council and myself. That discussion helped clarify the various design amendments and the Trusts' understanding of the reasons behind the fence alignment and its height. In the light of this additional information The Gardens Trust and Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust are now comfortable with the proposals and are able to withdraw the concerns raised in our previous letter dated 10 September 2022. Overall the Trusts have no objection to the application.</p> <p>We do have a few additional suggestions to make on the information contained in Document 19009-GNA-XX-XX-DS-A-9000 Rev D, namely:</p> <p>a) p10 Gate next to stables. Rather than add a solid panel (blocking views through) could black wire mesh be attached instead (as per proposal shown at p19)?</p> <p>b) p11 Gate on bridge by garden centre - ditto?</p> <p>c) Pp 27-28 Could the beaver mesh be sited either further back within the tunnel entrance or be coloured black where attached either to the rear of the existing gates or visibly in the tunnel portal?</p> <p>We are happy to leave final adjudication on these small additional points with yourself and your Council's Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Trentham Gardens	Staffordshire	E22/1002	II*	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Full planning application for the erection of an open-sided gazebo and pergola, alongside additional planting and landscaping.</p> <p>Land To The West Of The Italian Gardens Tea Rooms Trentham Estate</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 16.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Trentham. I apologise for the delay in responding. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The Secret Garden is a modern creation lying to the west of the Italianate</p>

					<p>Parterre, the centrepiece of the designed historic landscape at Trentham. The application site is intervisible with the parterre garden but for much of the year its presence is masked by the enclosing boundary hedge. The two proposed new timber structures are of lightweight and largely skeletal construction; their introduction particularly when clad in creeping plants will blend into the wider landscape and not cause harm to the significance of the RPG or conservation area</p> <p>The Trusts have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Your sincerely Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Shugborough	Staffordshire	E22/1436	I	<p><b>PLANNING APPLICATION</b></p> <p>The installation of 1No. 15m Alpha7-18 pole, 1No. Tri-Sector. antennas, 2No. 0.3m dishes and 3No. ground-based equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto. And additional planting scheme.</p> <p>National Trust Shugborough Estate Car Park, Explorers Walk, Shugborough Estate, Milford, Stafford, ST17 0XB</p>	<p><b>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the designated conservation area and grade I Registered Park and Garden at Shugborough. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The Trusts object to the design and siting of the telecommunication mast as proposed in this submission on the grounds of visual intrusion causing harm to the significance of the grade I heritage asset. The Trusts request that the application be refused consent and that the applicant be requested to reconsider the proposal.</p> <p>The application site lies against the fence alongside the West Coast main line railway on the north western boundary of a large open grassed area beyond the former Outdoor Education Centre within the park. It is screened from views across the current core of the landscape around the mansion house and Park Farm by the tree clad Underley Cop and presently enjoys no public access. However from the early 19th century this area was itself laid out as an integral part of the wider designed landscape to be viewed from the Lichfield Drive. Much of this landscape character has been lost since the second world war. The National Trust proposes to recreate this as part of its wider programme of re-imagining the historic landscape at Shugborough and opening it for public use.</p> <p>The grass area in front of the proposed mast is intended as the location of the Trust's new car park with vehicular access from the reopened Lichfield Drive. Hence the proposed new 15m mast and attendant control cabins</p>

					<p>will in the future be very publicly visible in this space and more widely across this sector of the park. Their height, alien form and intrusive presence will cause harm to the significance of the historic landscape. The proposed shroud cover to the antennae will be particularly noticeable above the tree line in views towards the site from the high point of the grade I listed Hadrian's Arch where it will appear as a very alien and incongruous feature in the otherwise largely wooded landscape.</p> <p>While the Trusts regret the installation of telecoms apparatus in a registered historic park they do, with reluctance, accept the technical arguments for siting the apparatus in this general vicinity next to the railway. They do, however, question the choice of this precise location for the mast as the few existing low-height trees, even if reinforced by new screen planting, will offer little by way of a foil to the height and prominence of the new apparatus. The Trusts query whether the mast might be relocated approximately 150 metres to the south east where it would benefit from the screening of a dense clump of taller, more mature pine trees.</p> <p>The Trusts accept that for technical reasons the antennae must have "line of sight" above the tree canopy but suggest that the shroud cover should be in a dark green or brown colour rather than the conventional white/pale grey of comparable apparatus elsewhere. This would help minimise its visual intrusion, especially in views from Hadrian's Arch.</p> <p>The Trusts request that the Borough Council support these suggestions and submit them for the attention of the applicants.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</p>
Sandon Park	Staffordshire	E22/1438	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Conservation to the existing building. Internal alterations to facilitate a staircase in the central area, rearrangement of some internal walls which are considered modern interventions. Two glass links to enable the use of the annexe buildings. In conjunction with 22/36145/LBC.</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (TGT) about this proposal within the grade II Registered Park and Garden at Sandon. Staffordshire Gardens and Parks Trust (SGPT) is a member organisation of TGT and works in partnership with it concerning the protection and conservation of historic sites. SGPT is authorised to respond on behalf of both Trusts in respect of planning consultations and notifications.</p> <p>The parkland at Sandon is thought to have been developed after 1770 shortly after the site of the hall was transferred to its present location. The classically inspired Home Farm was erected shortly afterwards in the valley below the hall as a model farm complex to the designs of Samuel Wyatt a</p>

				Home Farm Lichfield Road Sandon	<p>member of the Staffordshire family of architects. The range is now listed grade II.</p> <p>The Gardens Trusts have no objection in principle to the current application which will have no impact on the significance of the Registered Park. We are disappointed by the sparse detailing on the submitted drawings, in particular the lack of clarity about the roof profile, materials and construction of the new glazed links between the present office building and the adjacent structures. As depicted they appear rather uninspired and utilitarian. The Trusts are content to leave resolution of these matters in the hands of your Council's conservation officer.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Alan Taylor Chairman SGPT</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>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 02.12.2022</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>
Roker Park	Tyne and Wear	E22/1094	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Proposed development at Roker Park including earthworks to facilitate the creation of a new</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 12.12.2022</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting the Gardens Trust (GT) on the above application and together with Northumbria Gardens Trust we have now studied the amended plans and drawings. We note the constraints</p>

				<p>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  Roker Sunderland</p>	<p>imposed by the Victorian sewer but as a result of this, welcome the proposed reorientation and relocation of the café building as we consider that this will reduce the impact on the setting of the Grade II listed bandstand.  Overall, we consider that any harm caused to the Grade II park by the construction of the café will be mitigated by the public benefit derived from the improvements.  Yours sincerely,  Alison Allighan  Conservation Casework Manager</p>
Bilton Grange	Warwicks hire	E22/1343	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  The erection of a two, three and four storey boarding house to provide, bed spaces for eighty pupils, accommodation for five family residential units and associated ancillary spaces including landscape within the grounds of Bilton Grange Preparatory School. Minor demolitions and reconfiguration of internal spaces to Grade II and Grade II* listed school buildings to provide additional classrooms and educational facilities.  BILTON GRANGE, RUGBY ROAD, DUNCHURCH, RUGBY, CV22 6QU</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 29.12.2022  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens as per the above application.  We have considered the documentation accompanying this application. The need to balance the requirements of a thriving school in a historic setting is always difficult. In this instance, we consider that if the school does need to expand, the chosen location is probably the only suitable area.  We would suggest that the Governors of Rugby School consider commissioning a Conservation Management Plan to enable any future expansion to be included within the landscape at minimum harm to its setting and significance.  Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
Parlington Estate	West Yorkshire	E22/1347	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION  Variation of condition 3 (operating life of wind farm) and removal of precommencement conditions 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 08/01118/FU  Land At Hook Moor Wind Farm  Micklefield Leeds</p>	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 19.12.2022  Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting two sites on the Register – Lotherton Hall (list entry 1001223, first listed 1st Dec 1984) and Parlington Estate, (List entry 1447854, first listed 21st Sept 2017) both 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.  Planning permission was granted on appeal in December 2011 for the</p>

					<p>installation of 5 125m high wind 3 bladed turbines, application ref: 08/01118/FU. The first export of electricity was 12th January 2016 making the expiry date of the wind farm 12th January 2041. This application seeks to vary this condition to extend the life span of Hook Moor wind farm by a further 15 years lasting until 12th January 2056.</p> <p>Lotherton Hall situated c.3km east of Aberford is c. 1km from the nearest turbine, Although the registered area is essentially the formal gardens round the Hall it should be noted that the Deer Park to the west is a significant component of the heritage assets, and the wider estate is valued by the community and Leeds City Council who were given the Hall and country house estate by its owner Sir Alvary Gascoigne in 1969. The Parlington Estate was also a Gascoigne property bought by John Gascoigne from Thomas Lord Wentworth in 1545-6. The Estate lies to the west of Lotherton Hall with the A1(M) lying between the two sites. Hook Moor is to the south-east. The registered area is c.528ha and is a good example of an 18th century designed landscape reflecting the ideas, philosophies and interests of the Gascoignes including pioneering planting methods, and from c. 1700 racehorse breeding ('Gascoigne's Foreign Horse'). It has a strong group value with a large number of listed features probably the most notable being the Triumphal Arch of 1781 (listed grade II*) built to commemorate the American War of Independence. We have noted the Environmental Statement – Addendum, November 2022 and offer the following comments:</p> <p>Leeds City Council (LCC) is currently implementing a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for Lotherton Hall and estate and the negative impact/ visual detractor of the turbines is noted. Mitigation is achieved to some degree by additional tree planting (utilising historic maps to reinstate trees that assist in screening the turbines) and the CMP also states that the environmental benefit of low carbon energy should be considered a mitigation.</p> <p>We therefore think that LCC would not object on behalf of Lotherton Hall on the grounds that any damage is mitigated both by the physical tree planting but also by the benefits to society of low carbon electricity. The estate will adopt a policy to maintain the screen planting (mentioned in the CMP).</p> <p>We also agree with LCC officers who manage Lotherton Hall and estate that it would be very useful if the Liaison Committee for the Hook Moor Wind Farm could fund some display panels at Lotherton (in a suitable</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>location) to interpret the wind farm and perhaps interpretation for one of Lotherton's conservation projects.</p> <p>In terms of the Parlington Estate any impact will also be limited to visual intrusion particularly when the trees are not in leaf. One of the turbines can be seen at a point on the Avenue (permitted path) that links Aberford with the Triumphal Arch. The Avenue and the Arch are in a relatively elevated position and the turbines are situated on land at a similar elevation to the south- east. Parlington Lane, a PROW is much lower down, with intervening woodland, Aberford, and the motorway, so is not likely to be affected.</p> <p>As much of the estate is private, we are unable to comment. However similarly to our comments for Lotherton above, there may be an opportunity for some display panels on Parlington Lane to interpret the history of the estate and the Gascoigne family.</p> <p>Although Hook Moor Wind Farm has some visual impact on both Lotherton and Parlington, renewable energy is an important consideration and so overall, the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust do not object to this Variation of Condition 3 to increase the life of the wind farm for a further 15 years until 12th January 2056. However, we trust that should there be a move to increase the overall height of the turbines and/or the number of turbines at Hook Moor Wind Farm that such changes would be subject to further planning applications.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Bramham Park	West Yorkshire	E22/1381	I	FORESTRY COMMISSION Felling Licence Application Welhill Plantation, Dawsonfield Plantation, Biggin Wood	<p>CGT WRITTEN RESPONSE 13.12.2022</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 Bramham Park, which is registered grade I. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.</p> <p>Bramham Park is an internationally important historic garden and park; hence its grade I registration.</p> <p>The pleasure grounds and park adorned with temples and statuary were laid out in c.1700-1713 with additions by John Wood the Elder c. 1725-8 for</p>

					<p>Robert Benson, 1st Lord Bingley.</p> <p>This consultation is for mature broadleaf woodland in compartments 44 (PAWS ie Planted Ancient Woodland), and 31e both outside the registered park; although 31e is against part of the eastern boundary. Compartments 32b and 49b are within the registered boundary. 32b lies immediately within part of the eastern boundary towards the north and 49b immediately within the eastern boundary further south towards Black Fen (a significant feature of the historic pleasure grounds designed by John Wood the Elder).</p> <p>The Plan of Bramham Park, John Wood the Elder c.1728 (which is being used for the current restoration/conservation work), does not include the areas of this consultation. However, the route to the house now used by visitors passes Bramham Biggin which is alongside compartment 44 'Biggin Wood' and then passes along Old Road before turning and passing alongside compartment 32b to its west and near compartment 31e to the east, before turning west and across the park to the house.</p> <p>So, these compartments contribute to the sense of arrival at this important designed landscape and are part of its setting, so we advise care is taken in these areas.</p> <p>Thank you for the following helpful information:</p> <p>'In compartments 31e, 49b and 32b regeneration felling is going to be undertaken focusing on the removal of ash suffering from dieback; alongside this there will be an element of thinning. Deadwood will be left where it is safe to do so as per UKFS. Restocking will be carried out and protected from herbivores; a small element of mixed conifer (10%) is going to be introduced. Plant Health Grant to be applied for. It is worth noting that in 31e that there is a significant area of open space that is not currently stocked. 32b is adjacent to Bilton Beck [I think that this is Bramham Beck which is situated immediately to the north of that compartment]; measures identified in the UKFS, alongside good practice, will be undertaken to ensure there is no impact on the waterway.</p> <p>Compartment 44 is going to undertake a 30% thinning.'</p> <p>Thank you for the further information regarding the mixed conifer that is being proposed:</p> <p>49b: Scots Pine and ideally an element of Austrian Pine (instead of Corsican Pine that is under a moratorium). There was previously no conifer in this block so could plant just Scots Pine. Austrian Pine was introduced in 1835, so maybe Scots Pine would be more appropriate as the compartment is not</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>too far from Black Fen.</p> <p>32b: Scots Pine, Douglas Fir and an element of Austrian Pine. There is already conifer in this block.</p> <p>We presume that careful consideration will be given to how the conifer groups are arranged within the compartment and that the planting arrangement will be sympathetic to the historic designed landscape and its aesthetic qualities and view lines – although these conifers may be later thinned out?</p> <p>We understand from our Vice-president Nick Lane Fox (Bramham Park) that the park has suffered badly from ash die back. As much diseased ash as possible is to be removed and the woodland replanted with suitable replacement hardwoods (oak, Quercus robur, sycamore, beech and sweet chestnut mostly, with some softwood nurses to draw the hardwoods up, which will be thinned out in due course). He writes that although not part of this consultation but part of the felling licence, the estate has taken the opportunity, whilst removing all the ash in Black Fen, to re-cut two avenues, shown on the 1728 John Wood plan, which had disappeared. One of these terminates at the Round House rotunda. Additionally, the estate has included a small triangular oak bosquet, also shown on the Wood plan. The work proposed in this consultation should have little conservation effect on the registered landscape, particularly once the replacements have grown up and we are pleased that the estate has taken the opportunity to re-instate areas of Black Fen. The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust have no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Val Hepworth Trustee Conservation and Planning</p>
Lydiard Park	Wiltshire	E22/1377	II	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION</p> <p>Construction of a themed adventure golf course and associated works.</p> <p>Lydiard Country Park, Hook Street Swindon</p>	<p>GT WRITTEN RESPONSE 22.12.2022</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 Wiltshire Gardens Trust and their local knowledge informs this joint response.</p> <p>We have considered the fairly sparse documentation accompanying the application. The Supporting Statement (SS) says that the HIA was commissioned in 2019 to find a suitable location, but there is no indication to say which other sites were considered and why this particular location was chosen. Whilst the HIA does mention the Grade II registered park and</p>

					<p>garden (RPG) of Lydiard Park, it specifically states (3.1) 'The aim of this Heritage Impact Assessment is to identify any built heritage assets (our emphasis) in the vicinity of the site, to establish the importance of these assets ... and determine the potential impacts of the proposed development on these built heritage assets.' (again our emphasis) We consider that the impact of the proposals on the RPG has been inadequately considered by concentrating solely on built heritage. Whilst the SS stresses the temporary and green nature of the proposals, should this application be allowed, there is no indication of how long 'temporary' is. The 'Layout Plan' shows the arrangement of the various holes of the golf course within a formal rectangular area, but there is nothing to indicate what these structures will actually look like. The angularity of the enclosure and its contents is unsympathetic to the grassland and naturalistic edges of the adjoining woodland and historic landscape and urbanises this precious wild parkland so close to Swindon. We would presume and hope that all structures are of unpainted wood, but this is not made clear in any of the online documentation. We googled other courses created by Mr Anthony Aubrey and those would appear to have synthetic grass within the individual 'holes' as well as some structures which are not made of wood. Artificial grass has a very poor carbon footprint and goes against the green credentials mentioned in the SS. The existing play area already detracts from the setting of the RPG but much thought was given to surfaces, quality of railings, equipment etc when it was installed. Anything other than entirely natural unpainted materials would be totally out of character within the RPG and we have concerns that the proposals would be a garish intervention in this sensitive area. Should the quantity of visitors increase substantially, the playground carpark might need to be extended, further impacting upon the setting of the RPG and its historic views.</p> <p>Your officers will be familiar with Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), pub 2nd Dec 2017, Part I – Settings and Views (SHA). Page 4 of SHA states 'Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.' In such instances of unsympathetic development affecting the setting of the RPG, to accord with NPPF policies,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>consideration still needs to be given as to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset. In our opinion, the impact of the adventure golf course will further negatively impact upon the historic views outlined in the HIA.</p> <p>The SS indicates that the applicant is 'happy to plant trees around the course which will help Swindon Borough Council to increase carbon sequestration rates.' This fails entirely to appreciate the impact of random tree planting upon the original design intent of the RPG. This application would appear to be a business proposition rather than an attempt to enhance the setting and significance of this irreplaceable heritage asset.</p> <p>The GT/WGT are concerned that the proposals will harm historic views, negatively impact the setting and significance of the RPG and we object to the proposals.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,  Margie Hoffnung  Conservation Officer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--