



70 Cowcross Street  
London EC1M 6EJ  
Telephone: (+44/0) 207 608 2409  
Email: [enquiries@thegardenstrust.org](mailto:enquiries@thegardenstrust.org)  
[www.thegardenstrust.org](http://www.thegardenstrust.org)

**This Planning and Conservation Advice Note (PCAN) is one of a series published by The Gardens Trust's predecessor, the Garden History Society in 2005.**

The PCANs predate the National Planning Policy Framework. Any references to the planning system and planning policy (and particularly Section 8 'Planning Context' and Appendix 3) in the PCANs has been superseded and the conservation advice must be read in the context of the current National Planning Policy Framework published by the Government.

Government department names have changed since the PCAN series was published.

More information on The Gardens Trust's role in the planning system, casework, and our conservation publications and resource hub is available at:

<https://thegardenstrust.org/conservation/>

Email: [enquiries@thegardenstrust.org](mailto:enquiries@thegardenstrust.org)

THE GARDEN  
HISTORY SOCIETY

## Planning Conservation Advice Note 3

# **Extension of educational/ institutional establishments**



*GHS Head Office, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ*

*Tel: 020 7608 2409 Fax: 020 7490 2974 Email: [conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org](mailto:conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org)*

*[www.gardenhistorysociety.org](http://www.gardenhistorysociety.org)*

The Planning Conservation Advice Notes (PCANs) listed below have been devised by the Garden History Society to advise those wishing to determine the impact upon historic designed landscape of specific proposals for change. This includes local planning authorities, potential developers, owners or other interested parties. These PCANs seek to inform on necessary background information and good conservation practice while at the same time encouraging critical evaluation of the likely type and extent of potential impact. Not all impact is adverse, change is not necessarily detrimental, and opportunities do exist both for development and, where adverse impact has been identified, for appropriate mitigation. Informed evaluation is essential however, if irreversible damage is to be avoided and change is to be implemented in a way that is sympathetic to the historic and visual value of designed landscape.

### **Titles List**

*PCAN 1: Change of Use (of landscape, and of principal and/or subsidiary buildings)*

*PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development*

*PCAN 3: Extension of Educational/Institutional Establishments*

*PCAN 4: Executive Housing*

*PCAN 5: Golf*

*PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access*

*PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*

*PCAN 8: Telecommunications Masts*

*PCAN 9: Development of Domestic Amenities*

*PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting*

*PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*

*PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*

*PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

*PCAN 14: Management Plans (including Statements of Significance)*

*Appendix 1: Lists of subsidiary development generated by particular types of change*

*Appendix 2: General Evaluation Checklist (All types development/all types landscape)*

*Appendix 3: Planning Context*

Planning Conservation Advice Notes 1 to 12 deal with some of the most common types of change proposed in historic landscape or its setting. Notes 13 and 14 describe documentation required to evaluate and support proposals for such change. Appendices 1 to 3, which separate out specific aspects of proposals in note form for quick reference, may also be useful for evaluation of types of change not covered in PCANs 1 to 12.

### **Format**

PCANs 1 to 12 are divided into the following sections:

Section 1.0: Introduction

Section 2.0: Information Needed to Evaluate the Impact of Proposals

Section 3.0: Further Information Needed

Section 4.0: Potential for Mitigation

Section 5.0: Watchpoints

Section 6.0: Unavoidable Development/Damage

Section 7.0: Application of Advice

Section 8.0: Planning Context

Section 9.0: Evaluation

## **Evaluation**

Most sections follow a set format but Section 9.0 on evaluation differs between various PCANs.

**PCANs 3; 6; 8; 9; 10; 11** have a flow chart evaluation questionnaire. This may assist planning officers in particular, both in assessment of proposals and in preparation of recommendations for committee – the advice shown in upper case and bold type being intended to inform particularly on the following:

- level of potential impact
- further input which may be needed from other professionals
- further information which may be required
- where condition or legal agreement would be required to avoid adverse impact

**PCANs 1; 2; 7** have checklists of questions intended to:

- highlight other relevant evaluation tools
- highlight potential implications of proposals
- list questions relevant to evaluation of impact

**PCANs 4; 5** have short checklists of questions intended to:

- direct evaluation to specific conservation advice in the relevant PCAN
- assist evaluation by highlighting potential implications of proposals

**PCAN 12** seeks to assist evaluators by offering conservation advice for particular situations.

## **Current status of advice notes**

These planning conservation advice notes may be amended following trialling or with the introduction of new legislation. Any comments, and suggestions for improvement would be welcomed by the Society and feedback on content, usefulness, layout etc. of the sections on evaluation (including flow-charts) would be particularly appreciated.

## **Acknowledgements**

Individuals and organisations too numerous to mention have been involved in various stages of preparation of these PCANs and the Society would like to acknowledge this invaluable assistance and to offer its thanks to them all.

The Society would also like to highlight the input of the Society's conservation team in place at the time the original concept was devised (David Lambert, Anthea Taigel, Kath Gibson, Sarah Couch and Linden Groves), with particular thanks to David Lambert for identification of subjects, Sarah Couch for invaluable advice and for her work on PCAN 14 and advice flow charts, Kath Gibson for invaluable advice, particularly on PCANs 1 and 7, and Linden Groves for her support and enthusiasm. The Society is also indebted to the Jubilee Fund Trustees who provided initial funding for 'pilot' PCANs, and to the GHS Conservation Committee, which has supported this initiative throughout, with particular thanks to John Sales who has provided the text for Statements of Significance (included in PCAN 14). Format and text of PCANs and Appendices were otherwise devised by Anthea Taigel (former principal conservation officer of the GHS), with the advice and guidance of Elisabeth Whittle, (Chairman of the GHS Conservation Committee).

Copyright of the text of PCANS and appendices rests jointly with The Garden History Society and Anthea Taigel.

*See GHS PCAN 1: Change of Use, for new Educational/Institutional establishments in historic landscape.*

*The extension of Educational/Institutional establishments includes building extensions (either extension to an existing block of buildings or extension by erection of a new building independent of existing structures); extension of facilities such as sports grounds, vehicle parks and access, and new or increased provision of services such as lighting and security.*

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Among the wide range of styles, types etc., of historic landscapes are those which were laid out to enhance and serve institutions (e.g. schools, colleges, asylums, orphanages, religious foundations etc.). The layout of these grounds was invariably related to the way in which each community intended to use them, and the character of the landscape today usually reflects this rationale.
- 1.2 Such landscapes might include small ornamented spaces for use of select groups of the community (e.g. the gardens of individual University colleges, or those attached to individual 'villa units' in hospital and orphanage landscapes). Similarly, enclosed, designed landscape areas might be created around individual accommodation for members of staff and their families (e.g. managers or superintendent's housing, lodges for caretakers etc.).
- 1.3 Circuit walks, and views specifically designed to promote meditation, contemplation and inspiration, were a feature of certain types of institutional landscapes, while others included designed open spaces large enough to accommodate more active recreation and sports.
- 1.4 Integral to the designed landscape around institutions were service areas commensurate with the size of the community. Stables, service courts and drying yards were often supplemented by produce grounds (e.g. kitchen gardens and orchards) and some institutions, such as asylums, might have a working farm together with separate farmhouse, dairy etc. While service courts and drying yards were usually discreetly sited away from more decorative areas, other service facilities such as those outlined above could be, and frequently were, ornamented.
- 1.5 Institutional grounds might also include a private church or chapel – a favoured focus of long landscape views (with or without an avenue) – and religious and hospital institutions usually set aside a special area for burials.
- 1.6 In addition to landscapes originally designed for use by an institutional community are those which were adapted for this purpose at a later date. Probably the most common are country house landscapes, which appeared to offer substantial space for outdoor facilities and for future expansion, but larger villas and their grounds in urban settings are also represented in this group (e.g. through conversion to schools; residential units for the elderly etc.).
- 1.7 Changes in legislation, in patient treatment and in social structure in the latter half of the twentieth century has led to alternative uses being found for specific types of institution (e.g. orphanages and asylums). Others, in particular educational establishments, have continued to expand.
- 1.8 In addition to a desire to increase quality and extent of facilities overall, Universities, which progressively took over colleges and other training establishments in the latter half of the twentieth century as 'out-reach' campuses, are now being encouraged to rationalise, both by financial considerations and by government directives (e.g. on use of e-commerce, and need to reduce vehicle movement and road use). As a result, smaller and more distant campus sites are often sold off, with the facilities which they provided relocated onto main campuses; usually through extension.

- 1.9 For privately funded schools, expansion proposals are often driven by the desire to upgrade existing facilities and pressure to keep abreast of new developments (e.g. in technology). And for all schools, the method and timescale of expansion may be dictated by financial constraints.

## 2.0 Information needed to evaluate proposals

- 2.1 With the help of the English Heritage or Cadw (for Wales) Register description of the site (or of local inventory entries\*), and of any available listed building or conservation area descriptions, establish the significance within the context of the design of the historic landscape, of affected areas and features of the landscape, and of subject buildings and structures and their surroundings.  
\*Where a site is unregistered but designated of local or regional historic significance, local inventories (as produced by local authorities, county gardens trusts or other interested organisations) may provide a similar level of information to the *English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest*.  
N.B. While the register is a reliable guide, it should not be viewed as a comprehensive description, and the potential for additional structures and areas of importance to be identified should be recognised. A historic landscape assessment should be used to supplement if Register or Inventory entries and listed buildings or conservation area descriptions do not fully explain structures and areas in the context of the designed landscape, and insufficient information is presented with an application (see 3.2 below).
- 2.2 Proposals should also clearly identify any subsidiary development which would be generated, together with areas affected (this should include any additional security, lighting or signage proposed, additional vehicle movement within the historic landscape, increase in intensity of use of any area and any new circulation patterns [vehicle and pedestrian]).  
(For lists of the most common types of subsidiary development which may be generated by expansion of schools and institutions, see *GHS Appendix* items A1.4 and A1.5).
- 2.3 A supporting/justification statement should be included outlining why the proposed extension is required and setting proposals within the context of long term strategy for development of the institution/organisation. A business plan may be an appropriate addition.  
The supporting statement should also set proposed developments within the context of conservation management of the historic landscape (see 3.2 below).  
Where direct replacement footprint of structures or hard surfaced areas which are themselves inappropriate additions to the historic landscape is proposed, a supporting statement should be able to fully justify such replacement within the context of conservation management of the historic landscape.  
N.B. Piecemeal proposals, unsupported by a comprehensive conservation management plan, are inappropriate in historic landscape since they preclude evaluation of the potential cumulative effects of development and limit opportunity for developing long term strategies in response to management issues/problems (e.g. vehicle access, circulation and parking; service access; security provision etc.). See also 4.1. below.
- 2.4 Where proposals involve replacement footprint calculations, information should be available on any proposed increase in volume, and any corresponding proposed increase in height.

## 3.0 Additional information required

- 3.1 In assessing the potential impact of proposals on historic landscape, the potential for repair of the landscape also needs to be taken into account.  
(Where a historic landscape has been unmanaged or inappropriately managed for some time, the significance of a particular area may not be immediately apparent e.g. where these are overgrown or where new structures have been sited, or areas hard surfaced. Evaluators need to ensure that development will not compromise future repair of important historic landscape areas and features e.g. the reopening of a vista through woodland; replanting of an avenue reinstatement of a circuit walk; with associated features etc.).  
Any evaluation of change on historic landscape should therefore include assessment of:
1. Existing damage (e.g. areas of tarmac for vehicle parking; modern buildings, structures, access ways etc. which were not designed to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a historic landscape) and its potential reversibility.
  2. Decay (e.g. lost features, lost or overgrown planting) and potential for its repair.

A full historic landscape assessment can be an invaluable aid to understanding the provenance and significance of structures, features and areas of a historic landscape. A Conservation Management Plan, based on a Historic Landscape Assessment will confirm such potential for repair in cases of doubt.

See *GHS PCAN 13: Briefs for Historic Landscape Assessments*

*GHS PCAN 14: Management Plans*

- 3.2 A comprehensive conservation management plan (CMP) for the historic landscape should support proposals for extension.

Good conservation practice indicates that proposals for change on historic landscape should flow clearly from a historic landscape assessment and be supported by a comprehensive conservation management plan for that landscape. In addition to outlining ongoing conservation management (as opposed to routine maintenance and management), this can examine constraints and opportunities for development in detail (e.g. through examination of relative sensitivity on an area by area basis) and effectively establish a 'blueprint' for the future of that landscape.

See also *GHS PCAN 14: Management Plans*

#### **4.0 Potential for Mitigation**

- 4.1 Where an application appears an isolated instance, and proposals are for minor extension of structures and facilities only (e.g. a small addition to a sports pavilion set against backdrop woodland, or a small extension to a teaching unit in an already developed area of a site, generator housing, conveniences etc.), mitigation of any potential adverse impact may include careful siting of such extension\*, use of appropriate colours, form and materials, or some limited extension of existing planting.

(\*away from obvious areas/features of significance and focussed views)

In such circumstances, while it would be unreasonable to impose conditions or seek legal agreement in respect of comprehensive long-term conservation management of a site, authorities will be aware of the potential for cumulative effect of development from a succession of piecemeal proposals.

In order to mitigate against potential future adverse impact, applicants should be advised of good conservation practice in respect of Historic Landscape (see 3.3 above) and that a proper context would be expected (see 2.2 and 2.3 above) should further proposals be put forward.

- 4.2 The most effective way to avoid potential adverse impact from primary development, and from any subsidiary development generated by extension of schools and institutional establishments in historic landscape, is to consider such requirements in the context of a comprehensive conservation management plan for that landscape (see 3.2 above).

- 4.3 As well as promoting good conservation management, a CMP will also identify any repair which would be appropriate. Where financial constraints limit landscape repair in the short term, agreement may be reached that successive phases of development be matched by phased repair; usually of associated areas. This can be advantageous where fund-raising is anticipated.

N.B. Such an approach may acknowledge and seek to rectify past errors or omissions, but should not be seen as a way of gaining approval for development which would irreversibly damage historic landscape. Standards of design excellence and of assessment procedures formulated to protect or mitigate against adverse impact should be maintained.

- 4.4 Where extension of facilities on a main university campus is associated with relocation from an outlying campus site and both campus sites are associated with historic landscapes, consideration may be given to developmental quid pro quo (e.g. increased student accommodation on one site may be supported by removal of similar accommodation from the other, where such arrangement would preserve and enhance the latter). However, as 4.3, standards of design excellence and of assessment procedures formulated to protect or mitigate against adverse impact should be maintained.

- 4.5 For mitigation of impact of specific types of primary and subsidiary development, see

*GHS PCAN 2: Hotel and Leisure Development (including sport)*

*PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access*

*PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances* (e.g. visibility splays, signage, furniture)  
*PCAN 9: Development of Domestic Amenities* (tennis courts, swimming pools, garaging, equine facilities)  
*PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting*  
*PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*  
*PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*

AND *GHS Appendix 1: Lists of subsidiary development generated by particular types of change*

## 5.0 Watchpoints

- 5.1 Temporary solutions to expansion requirements (e.g. portacabins for extension of teaching accommodation) are rarely appropriate in historic landscape, since they preclude full impact assessment and, without plans for long-term resolution, can result in repeated applications for extension of consent (with increasing precedence for retention of provision).
- 5.2 Assessment of potential impact of primary development should include visual and other impact of new proposals, loss of ground to new structures and any potential long-term effect from construction works. Potential for, and implications of, an increase in the number of people using a site should also be considered, even where a proposed extension would lie within an already developed area.
- 5.3 Improved facilities should also be assessed in the context of increased numbers of users of a site (e.g. upgrading dormitory accommodation to single or shared study units [with corresponding extension of buildings] may have no effect on the total numbers of pupils in a school, but extension or upgrading of sports pitches could generate increase in match use with subsequent requirement for stadia, pavilions, coach access, vehicle parking, lighting, etc.).
- 5.4 For extension of buildings consider both change in immediate curtilage and visual impact on surrounding and wider landscape (including long views).
- 5.5 Views within a historic landscape or its setting can change markedly in different seasons.
- 5.6 Consider possible subsidiary development and its potential impact.  
(For lists of the most common types of subsidiary development which may be generated by expansion of schools and institutions, see *GHS Appendix 1: A1.4* and *A1.5*)  
For CCTV; Vehicle parking and access; Treatment of boundaries and entrances and New Features in Historic Landscape, see relevant *GHS PCANs* (as 4.5 above).
- 5.7 Where a succession of minor extensions (which individually may be assessed as having an insignificant effect upon historic landscape) to existing structures and facilities are proposed, the cumulative effect should be considered, as well as possible gradual increase in intensity of use of a landscape from progressive upgrade/extension of facilities available.
- 5.8 The presence of otherwise discreetly sited ground level facilities (e.g. sports pitches, playgrounds and car parks), may be visually accentuated by the addition of lighting or CCTV columns, or high security fencing.
- 5.9 Where proposals involve replacement footprint, increase in height of structures can impact on a greater area of the historic landscape.
- 5.10 Where proposals involve replacement footprint, or new build on already hard surfaced areas (e.g. sports hall on former tennis courts), consider potential for landscape repair (see 3.1 above) and of any need for examination of alternative sites.
- 5.11 The more areas of a landscape from which development is visible the greater will be the cumulative effect.
- 5.12 The potential impact of overtly modern structures is likely to be greater on areas and views of historic landscape where no such imposition has occurred to date.

- 5.13 Where the development history of a site (as identified through a historic landscape assessment) suggests existence of areas of potential archaeological significance\*, and changes in levels or contours are proposed, consider archaeological evaluation.
- \*Not all areas of potential archaeological significance in respect of designed landscapes have yet been identified on county Sites and Monuments Records (SMRs).

## 6.0 Unavoidable Development

- 6.1 If extension of educational or other institutional facilities would result in significant adverse impact but development is difficult to resist (e.g. replacement footprint on a Major Developed Site), every attempt should be made to mitigate against such impact, and corresponding gain for the affected historic landscape should be secured as part of any consent which an authority may be minded to grant. This may include funding for a comprehensive conservation management plan or, if such a plan is already in place, funding for specific repair projects, planting etc.

## 7.0 Application of Advice

- 7.1 If an application for extension of educational or other institutional facilities, would result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape, and potential for mitigation of such impact has not been identified or cannot be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant, the Society would anticipate that the authority would refuse consent to the application.
- 7.2 If an application for extension of educational or other institutional facilities, would not result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape, or if appropriate mitigation of any potential adverse impact can and will be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant, the Society would be unlikely to object to such an application and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.3 Should there be doubt over the extent of impact on the historic landscape of an application for extension of educational or other institutional facilities, we advise that a request be made via our London office\* for the Society's regional conservation officer to discuss the case with the local authority.
- \*Such request should be made to the Society's Conservation Casework Manager, at The Garden History Society, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ. Email [conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org](mailto:conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org) or telephone 020 7608 2409.

## 8.0 Planning Context

This section highlights some parts of government Planning Policy Guidance notes (general guidance on specific topics) which may be particularly relevant to applications for change on historic landscape. Further information may be accessed via the planning website (see 8.4 below).

### PPG15: Planning & the Historic Environment

- 8.1 Para 2.24 instructs that 'planning authorities should protect registered parks and gardens in preparing development plans and in determining planning applications'.
- Para 2.24 also confirms that the effect on a registered park or garden or its setting is a material consideration in assessing an application.
- N.B. It is important to recognise the difference between setting of a listed building, which may comprise historic landscape, and the setting of the landscape itself, the evaluation of which involves a range of different issues. (See *GHS PCAN 11: Development in the Setting of Historic Designed Landscape*)
- 8.2 Para 2.16 notes that when authorities consider applications for planning permission or listed building consent for works which potentially affect a listed structure they should pay special regard to certain matters including the desirability of preservation of the setting of a listed building.
- Para 2.16 also notes that, 'The setting is often an essential part of the building's character, especially if a garden or grounds have been laid out to complement its design or function' and para 2.17 continues, 'In some cases setting can only be defined by a historical assessment of a building's surroundings'.

### PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation

- 8.3 Para 31: **Sports and Recreation requiring Natural Features and Water** '...the visual amenity, heritage and nature conservation value of water resources should also be protected'.

Planning Website

8.4 The website of the office of the deputy prime minister ([www.odpm.gov.uk](http://www.odpm.gov.uk)) may be accessed for full information on the above PPGs and other relevant planning guidance e.g.

*PPG13: Transport*

*Planning and Access for Disabled People : A Good Practice Guide*

See also *GHS Appendix 3* for further parts of

*PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment*

*PPG16: Archaeology and Planning*

*PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation*

AND *Planning Policy Wales*

## 9.0 Evaluation of Impact

- Q1** Have there been previous applications for extension of structures/facilities within this landscape, within the recent past (last two years)?  
If No, Go to Q1A  
If Yes, Go to Q2
- Q1A** Is this application part of a larger scheme?  
If No, Go to Q1B  
If Yes, Go to Q2
- Q1B** Is the application for minor extension of existing subsidiary structures or facilities (e.g. as 4.1 above)?  
If No, Go to Q2  
If Yes, Go to Q1C
- Q1C** Are proposals well sited and in keeping with, or a visual improvement on, existing structures and facilities?  
If No, **SEEK AMENDMENTS**  
If Yes, **ADVERSE IMPACT UNLIKELY**  
**BUT: If no conservation management plan is in place for this landscape, advise applicant of good conservation practice in respect of any future applications (see 4.1 above).**  
**ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**
- Q2** Is there a comprehensive conservation management plan for the historic landscape?  
If Yes, Go to Q2A  
If No, Go to Q3
- Q2A** Does this support development proposals in principle?  
If Yes, Go to Q2B  
If No, Go to Q3
- Q2B** Does the plan undertake detailed examination of proposals in the context of required mitigation of adverse impact (from primary and subsidiary development)?  
If Yes, Go to Q2C  
If No, Go to Q3
- Q2C** Does the plan identify any need for mitigation of adverse impact from these proposals?  
If Yes, Go to Q2D  
If No, **ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**
- Q2D** Is there potential within this application for Condition/Legal Agreement to maintain such mitigation in perpetuity?  
If Yes, **CONDITION/AGREEMENT REQUIRED** **ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**  
If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH** **ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**
- Q3** Do proposals involve new built structure(s) (free-standing or extension to existing)?  
If Yes, Go to Q3A  
If No, Go to Q5
- Q3A** Will this/these lie within an existing building group (N.B. For proposals involving both building within an existing building group and building on a new site, go to Q3B AND answer Q4)?  
If Yes, Go to Q3B  
If No, Go to Q4
- Q3B** Will the structure(s) be visually prominent\* from outside the building group?  
If Yes, Go to Q4  
If No, Go to Q3C  
(\*i.e. be clearly identifiable from the existing group in long views)
- Q3C** Does the area proposed for the new structure include specific designed features/areas, identified in register or inventory entry (e.g. a formal or walled garden, a main approach etc.)?  
If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR LOSS OF DESIGNED FEATURE**, Go to Q3D  
If No, Go to Q3D

- Q3D** Will the additional structure reduce appreciation of designed structural features within the building group (i.e. will it encroach on curtilage e.g. circulation space around a chapel or garden building, or affect distant views)?  
If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT**, Go to Q3E  
If No, Go to Q3E
- Q3E** Are additional proposals included with this application?  
If Yes, Go to Q5  
If No, Go to Q3F
- Q3E** Will proposals result in subsidiary development or significantly increased use of the designed landscape?  
If Yes, Go to Q6  
If No, Go to Q3G
- Q3G** Are answers to Qs 3D and 3E negative?  
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT (As identified)**  
If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT LOW ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**
- Q4** Has the historical development history of the area(s) in and around which a new structure(s) is to be sited been fully explained  
If Yes, Go to Q4A  
If No, **FURTHER INFORMATION NEEDED before proceeding with evaluation**
- Q4A** Is the new structure on the site of an existing structure, hard surfaced or otherwise developed area?  
If Yes, Go to Q4B  
If No, Go to Q4D
- Q4B** Does the site occupy a key position\* within the designed landscape?  
(\*e.g. did it previously form a designed link between other designed landscape areas and features, or was itself a significant feature or area of the designed landscape?)  
If Yes, Go to Q4C  
If No, Go to Q4D
- Q4C** Is there potential for repair of this area?  
If Yes **CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE SITE**  
If No, Go to Q4D
- Q4D** Has the structure(s) been designed to enhance this area of the historic landscape (i.e. is it part of an appropriate contemporary landscape ‘design layer’)?  
If Yes, Go to Q4E  
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**, Go to Q4E
- Q4E** Will the new structure(s) be visible from significant areas and features of historic landscape beyond the proposal site?  
If Yes, Go to Q4F  
If No, go to Q5
- Q4F** Will such visibility disrupt designed views, vistas or panoramas, change visual priority, introduce visually inappropriate elements or alter the character of these areas\*?  
If Yes, Go to Q4G  
If No, Go to Q5  
(\*See also *PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features* for more detailed evaluation)
- Q4G** Is there potential for appropriate\* mitigation of impact?  
If Yes, Go to Q4H  
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**, Go to Q5  
(\*For example, a block of conifer planting or a high earth bund may mitigate against adverse visual impact but, if this is not part of design intention, may itself create adverse visual impact.)
- Q4H** Is there potential within this application for Condition/Legal Agreement to maintain such mitigation in perpetuity?  
If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**, Go to Q5  
If Yes, **CONDITION/AGREEMENT REQUIRED**, Go to Q5

- Q5** Does this application include extension of facilities (e.g. sports, play, vehicle parking etc.)?  
 If No, Go to Q6  
 If Yes, Go to Q5A
- Q5A** Has the historical development history of the area(s) in and around which a new facility(s) is to be sited been fully explained?  
 If Yes, Go to Q5B  
 If No, **FURTHER INFORMATION NEEDED before proceeding with evaluation**
- Q5B** Is proposed facility(s) on the site of an existing structure, hard surfaced or otherwise developed area?  
 If Yes, Go to Q5C  
 If No, Go to Q5E
- Q5C** Does the site occupy a former key position\* within the designed landscape?  
 (\*e.g. did it previously form a designed link between other designed landscape areas and features, or was itself a significant feature or area of the designed landscape?)  
 If Yes, Go to Q5C  
 If No, Go to Q5F
- Q5D** Is there potential for repair of this area?  
 If Yes **CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE SITE**, Go to Q6  
 If No, Go to Q5F
- Q5E** Does the site comprise/include significant features or designed landscape areas?  
 If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR LOSS OF INTEGRAL ELEMENTS HIGH**, Go to Q5F  
 If No, Go to Q5F
- Q5F** Will the new facility(s) be visible from significant areas and features of historic landscape beyond the proposal site?  
 If Yes, Go to Q5G  
 If No, go to Q6
- Q5G** Will such visibility disrupt designed views, vistas or panoramas, change visual priority, introduce visually inappropriate elements or alter the character of these features or areas\*?  
 If Yes, Go to Q5H  
 If No, Go to Q6  
 (\*See also *PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features* for more detailed evaluation)
- Q5H** Is there potential for appropriate\* mitigation of impact  
 If Yes, Go to Q5J  
 If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**, Go to Q6  
 (\*For example, a block of conifer planting or a high earth bund may mitigate against adverse visual impact but, if this is not part of design intention, may itself create adverse visual impact.)
- Q5J** Is there potential within this application for Condition/Legal Agreement to maintain such mitigation in perpetuity?  
 If No, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH**, Go to Q6  
 If Yes, **CONDITION/AGREEMENT REQUIRED**, Go to Q6

- Q6** Will the application result in Subsidiary Development\*?  
 If Yes, Use the following Planning Conservation Advice notes and flow charts to evaluate

Lighting:	<i>GHS PCAN 10</i>
CCTV:	<i>GHS PCAN 10</i>
Changes to Boundaries and Entrances:	<i>GHS PCAN 7</i>
Signage, street furniture etc.:	<i>GHS PCAN 7</i>
New vehicle access and circulation, increased vehicle use of drives/areas and additional parking:	<i>GHS PCAN 6</i>

\*See also *GHS Appendix 1* for most common types of additional and subsidiary development

**AND** - Go to Q6A

If No,

**ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**

- Q6A** Will individual elements disrupt designed views vistas or panoramas, change visual priority, or adversely affect the character or appearance of areas of the designed landscape\*?  
If Yes, **RELOCATION REQUIRED**, Go to Q6B  
If No, Go to Q6B  
(\*Include increased intensity of pedestrian use, particularly in small or formally laid out areas)
- Q6B** Will the cumulative effect of subsidiary development have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the designed landscape  
If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT HIGH, ASSESSMENT COMPLETE**

## CHECKLIST OF DEVELOPMENT and SUBSIDIARY DEVELOPMENT (see GHS Appendix 1)

### **A1.4 Schools**

Intensification of use of areas of high ornamentation i.e. immediately adjacent to key buildings (desire line paths, ground erosion and compaction etc.)  
Games courts and pitches (hard and grass, with ground recontouring, goal posts, lighting etc.)  
Swimming pools (with associated hard surfaced surrounds, pool covers and service buildings)  
Play grounds (hard surfacing with play equipment)  
Lighting, signage and CCTV (around central structures, vehicle parks and sports pitches)  
Traffic management measures (passing bays, speed bumps, mini roundabouts etc.)  
Vehicle parking and access (including coaches and minibuses)  
Service and delivery access (+ bin and fuel stores, laundry facilities etc.)  
Potential for expansion of facilities and additional buildings  
Safety and security measures  
Potential for reduced maintenance and management of outlying areas  
Potential for sale and subletting of unused structures and areas  
Requirements for compliance with Disability Discrimination Act (ramps, widened access, disabled parking spaces etc.)

### **A1.5 University and Other Institutional Use**

Intensification of use of areas of high ornamentation i.e. immediately adjacent to key buildings (desire line paths, ground erosion and compaction etc.)  
Separate student accommodation blocks (with multiple areas of vehicle parking)  
Sports areas and facilities (ground recontouring, additional buildings)  
Lighting, signage and CCTV (around central structures, vehicle parks and sports pitches)  
Traffic management measures (passing bays, speed bumps, mini roundabouts etc.)  
Vehicle parking and access (including coaches and minibuses)  
Service and delivery access (Likely to be multiple points + bin and fuel stores, laundry facilities etc.)  
Potential for expansion of facilities and additional buildings  
Potential for reduced maintenance and management of outlying areas  
Potential for sale and subletting of unused structures and areas  
Requirements for compliance with Disability Discrimination Act (ramps, widened access, disabled parking spaces etc.)

**For religious institutions** include potential for specialised new build (e.g. chanting halls) commemorative planting and burial grounds