



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system and planning policy (and particularly Section 8 'Planning Context' and Appendix 3) in the PCANs has been superseded and the conservation advice must be read in the context of the current National Planning Policy Framework published by the Government.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 6

Vehicle parking and access



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.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The importance of access to the designed landscape is well demonstrated by surviving highly impressive entrances to country house estates, ornamental cemeteries and public parks and institutions. The access routes which led from these and more modest entrances were designed according to who was to use them and the type of traffic they were intended to carry.
- 1.2 The formal gardens and geometric compartments, commonly associated with status houses until around the mid 18th century, did not require access for vehicular traffic. Such grounds usually lay to one side of a residence, were enjoyed on foot and had little connection with the general comings and goings of mansion or estate. However, increasingly from the late 17th century onwards, as designed grounds expanded, the approach to a status residence, through wider estate land, became a designed feature. Initially, fashion demanded that this should be straight and flanked by an avenue of trees, which often framed or focussed on an entrance facade. Numerous avenues might be planted across the wider estate land – some as rides, some as vistas and some to frame a feature or element. Only a minority related to a vehicular approach.
- 1.3 Typically, such avenues terminated at ornamental gates and screen which enclosed a formal entrance forecourt to a residence. Visitors in carriages might continue through the entrance gates and across or around the entrance court to the main portico. Other traffic and riders would turn aside before the entrance gates and go direct to stables and service yards, usually located to one side of a mansion. On some sites the stable ‘branch’ of the approach continued across the front of the forecourt screen, effectively forming an alternative, often more direct, route which could be used by estate traffic.
- 1.4 The advent of the landscape park demanded alteration to these arrangements. Straight lines and regular features had no place in this new ‘natural’ style and any movement had to be carefully tailored to the composition. Owners of even small estates went to great lengths to remove all public, domestic and service traffic from across the new scenes. Public roads were closed and rerouted, dense tree belts might be planted along new park boundaries to shut out even a distant glimpse of such traffic and roads that could not be closed might be run in new cuttings to avoid visual intrusion (there are some notable exceptions where public routes through a designed landscape were not closed and which remain today, e.g. Windsor Great Park; Woburn).
- 1.5 Estate workers and estate traffic were considered unsightly and separate service entrances were constructed. Where existing stables and service courts remained in use, a house might be ‘turned’, with the former garden facade becoming the main facade, approached across the new landscape park, and the old main facade becoming the service entrance, with all service facilities suitably screened. Alternatively, new (screened) stables and service areas might be constructed at a distance from a house; often using existing topography to minimise visibility.
- 1.6 Those vehicular routes which did cross the ornamental landscape were carefully integrated with the design and their exclusivity ensured limited use. At the mansion, carriages would drop off passengers and proceed to enclosed stables and courts where they awaited further use. Accumulation of carriages in the open landscape was rare (e.g. for sporting and social occasions).
- 1.7 These essential divisions between public, service and more exclusive traffic were largely maintained on individually owned private landscapes in succeeding centuries. Even villa residences in urban settings usually had some sort of separate service access. Public landscapes too had separate service areas with discreet access, and asylum and institutional landscapes with farms and/or produce gardens invariably had a second access dedicated to these facilities.

- 1.8 Some early 19th century public parks had perimeter carriage drives and rides, and a few were bisected by public roads, but the primary purpose was to provide suitable recreation for those on foot and the majority of such spaces were devoted to pedestrians. When cars started to replace horses as a means of transport, these were not considered suitable in public parks and the bye-laws of many municipal parks prohibited all wheeled vehicles other than baby and invalid carriages.
- 1.9 The advent of the combustion engine also resulted in some changes on private landscapes. Many stables were converted to garages and those residences created after the early 20th century tended to have more garages than stabling. However, the same discreet relationship of service areas to house was maintained and the practice was continued of setting passengers down at an entrance with the vehicle driven round to an area out of sight of main facades.
- 1.10 After World War II, when live-in staff became the exception rather than the rule and ‘the chauffeur’ a luxury increasingly few people could afford, vehicles started to be parked around carriage circles and in forecourts. But the most major change, for both public and private landscapes, has arisen from the post-war rise in personal transport. This has facilitated change of use of country houses and institutions such as asylums (for divided residential units, educational and commercial organisations etc.) and an altered pattern of access to public parks. Together with the widespread commercial opening of historic houses and grounds, this has resulted in an unprecedented number of vehicles appearing in historic landscapes.
- 1.11 Historic building conservation experts are clear that vehicles in the vicinity of main facades compromise the setting of such buildings. Historic landscape conservation experts are equally clear that vehicles visible within significant areas (either parked or en route) will compromise the landscape.

2.0 Information needed for evaluation

- 2.1 With the help of the English Heritage or Cadw (for Wales) Register description of the site, (or of local inventory entries*), identify historically significant areas and designed points of view (e.g. garden terraces; high points in the landscape which command views within the site; specific views/vista lines – including avenue lines).
*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 as a supplement if Register or Inventory entries do not fully explain potentially affected areas in the context of the designed landscape, and insufficient information is presented with an application.

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 drive or 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

4.0 Potential for Mitigation/Alternative Solutions

- 4.1 Obvious solutions, such as siting parking within an area which is already screened from the wider landscape, or the establishment of a new screen around an area, need to be assessed very carefully if historically significant areas are to be avoided and screening is not itself to create adverse impact by being at odds with the historic environment.
A historic landscape assessment should be used to inform if the English Heritage Register entry does not give a clear explanation of the proposed area(s) and insufficient information is presented with an application.
- 4.2 Given the adverse impact of large groups of vehicles parked in historic landscape, it may be useful to consider alternatives such as parking split between a number of smaller sites; vehicle parks divided by planting, or terraced; or underground parking (particularly where new housing units are proposed).
- 4.3 Where pedestrian-only access to the interior of a landscape is desirable, consideration may be given to perimeter vehicle parks with a single, discreet 'essential vehicle' approach drive e.g. for service vehicles and disabled access.
- 4.4 Where solutions are restricted, initiatives such as 'Park and Ride' or Bonus Schemes for shared car use may be beneficial.
- 4.5 Where existing access routes are too narrow for two vehicles to pass and weight of traffic requires this regularly (leading to damage to verges, avenues etc., adverse visual intrusion from additional surfaced 'passing places', or to inappropriate increase in the designed width of historic drives) consideration may be given to a one way system.
- 4.6 Possible mitigation of visual impact should extend to the entrance to a vehicle park. A staggered or curved entrance running through planting to such an area can limit view of parked cars and significantly reduce adverse impact.
- 4.7 Adverse impact may be lessened by grant of consent for a limited number of days only in a year; thus allowing the landscape to be enjoyed on other days without vehicle parking. If this approach is adopted, care should be taken to ensure appropriate surfacing and that no permanent features such as surface markings, bollards, kiosks, lighting etc. are permitted.
Consideration should also be given to conditions to remove any temporary associated elements between use.
- 4.8 Where the size of vehicles such as coaches and delivery vans would require unacceptable changes to the historic landscape (e.g. to boundaries and entrances) or result in damage to features and areas (e.g. bridges, avenues etc.), consideration may be given to 'dividing the load' by the use of a greater number of smaller vehicles*.
*such strategy must be assessed against the potential impact of increased intensity of use on access and circulation routes (see also 5.2 and 5.4 below).
- 4.9 Where vehicle access or vehicle parking adjacent to buildings or facilities would result in adverse impact, consideration may be given to siting of vehicle parks at a distance and the provision of regular internal transport*.
For hotels, the potential for drop-off and transport of visitors' cars by staff, to outlying or underground car parks, may also be explored.
*e.g. by electric buggy with carriage train. This strategy has been successfully adopted by national organisations on a number of sites open to the public.

5.0 Watchpoints

- 5.1 Subsidiary Development: Vehicle parking areas require vehicle access. Where such access crosses historic landscape, the potential impact of vehicles *en route* as well as that of vehicle parks should be evaluated. New or upgraded traffic routes may require considerable subsidiary development in the form of new surfacing (particularly if heavy vehicles are to be accommodated), lighting, signage, speed restriction measures, CCTV etc. All have potential for adverse visual impact and for erosion of the character and appearance of historic landscape. The possible cumulative effect of such subsidiary development should also be taken into account.

- 5.2 Vehicle parking and traffic movement is fundamentally alien to the majority of historic landscapes (see section 1.0 above) and, if visible, will almost certainly result in adverse impact. Increase in the numbers of vehicles using a landscape, or in their size is likely to result in an increase in adverse impact.
- 5.3 Changed access routes or new parking arrangements may lead to significant changes in noise level on various parts of a historic landscape, particularly if heavy vehicles are braking, turning or reversing. The character of a landscape may suffer accordingly.
- 5.4 Increased weight, height or width of vehicles using access routes may lead to damage to verges and road/drive side planting (particularly avenues) and may have similar implications for historic structures e.g. entrance gates, piers, arches and bridges.
See also *GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*
- 5.5 Where proposed solutions involve multiple use of an area (e.g. parking at weekends with use of the ground for informal recreation during weekdays), assessment of potential adverse impact should include possible surface erosion, ground compaction and ponding, oil and petrol spillage etc.
- 5.6 Specialist advice (e.g. from a tree or landscape officer) should be sought on potential impact of vehicle parking and access proposed in areas of mature trees.
- 5.7 If existing or proposed planting is considered to satisfactorily mitigate against potential adverse impact, any condition or S106 Agreement should seek both its maintenance and replacement in perpetuity and identified phasing of replacement to ensure that such mitigation is consistently maintained.
- 5.8 Where topography mitigates against potential adverse visual impact of vehicle access and parking, associated subsidiary development, such as high fencing and lighting columns, should be similarly obscured.
- 5.10 Views within and across historic landscape may change markedly in different seasons. Any evaluation of potential impact should take this into account.
- 5.11 The more areas of a landscape from which development is visible the greater will be the cumulative effect.
- 5.12 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 significant adverse impact has been identified, but development is difficult to resist (e.g. other material considerations outweigh damage to historic landscape), 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 (the essential blueprint which should underpin repair and future conservation management on all historic sites) or, if such a plan is already in place, funding for specific repair projects, planting etc.

7.0 Application of Advice

- 7.1 The appended evaluation checklist is intended to identify whether development would adversely impact on a historic landscape. If evaluation were to identify such potential damage, the Society would anticipate that the authority would refuse consent to the application.
- 7.2 Where level of impact was assessed as low or non-existent, or where a condition would be imposed upon a consent which would avoid a high level of adverse impact, the Society would be unlikely to have any objection in principle to such an application and would not anticipate consultation.

N.B. The Society would not normally anticipate consultation on proposals for increase of less than 10% of an existing area of parking, UNLESS this extended into a different type of landscape area (e.g. woodland to open parkland or walled enclosure; service area to public park or ornamental cemetery grounds etc.) OR potential adverse impact had already been identified. However, successive applications for extension of parking should be treated as cumulative and time-limitless for the purposes of consultation.

- 7.3 Should there be doubt over the potential for an application to generate a high level of adverse impact upon a historic landscape, 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.

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'.
- 8.3 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'.

Planning Website

- 8.4 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

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

ACCESS TO VEHICLE PARKING AREAS

- Q1** Will an existing vehicle access route to this area be used?
If No, Go to Q2
If Yes, Go to Q1A
- Q1A** Does the existing access route cross the historic landscape?
If No, Go to Q3
If Yes, Go to Q1B
- Q1B** Will higher, wider or heavier vehicles access the area? **OR**
Will a significantly greater number of vehicles access the area? **OR**
Would changes to the drive be proposed ?
(Include new surfacing; increased widths, speed restriction measures, signage, lighting, CCTV etc.)
If No, Go to Q1C
If Yes, **SEPARATE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF CHANGED ACCESS ON HISTORIC LANDSCAPE REQUIRED** (see watchpoints: subsidiary development) Go to Q1C
- Q1C** Will any major changes to main entrances to the historic landscape be required?
(Include assessment of turning requirements from a public road, need for improved visibility splays etc.)
If No, Go to Q3
If Yes, **SEPARATE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT REQUIRED**
(See *GHS PCAN 7: Treatment of Boundaries and Entrances*)
- Q2** Will the new vehicle access route cross the historic landscape?
If No, Go to Q3
If Yes, Has the historical development history of the area proposed for the new route been fully explained (i.e. its purpose within the overall design of the site)?
If Yes, Go to Q2A
If No, **HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT REQUIRED** before proceeding with evaluation
- Q2A** Is the proposal for a new route supported by the development history?
If Yes, Go to Q2B
If No, **POTENTIAL IMPACT HIGH** Go to Q2B
- Q2B** Will surfacing of the new route be appropriate to the areas through which it travels?
If Yes, Go to Q2C
If No, **SEEK ALTERNATIVE** Go to Q2C
- Q2C** Is any subsidiary development proposed? (Include speed restriction measures, signage, lighting, CCTV etc.)
If No, Go to Q3
If Yes, Go to Q2D
- Q2D** Is design and location of subsidiary development appropriate in the historic landscape?
(Include cumulative effect of such development on character of areas of the historic landscape)
If Yes, Go to Q3
If No, **SEEK AMENDMENTS** Go to Q3

EXISTING USE OF GROUND

- Q3** Has the historical development history of the area proposed for parking been fully explained (i.e. its purpose within the overall design of the site)?
If Yes, Go to Q4
If No, Go to Q3A
- Q3A** Has the area already been compromised by development?
If Yes, Go to Q3B
If No, **HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT REQUIRED** before proceeding with evaluation
- Q3B** Are such changes irreversible?
If Yes, Go to Q5
If No, **HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT REQUIRED** before proceeding with evaluation

- Q4** Does the area in question comprise or include a specific feature(s); important ‘link’ or defined element in design of the landscape (e.g. pleasure ground, walled garden or service area in public park)?
 If No, Go to Q5
 If Yes, **POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE IMPACT/DAMAGE HIGH** Go to Q5
- Q5** Is the overall area proposed for parking visible from the wider landscape? (*include assessment potential visibility from high points e.g. garden terraces and mounds*)
 If No, Go to Q6
 If Yes, Go to Q7
- Q6** What prevents visibility?
 a. lie of the land – **LOW VISUAL IMPACT**. Go to Q8
 b. planting
 Is such planting deciduous or evergreen?
 ● If deciduous treat as visible. Go to Q7
 ● If planting is evergreen, is there potential within this application for condition for maintenance of such planting in perpetuity and is such planting appropriate*?
 If No, treat as visible. Go to Q7
 If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q9
 c. existing buildings intervene
 Are such structures temporary or permanent?
 If temporary treat as visible. Go to Q7
 If permanent treat as not visible. Go to Q9
- Q7** Is there potential for appropriate screening of entire vehicle park?
 If No, treat as visible. Go to Q8
 If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q9
 (*Such screening should not in itself alter the character or compromise landscape design – e.g. a high earth bund, Leylandii hedge or coniferous tree planting may restrict visibility of development but present an incongruous line or obstruction across historic landscape – a historic landscape assessment will inform.)

SUBSIDIARY DEVELOPMENT

- Q8** Is lighting proposed within the vehicle park?
 If No, Go to Q9
 If Yes, Go to Q8A
Q8A Will lighting units be visible from the wider landscape?
 If No, Go to Q9
 If Yes, Go to Q8B
Q8B Is there potential for reduction in height of proposed lighting columns?
 If No, Go to Q8C
 If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED**
Q8C Is there potential for alteration in position of columns to restrict visibility (e.g. to be seen against a backdrop of trees in long views)?
 If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE VISUAL IMPACT**, Go to Q9
 If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q9
- Q9** Does the application include new landscaping proposals?
 If No, Go to Q9B
 If Yes, Go to Q9A
Q9A Is such landscaping appropriate in this position in the historic landscape?
 If No, **SEEK AMENDMENTS** Go to Q9C
 If Yes, Go to Q9C

Q9B Is there potential for appropriate planting be added to break up the mass of parking?

If No, Go to Q9C

If Yes, **CONDITION REQUIRED** Go to Q9C

Q9C Is there existing planting which will remain within the area of parking? (See 5.6 above)

If No, Go to Q10

If Yes, Go to Q9A **CONSULT TREE/LANDSCAPE OFFICER** Go to Q10

Q10 Does the application include hard surfacing?

If No, Go to Q11

If Yes, Go to Q10A

Q10A Will such surfacing blend with the surrounding landscape when the car park is not in use (are marked-out spaces proposed)?

If No, Go to Q10B

If Yes, Go to Q11

Q10B Could surfacing be changed to blend with surrounding landscaping?

If No, **POTENTIAL ADVERSE VISUAL IMPACT**, Go to Q11

If Yes, **SEEK AMENDMENTS** Go to Q11

Q11 Will any additional areas for reversing or turning of large vehicles be required (service and delivery vehicles/coaches/specialised transport e.g. horse boxes)?

If No, Go to Q12

If Yes, **ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT REQUIRED**, Go to Q12

(As for vehicle park itself Qs 1–11 above)

Q12 Will security measures/servicing arrangements be required within the vehicle park – e.g. CCTV; attendant kiosk; security fencing?

If No,

ASSESSMENT COMPLETE

If Yes, **ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT REQUIRED**