



70 Cowcross Street
London EC1M 6EJ
Telephone: (+44/0) 207 608 2409
Email: enquiries@thegardenstrust.org
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system and planning policy (and particularly Section 8 'Planning Context' and Appendix 3) in the PCANs has been superseded and the conservation advice must be read in the context of the current National Planning Policy Framework published by the Government.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

THE GARDEN
HISTORY SOCIETY

Planning Conservation Advice Note 4

Executive housing and other new residential developments



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

Tel: 020 7608 2409 Fax: 020 7490 2974 Email: conservation@gardenhistorysociety.org

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.

The term 'residential development' used in this planning conservation advice note refers to developments of three or more individual, new, housing units with individual curtilage and common access.

The term 'executive home' should not be confused with the individual, architect-designed dwelling, albeit both may present as status residences and both may result in an extensive range of subsidiary development.

For evaluation of the latter – see GHS PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Features

1.0: Introduction

Historic Landscape

- 1.1 Historic designed landscapes invariably include buildings and structures. Some structures may predate, and subsequently be absorbed into, ornamental landscape design (e.g. a medieval church later surrounded by a landscape park). Alternatively, the erection or existence of major (primary) buildings (e.g. country houses, asylums, university colleges etc.) might be the catalyst for the creation of the landscape (i.e. as designed setting).
- 1.2 In addition are those structures integral to one or (more usually) several different phases of landscape design. These can be primarily ornamental (e.g. follies; eyecatchers; gazebos etc.) or may also serve a specific function (chapels; lodges; farms; dovecotes; stables etc.).
- 1.3 Many historic designed landscapes, from public parks and cemeteries to country house estates, contain buildings and structures which follow particular architectural styles or show patterns of ornamentation.
- 1.4 The degree of ornamentation and quality of materials of a building or structure usually reflected its status and, together with the scale of the structure, determined its position in the hierarchy of buildings in a designed landscape.
- 1.5 Secondary structures intended for residential use (e.g. a park-keeper's lodge in a public park; an agent's house in the country house landscape; a superintendent's house in the grounds of an asylum) frequently had attached grounds or garden enclosures. The size and ornamentation of such areas was in keeping with the scale of the structure to which it belonged and, like the building, usually reflected the status of the occupant. The degree to which such structures and areas were intended to be visible varied between individual landscapes and over time.
- 1.6 Other structures in historic landscape might also be associated with specific designed areas. While these areas might not be ornamented to the degree of the formal garden, they were nonetheless integral to the overall landscape design and an important part of the immediate setting of individual structures (e.g. the ornamental dairy with foreground of pasture surrounded by a continuous ha-ha; the produce garden adjacent to the stables etc.).

Individual Architect Designed Residences

- 1.7 There is considerable historical precedence (particularly within the country house landscape) for resiting of a primary residence. Reasons for this were varied. An existing house might be considered too small, too decayed, too unfashionable etc., or a new location might be required to fit prevailing landscape fashions (e.g. if extensive landscape views were required, a dwelling in the bottom of a narrow valley could be considered unsuitable).
- 1.8 A new house, in the prevailing architectural style of the day was frequently related to a new landscape 'design layer'.
- 1.9 The earlier house might be demolished, or it could be used as a subordinate dwelling for other family members. Alternatively, it could be reduced in size and many such dwellings were inhabited subsequently by tenant farmers or estate staff.

- 1.10 This process has continued into the present day, as evidenced by applications for individually designed modern status residences in new locations on historic landscapes (for families vacating another primary residence).
- 1.11 The distinction between this and an executive home (or other massed residential) development lies in the following aspects:
1. The former, by virtue of its more fashionable form, style and location, maintains a dominant position in the hierarchy of estate architecture.
 2. The position of the former can be specifically chosen to take advantage of the existing designed landscape (i.e. taking full account of constraints and opportunities).
 3. With the former, new landscaping is designed around the new residence alone, and is not constrained in size or location since either the whole of the landscape remains in single ownership, or the owner has the choice of which areas to retain with the new residence.
 4. Also in the former case, no other such residence is present which would compete with its status.
 5. The design of an individual status residence and any related new landscaping is unique, and, as such, follows historical precedence in concept.
- Such new residences may enhance the historic landscape and enable its continued development while preserving its character and appearance.

Executive Homes/ Housing Developments

- 1.12 The 'executive home' is a mass-produced concept. As with all modern homes, its form has been partially determined by building regulations pertaining to minimum volume of individual spaces, ceiling heights, sanitary provision and so on, but the form of the executive home is particularly related to its perceived function as a 'status residence'. As such, it is of large scale (albeit often of compressed form), invariably has extensive fenestration and its ornamental detailing 'borrows' from past status residences; often resulting in a pastiche of porticos, columns, turrets etc.
- 1.13 The impression created by the size and style of these dwellings is usually enhanced by the provision of a range of additional structures and facilities. Chief among these is the conservatory, double or triple garage, extensive hardstanding and comprehensive, high level lighting and security systems. To the front, the aspect is usually open between dwellings; making the best visual use of often limited space and showing the full extent of the property and its associated elements. Such open aspect may be dictated in perpetuity by restrictive covenants.
- 1.14 Other additions may include patio for barbeques etc., swimming pool, gymnasium or games room, tennis court and fully equipped play area for children. Boundary definition between properties reflects limited space and high fences or walls are more common than hedges or belts of trees.
- 1.15 Executive homes are commonly built in groups and, since the profit motive is inherent in their construction, the proportion of curtilage allotted to each is usually the minimum required for provision of subsidiary facilities, plus a relatively small garden area. While a property may differ from its immediate neighbour in layout or ornamentation, the repetitive 'pattern book' approach is usually clearly identifiable in such developments, with ornamentation added on a 'mix and match' basis.
- 1.16 Other modern residential estates have certain features in common with executive home developments. Here too, houses are usually grouped closely together, designed with open aspect to front and have limited space for individual boundary definition. In addition, both usually require wide, smooth-surfaced roads (tarmac is often chosen) with turning areas to accommodate service and delivery vehicles.

2.0 Information needed to evaluate proposals

- 2.1 Where proposals constitute Enabling Development*, English Heritage advises that there should be a presumption against development which does not meet all of the following criteria:
- The enabling development will not materially detract from the archaeological, architectural, historic, landscape or biodiversity interest of the asset or materially harm its setting
 - The proposal avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the heritage asset

- The enabling development will secure the long term future of the heritage asset and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose
- The problem arises from the inherent needs of the heritage asset, rather than the circumstances of the present owner or the purchase price paid
- Sufficient financial assistance is not available from any other source
- It is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the heritage asset, and that its form minimises disbenefits
- The value or benefit of the survival or enhancement of the heritage asset outweighs the long term cost to the community (i.e. the disbenefits) of providing the enabling development.’

Enabling development and the conservation of heritage assets.

English Heritage, London. 2001

*Enabling Development may be defined as development that would normally contravene planning policy guidance and plan policies, but which is proposed in the context of funding essential repair and conservation of an important heritage asset.

Authorities will be aware of the extent and level of information required to assess whether the above criteria have been met.

2.2 A full historic landscape assessment (HLA) and conservation management plan (CMP) are desirable to underpin any proposed change to historic landscape. They are essential where a residential development is proposed. The scale of such developments and the far-reaching implications for the historic landscape (from primary and subsidiary development; landscape subdivision; fragmentation of management etc.) preclude proper assessment of impact through register or inventory information alone.

N.B. HLAs and CMPs can differ markedly in content. For large-scale development, it is critical that constraints and opportunities for development are examined on an area by area basis. This examination should include both potential for repair of the historic landscape in each area, and the potential for appropriate mitigation of any adverse impact.

For more detailed consideration of content, see also

GHS PCAN 13: Brief for Historic Landscape Assessment

GHS PCAN 14: Management Plans for Historic Landscape

3.0 Additional information required

3.1 Even where a proposal site is the only area of historic landscape within an applicant’s ownership, full information on the significance of the area (through a historic landscape assessment), and its potential for repair should be available.

3.2 Clear identification of the extent of land ownership is needed for examination of alternatives and evaluation of potential for mitigation.

3.3 Clear identification is needed of potential impact on those parts of the historic landscape or its setting, which lie beyond the immediate development site (see 2.2 above).

e.g. Changes required to existing access arrangements to accommodate higher, wider or heavier vehicles (visibility splays, turning circles etc.) and possible impact on historic structures (arches, bridges etc.), together with any potential changes in traffic (type and size of vehicle and intensity of use etc.).

See also *GHS PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access*

4.0 Potential for Mitigation

The following comments should be read in the context of unavoidable development – See 6.0

4.1 For all residential development, the scale, form and location of individual dwellings should be devised to impose minimum impact upon the historic site, respect the historic built hierarchy and preserve, as far as possible, the character and appearance of the historic landscape.

4.2 Location of new residential development should be decided on the basis of a thorough understanding of the historic designed landscape (the areas and features of particular significance, any designed links between such areas and features, potential for landscape repair etc.).

i.e. such decision should be based on a full historic landscape assessment and supported by a comprehensive conservation management plan which examines constraints and opportunities for development.

The fundamental choice between massed and dispersed development should be specific to the landscape in question. For example, in some landscapes, the siting of development within a walled enclosure may result in less adverse impact than a development with individual units dispersed over a wide area of woodland. For others, the reverse may be the case. This depends on such aspects as the importance of individual areas to the overall designed landscape, circulation patterns within the landscape (historic and proposed) and potential visibility from key areas.

- 4.3 Removal of permitted development rights may be considered to avoid additional visual fragmentation between new landscape areas.
See also *GHS PCAN 9: Development of Domestic Amenities* (tennis courts, swimming pools, garaging, equine facilities)
- 4.4 Maintenance of existing historic landscape planting within and around the affected area, and a requirement to replace in perpetuity, may ensure that the basic framework of the area is retained. Similarly additional planting and arrangement within new curtilages may be chosen to support the historic landscape layout in type and position (e.g. species, hard landscaping and garden structures).
- 4.5 Where development is massed, the potential for appropriate screening e.g. by planting within the surrounding areas* may be explored.
Similarly an angled or serpentine approach to a massed development, which is taken through permanent planting* may limit visual intrusion, both from the development itself and from the vehicles which need to access it.
*N.B. Such planting should be appropriate to the historic landscape and should not itself result in adverse impact.
- 4.6 In order to preserve the character and appearance of the wider landscape, traffic management measures (e.g. signage, speed bumps, passing places, lighting etc.) on approaches to the development should be kept to a minimum.
See also *GHS PCAN 6: Vehicle Access and Parking*
- 4.7 Increase in communal areas of landscape and decrease in private areas may limit loss of visual integrity and fragmentation of management

5.0 Watchpoints

The following comments should be read in the context of unavoidable development – See 6.0

- 5.1 Where areas of historic landscape are divided into smaller individual units, particularly where such division also includes that of a primary residence, institution etc., the potential is high for progressive loss of integrity and cohesion of landscape design (and thus of its character and appearance), through imposition of alien planting and layout, and fragmentation of management regimes.
The potential for neglect of outlying areas of the historic landscape and for management companies to concentrate on routine maintenance rather than conservation management (which includes phased replacement and repair) is high.
- 5.2 Where housing developments and surrounding landscape devolve to control of a management company, pressure may be exerted for extension, through lease or purchase, of the limited area of curtilage initially assigned to individual properties*.
Authorities may wish to ensure that the articles of any such company include a requirement for any changes to the agreed conservation management plan (on which it is assumed that any planning consent would be based) to be approved by the planning authority.
*e.g. to site horse paddocks, maneges or stables; to site enclosures or tracks for off road vehicles or trial bikes; to accommodate children's play areas; to extend ornamental gardens etc.
- 5.3 PPG15 refers to the impact of proposals on the historic landscape or its setting. The latter should be particularly carefully considered where proposal sites are located close to the boundary of a historic landscape.
See also *GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*

- 5.4 Where planting (new or existing) is identified as mitigating against adverse visual impact upon the wider historic landscape, the potential for future growth of that planting to conflict with residents' wishes should be assessed. Whether such planting is within the curtilage of individual properties or under the control of a management company, suitable measures should be put in place at the outset to avoid unsuitable pruning or inappropriate removal in the future.
- Authorities may wish to consider TPO designation for significant trees or the designation of the historic landscape as a conservation area*.
- *Para 3.4 of the English Heritage publication *Conservation Area Practice* 1995, supports designation of historic landscapes as conservation areas.
- Trees within a conservation area also have a measure of protection, even if not the subject of tree preservation orders. Under Section 211 of the Town & Country Planning Act (1990) an authority must receive six weeks notification of intention to cut down, lop or top a tree (with some exceptions e.g dead or very small trees). When considering such notification, PPG15 para 4.40 states that 'local authorities should always take into account the visual, historic and amenity contribution of trees'.
- 5.5 Changes outside the affected area (traffic management measures, lighting, signage etc.) may impact on the character and appearance of historic landscape over a wide area and possible cumulative effect of such changes should be considered.
- See also *GHS 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* (particularly in public parks)
- 5.6 The production of a comprehensive conservation management plan is not necessarily dependent on all the landscape being within an applicant's ownership, although the co-operation of all owners (particularly in the context of site survey) is clearly desirable.
- 5.7 Outline planning applications are inappropriate for residential development on historic landscape since detailed examination of location, layout, areas required for mitigation of impact etc., is required before informed decisions may be made on the scale and extent of development.
- 5.8 Views within and across historic landscape may change markedly in different seasons. Any evaluation of potential impact should take this into account.
- 5.9 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.
- 5.10 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

Executive homes are inappropriate in historic landscape. The scale* and form, both of individual units and of massed developments, disturbs the hierarchy of estate/landscape buildings and adversely affects the character and appearance of the historic landscape (see 1.7 to 1.10 above). In addition, the relatively limited extent and divided nature of curtilage (combined with the extensive subsidiary development and additional facilities demanded) precludes the potential for a cohesive new landscape 'design layer' for the affected area. Greater opportunity may exist for mitigation of impact upon historic landscape of developments of smaller residential units but, where these are not specifically designed to enhance such landscapes (i.e. are not part of a contemporary design 'layer'), such proposals should only be admitted in the context of 'unavoidable development'.

*There is a direct relationship in historic landscape between the size (and status) of a residential structure and the extent of its curtilage. The limited curtilage of an executive home and the massing of status residences conflicts in a major way with historical precedence.

- 6.1 For all residential developments, where consent already given in outline or development outlined in a Local Plan precludes alternatives in location or extent of development, every effort should be made to mitigate against adverse impact on the wider landscape, and corresponding gain for the affected historic landscape should be secured as part of the application. This may include funding towards a comprehensive conservation management plan (see also 6.2 below) or, if such a plan is already in place, funding for specific repair projects, planting etc.
- 6.2 Where some new residential development is deemed the only way of securing the future of a heritage asset**, **Enabling Development** calculations should be rigorously scrutinised and conservation gain should be clearly identified, and achievable. Repair and future conservation management of the historic landscape, in the form of a comprehensive, long term conservation management plan, to be tied to a Section 106 Agreement***, should be secured as part of any consent granted to such enabling development. A legally binding timetable of works is important in this context, to ensure that restoration works precede or run in tandem with development.
- **See 2.1 above and *Enabling development and the conservation of heritage assets*. English Heritage, London. 2001 (See also: *Policy Statement*. English Heritage, June 1999 and *Rescued or Ruined: Dealing with Enabling Development*. Joint Amenities Societies publication. June 1999.)
- ***Such plan should include proper scheduling of works, identification of timescale within which works are to be completed and arrangements for monitoring, arbitration in case of dispute, and identification of action which would be taken by an authority in such event. Authorities need to be aware of the resource implications of a long-term commitment to securing conservation gains on offer.

7.0 Application of Advice

- 7.1 Where proposals for a residential development on historic landscape cannot be justified in the context either of a contemporary design layer or of unavoidable development, the Society would anticipate that the authority would refuse consent to the application.
- 7.2 Where proposals were properly justified in the context of unavoidable development and where appropriate conservation gain would be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to give, the Society would be unlikely to object in principle and would not anticipate consultation.
- 7.3 Should there be any doubt over establishment of proper justification or of appropriate conservation gain, 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 or telephone 020 7608 2409.

N.B. The Society does not have the resources either to evaluate enabling development calculations, or to advise in detail on the conservation gains on offer in specific conservation management plans.

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 8.7 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'.
- 8.3 Para 4.6 notes that **conservation area** '...designation may well... be suitable for historic parks or gardens and other areas of the historic landscape containing structures that contribute to their special interest'.
Para 4.40 directs that, '...when considering whether to extend protection to trees in **conservation areas**, local planning authorities should always take into account the visual, historic and amenity contribution of trees'.
- 8.4 Para 2.24 notes that, 'Planning and highway authorities should also safeguard registered parks and gardens when themselves planning new developments or road schemes.
Para 5.2: **Transport & Traffic Management** continues, 'Local highway and planning authorities should ... integrate their activities and should take great care to avoid or minimise impacts on the various elements of the historic environment and their settings'.
Para 5.3 notes that, 'The Secretaries of State also attach particular importance to early consultation in traffic management and highway maintenance schemes, and associated development proposals which could affect listed buildings or conservation areas or parks, gardens or battlefields, and their settings'.

PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation

- 8.5 Para 14: **Maintaining an Adequate Supply of Open Space And Sports And Recreational Facilities** – 'Parks, recreation grounds, playing fields and allotments must not be regarded as 'previously developed land' as defined in Annex C of PPG3. Even where land does fall within the definition of 'previously developed', its existing and potential value for recreation and other purposes should be properly assessed before development is considered'.
- 8.6 Para 17: **Developments within Open Space** 'Local authorities should (i) avoid any erosion of recreational function and maintain or enhance the character of open spaces'

Planning Website

- 8.7 The website of the office of the deputy prime minister (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

Permitted Development Rights

- 8.8 Local planning authorities may consider the serving of an Article 4 Direction to withdraw permitted development rights and to require specific planning permission to be obtained before development can proceed.
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

For reasons outlined above, residential development is an inappropriate use of historic landscape. Such development will result in damage and in loss of areas of the designed landscape. The extent of damage and of loss will depend upon the individual landscape; the extent, form and location of individual developments; and the potential for minimising adverse impact.

Identification of the full extent of potential adverse impact is critical to proper evaluation of such proposals and the following list is designed to highlight main issues. There is no flow chart for this Planning Conservation Advice Note but evaluators should follow flow charts of other planning conservation advice notes, where indicated.

9.1 Setting

Is development within the setting of the historic landscape?

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

9.2 Type of Application

Is the application for full consent (See 5.7 above)?

9.3 Information for Evaluation

Is sufficient information available for proper evaluation of proposals (See 2.0 & 3.0 above)?

9.4 Unavoidable Development

Is development unavoidable (See 6.0 above)?

e.g.:

- Outline consent already granted
- Outlined in the Local Plan
- Enabling Development

If so:

Have the criteria laid down by English Heritage been met (See 2.1 above)?

Have enabling development calculations been independently scrutinised?

Are the conservation gains on offer achievable, and can the planning authority ensure that resources will continue to be available (See 6.2 above)?

9.5 Optimum Site and Layout

Is this the least damaging site and layout (in the context of the historic landscape) for development?

e.g. would it result in:

- Least adverse visual impact on other areas
- Least loss of significant areas and features
- Minimum subsidiary development and access requirements
- Greatest potential for mitigation of adverse impact

9.6 Historic Landscape Assessment & Conservation Management Plan

Is the application based on a proper historic landscape assessment and is it supported by a comprehensive conservation management plan for the landscape (See 2.2 above)?

9.7 Mitigation of Adverse Impact

Is there potential for mitigation of adverse impact within these proposals (See 4.0 above)?

- Practically (e.g screening, reduction in traffic etc.)
- Through planning controls

e.g. by

- designation as a conservation area
- use of tree preservation orders
- removal of permitted development rights

9.8 Subsidiary Development

Will proposals result in subsidiary development (See *GHS Appendix 1* and *GHS PCANs 6, 7, 9 and 10*)?

- within the affected area
- within the wider landscape

9.9 Landscape Use and Management

Will proposals result in fragmentation of use and management? (See above: 5.1, 5.2 and *GHS PCAN 1:*

Change of Use)

- within the affected area
- within the wider landscape

9.10 Conservation Gain

Will proposed conservation gains and a proper conservation management regime be secured by legal agreement?

- Will this be independently monitored in the future?
- Does the authority have the in house expertise and resources to undertake such monitoring?
- What would be the action in case of dispute?