



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system and planning policy (and particularly Section 8 'Planning Context' and Appendix 3) in the PCANs has been superseded and the conservation advice must be read in the context of the current National Planning Policy Framework published by the Government.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 7

Treatment of boundaries and entrances



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

Boundaries

- 1.1 Boundaries define (e.g. ownership), divide (e.g. land use), and secure. While all boundaries are important in one or more of these contexts, those boundaries of designed landscapes which run alongside public roads and tracks, or divide land in different ownerships, usually receive particular attention.
N.B. While the particular definition of a boundary may relate to the layout of a designed landscape, its alignment may be of ancient origin and thus of independent historical significance.
- 1.2 Visually, the boundary around a designed landscape could be as important as the frame around a picture. Where desire was for exclusivity, security* or simply total privacy, it could also be as complete, with walls or boundary tree belts interspersed only by entrance gates and lodges. Boundary tree belts could be dense enough to prevent any view of the interior of a landscape from outside and, on country house estates, the height of boundary walls was often above the eye-line of a pedestrian.
*Public as well as private landscapes were often so defined, particularly those where an entrance fee was demanded (either regularly or on the occasion of special events) or where security was of particular importance (e.g. cemeteries).
- 1.3 On other designed landscapes, boundaries around most of the perimeter were visually exclusive, but were interrupted to give selected views into the interior from adjacent public roads, or to allow selected views outwards.
Boundary treatment might be similarly visually selective around communal gardens of urban squares and terraces.
- 1.4 Where the design intention was to increase the visual or perceived extent of a landscape, wide sections of a boundary might be defined only by light fencing or a *haha**, and in some instances the level of an adjacent public road might be artificially lowered to prevent visual intrusion.
*a 'haha' may be defined as a dry ditch, either faced to one side with a wall or with a sunk fence, which maintains visual continuity while providing a physical boundary between areas of different use (e.g. grazed parkland with stock from dressed grounds).
- 1.5 More recently, and particularly since the mid 20th century, some landscapes, now acknowledged as of historic importance, were designed as part of comprehensive town planning schemes (e.g. some post war housing developments, New Towns etc.). As such, the landscaped areas were integrated with structures, communication routes etc., and were often without visible boundaries.
These should not be confused with those designed landscapes, particularly in an urban context, which have lost boundary definition (e.g. those where ironwork was removed to contribute to the war effort in the 1940s).

Entrances

- 1.6 Carriage entrances to both public and private landscapes were invariably designed to impress, with structures and landscaping integrated in carefully detailed compositions. These were usually designed to be viewed in more than one direction (e.g. on entrance and exit and, in some instances, the composition or certain features of it, might also form a focus of other views from within the designed landscape).
External approaches to such entrances were also manipulated according to taste and fashion, and public roads were often widened or lined with trees for a considerable distance in advance of such entrances. Conversely, an entrance might be sited to take advantage of an existing road configuration, particularly in early periods or in an urban context, where a straight tree-lined approach to a main entrance was considered desirable.

- 1.7 Where more than one entrance existed, their planting and architecture might follow a particular pattern*. Where boundaries were extensive such ‘appropriation’ served to identify entrances as part of a larger entity. *Patterns of architecture (e.g. in curtain walls, gates etc.) are usually easily recognisable, and screens, gates and finialled gatepiers may incorporate family or civic arms and mottos. Patterns of planting within an entrance composition could also include a single specimen of a newly introduced, unusually pruned, or particularly colourful, exotic or architectural tree (e.g. *Sequoiadendron giganteum*). In ornamental cemeteries this also served to identify the type of ground being approached (the entrance specimen here often a symbolic ‘weeping’ tree). In some instances, specimen planting was continued some way along a boundary road to signify that an entrance was being approached.
The importance of entrance ‘compositions’ as identification to the passer-by of the status and extent of its designed landscape is well demonstrated on innumerable sites around the country.
- 1.8 From the 18th century, when entrance lodges started to become fashionable, entrance compositions increasingly included some formal landscaping directly associated with such buildings (from simple shaven lawns as a foreground to the structures, to intricately detailed flower gardens). The type of such arrangement depended on the fashion of the time and often on the style and form of the lodge(s), which might range from classically regular triumphal arches to wildly irregular Gothick fantasies.
- 1.9 The architectural diversity of lodges is well documented, but the number and arrangement of such buildings at an entrance also varies. On large estates as many as four lodges might be found at a single entrance (two on either side of a public road) and paired lodges, often connected by an arch, were common on both public and private landscapes.
Public parks and ornamental cemeteries usually had a lodge at each public carriage entrance, and lodges on institutional landscapes were also usually related to public access (evidence of their gatekeeping function). On country house estates, entrance lodges were usually directly adjacent to a carriage drive but might also be sited on the opposite side of a public road from a carriage entrance.
N.B. Lodges which were not connected to entrance drives might also be erected around boundaries, particularly on great estates (e.g. to add ornamentation to, or to highlight the extent of, a boundary; to give added security etc.).
- 1.10 Where lodges doubled as staff accommodation, that part of the curtilage devoted to domestic trappings (waste, washing, privy etc.) would be very carefully screened from all view; the direct antithesis of the remainder of the entrance composition.
- 1.11 Where several entrances existed, there might be a distinct hierarchy of ornamentation between them, and service entrances were frequently unadorned; these usually taking the most direct route from points of public access and screened as far as possible from general view.

2.0 Information needed to evaluate proposals

- 2.1 Establish the design intention and significance of the features and areas* of a historic landscape or of its setting upon which primary development would potentially impact (include visual and other impacts of new proposals e.g. wear and tear on historic features and areas, loss of ground to new structures etc.).
*The *English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest* usually gives at least an outline of the provenance of entrances and approaches. 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 Register. Further information may be contained in listed building and conservation area descriptions.
N.B. While the Register is a reliable guide, it should not be viewed as a comprehensive description. Where this, or an inventory entry, together with any related listed building or conservation area descriptions are not sufficiently detailed to allow assessment of proposed changes, additional information will be required – See 3.1 below.
- 2.2 Proposals for changes to entrances and boundaries should also clearly identify any subsidiary development which would be generated, and areas which would be affected. Details of alterations to public carriageways and footpaths; signage; security measures (e.g. lighting, CCTV, gatekeeping facilities, additional fencing etc.);

street furniture (e.g. lighting columns, bollards, seating, bins etc.) and any resultant changes to vehicle and pedestrian circulation patterns should be included.

See also *GHS PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access*
GHS PCAN 10: CCTV and Lighting

- 2.3 A justification statement should accompany proposals for any major changes to entrances and boundaries on historic landscape. This should include examination of alternatives and the implications to the landscape both of proposals and of alternatives.

3.0 Additional information required

- 3.1 Specialist evaluation (based on historical documentation and site survey) may be required to determine the significance of a boundary (e.g. date and design intention) or of an entrance (e.g. is it a main entrance; is it the only designed entrance or one of a number of designed entrances and, if the latter, is it of less, equal or higher status than other designed entrances; conversely, is it a service entrance?). Information should also be available on the extent and layout of an entrance composition. In addition to structural features (e.g. lodges, piers, gates, curtain walls, railings etc.), other elements of the historical layout should be identified (backdrop or framing planting; ornamental gardens/apron to a lodge; identification of any service areas and of any screen treatment for these; specimen planting etc.). Examination of the layout should also include details of relevant topography and road layout, and the exact disposition of structures and planting in relation to these.

- 3.2 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, there is potential for features and areas of significance to lose definition or, in some instances, to be entirely obscured 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 approach avenue; re-establishment of the ornamental setting to an entrance lodge 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

- 4.1 Where extension to a lodge is proposed, the integrity of an entrance composition may be maintained by the siting of such extension within those parts of the curtilage not intended to be on view (See 1.10 above). Where the designed screening of such an area has decayed, a planning condition for its repair and maintenance in perpetuity may be considered to mitigate against adverse visual impact.
- 4.2 Where extension of a lodge would be visible within an entrance composition, its scale and appearance should not compromise the original lodge, and consideration may be given to a corridor-linked subsidiary structure (such structure may be set back from main lodge facades). Design excellence is particularly important in such situations.
- 4.3 Where new signage or lighting is required, particularly at an entrance, the following may minimise adverse visual impact:

Signage

- Ensure a sign is no larger than necessary (i.e. than is readable).

- Ensure a sign is no higher than necessary (while signs obviously need to be visible, those sited below standing eye-level are likely to be less intrusive).
- Position the sign(s) so that it does not obscure any designed features of either entrance or landscape.
- Position the sign(s) so that it does not obstruct or impinge on any important views into, out of, or across the landscape.
- Ensure that the colour palette of the sign(s) is in keeping with the designed landscape (bright primary colours are rarely appropriate in a historic setting and suitable 'period' colours may be chosen from the now available ranges of paints devised through historical colour research).
- Ensure that materials of the sign(s) are appropriate to the setting (traditional materials such as wood and cast metal are usually preferable to plastic and highly reflective metals such as stainless steel).
- Ensure the design of the sign is suitable to the setting (e.g. a rustic sign may conflict with a formal setting).

Lighting

- Avoid free-standing columns and high-intensity lighting (provided that they can be sited sensitively within the setting, a greater number of low height or low intensity lights may be preferable to a smaller number of the former type).
- Lights sited on existing structures may be preferable to free-standing units.
- Lighting columns viewed against a backdrop (e.g. of trees) are likely to have less visual impact than those seen against open sky.
- Where lighting is required infrequently (e.g. to identify access for occasional evening events) provision of power points for temporary event lighting may meet requirements.

4.4 Where major changes are proposed to a road(s) adjacent to an ornamental entrance (e.g. road widening, dualling etc.), realignment of the road away from the entrance and provision of a service or slip road 'apron' in front of it (by retaining part of an existing carriageway) may reduce adverse impact. Such works may obviate the need for new visibility and turning splays which would compromise an entrance, and may allow its visual and spatial integrity to be maintained.

4.5 The imposition of a one-way vehicle route through a landscape may be considered as an alternative to alterations to an ornamental entrance to meet traffic requirements.

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

Where increased access for service and delivery vehicles is required, separation of larger vehicles from smaller traffic may be considered (accommodation of larger vehicles at a service rather than at a main entrance may limit damage to the historic landscape).

4.6 Where there is no alternative to an improvement of sightlines/turning splays at an ornamental entrance consider the following:

- requirements may be met by alterations to the highway e.g. extending existing pavements outwards to improve sightlines
- use of appropriate matching materials to define carriageways and footpaths
- maintenance of the essential character of the entrance (e.g. kerbs and edgings may be incongruous in a rural setting)
- relocation and rebuilding of gateposts and walls on revised sightlines using existing or matching materials*.

*N.B. This should be considered only as a last resort, where there is no other alternative to loss of historic features, and where such loss would significantly compromise the designed area in which they are located.

The inter-relationship between such features and area(s) requires very careful evaluation.

4.7 Where a new entrance is proposed in an existing boundary, visual continuity of the boundary may be maintained if the alignment of the new access is staggered/serpentine, and it can be routed through planting of a substantial height (e.g. woodland, boundary tree belt etc.). This principle can also be applied to new vehicle access through fences/hedging of a lodge curtilage to maintain visual integrity of an entrance composition.

In these situations prominent new structural elements (e.g. gatepiers, gates etc.), which would visually define the new access, should be avoided.

- 4.8 Where an existing ornamental entrance is to be superseded, its visual and historic integrity as part of a designed landscape remains important. Future adverse impact may be limited by planning condition to maintain an agreed layout (including drive lines) in good repair and to replace structural elements (including key planting) as necessary, in perpetuity.
Where such entrance includes a structure(s) which will devolve to separate residential occupancy, the removal of permitted domestic development rights may be considered.
- 4.9 Where added security of a boundary is required, the lowering of ground levels along its length (e.g. by dyking) rather than increasing the height of fencing/walling may limit adverse visual intrusion.
Where boundary definition is required as a deterrent (e.g. to entry of livestock, casual intrusion etc.) and space is available, traditional solutions such as fencing in the bottom of a ditch or narrow stretches of water* are likely to be less visually intrusive than above ground structures. Such solutions may be appropriate where ownership of landscape becomes divided and internal boundaries require added definition.
*N.B. Professional advice should be taken to ensure that the imposition of such solutions does not conflict with the character and appearance of an individual landscape.

5.0 Watchpoints

- 5.1 Where changes to entrances are proposed, consider the potential implications for the wider landscape (i.e. views on the approach to such entrance, both from within the historic landscape and from without). Particular care should be taken not to disrupt an existing arc of view which circumscribes a balanced entrance composition (e.g. by imposition of a prominent additional vehicle access to one of a pair of lodges. See also 4.7 above).
- 5.2 While some structures (lodges, curtain walls, railings etc.) may not be listed as of national importance, their significance in the context of the designed landscape and in particular to an entrance composition may be high.
Similarly boundary walls, even if not listed, may be critical to maintenance of the character and integrity of the landscape.
- 5.3 The balance and integrity of an entrance composition may be seriously compromised by inconsistent treatment* of component parts (e.g. of paired lodges and their curtilages). Similarly, where a series of entrances show a common design or theme, inconsistent treatment should be avoided.
*e.g. in structural alterations, new boundary definition, hard landscaping layout and materials, planting etc. Particular care is needed therefore where entrances, or parts of an entrance devolve to separate ownership. Where an application is likely to result in ownership division (e.g. where an existing designed entrance is to be superseded; where a country house estate is being redeveloped for individual residential units, etc.), a historic landscape conservation management plan should be secured as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant (Any subsequent sale or lease of individual areas should refer to such plan).
See also 5.6 below and *GHS PCAN 14: Management Plans*
- 5.4 Consider whether subsidiary development is likely to result from any proposed changes to boundaries and entrances (e.g. alterations to carriageways and footpaths; signage; security measures (e.g. lighting, CCTV, additional fencing etc.); street furniture (e.g. lighting columns, bollards, seating, bins etc.).
New or replacement elements should be well-designed, fit for the purpose and appropriate to the individual historic landscape setting.
- 5.5 Signage and street furniture which is visually intrusive (e.g. out of scale, made of inappropriate materials, poorly designed etc.) may significantly disrupt a designed entrance composition.
- 5.6 Where an existing ornamental entrance is to be superseded by a new entrance consider:
● Whether the character and appearance of the entrance which it replaces will be appropriately maintained (and whether future repair and appropriate conservation of component parts will be secured. See also 4.8. and 5.3 above)

- Whether the new entrance is to be a new design feature or a discreet addition
 - ... if a new design feature ensure both appropriate integration with the wider designed landscape (see also 5.7. below) and design excellence
 - ... if a discreet addition ensure that individual elements and overall scale and design are subordinate to any entrance which it replaces, and that it is well integrated with the wider designed landscape (see also 4.7 above and 5.7 below).

- 5.7 Where a new entrance(s) is proposed, consider the potential impact of new/altered vehicle routes and circulation patterns to serve it.
- 5.8 Where significant change to the alignment of a boundary is proposed consultation with the County Archaeological Department may be advisable (See 1.1 above).
- 5.9 Views within and across historic landscape may change markedly in different seasons. Any evaluation of potential impact should take this into account.

6.0 Unavoidable Development

- 6.1 If changes to boundaries or entrances would result in significant adverse impact upon the historic landscape or its setting, but there are no possible alternatives which would result in a lesser impact, and personal or public safety would be seriously jeopardised or the law infringed, if proposed changes were not instituted, 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 towards 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 Where proposed changes to boundaries or entrances cannot be justified in the context of unavoidable damage (see 6.1 above), but would result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape or its setting, 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 changes to boundaries or entrances would not result in significant adverse impact on a historic landscape or its setting, 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 or its setting of an application for changes to boundaries or entrances, 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 GHS, 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 8.5 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'.

PPG16: Archaeology and Planning

A significant number of historic parks and gardens (registered and unregistered) are included on county sites and monuments records (SMRs) either in their own right or as part of the setting of other monuments.

8.4 Section B : Advice on the Handling of Archaeological Matters in the Planning Process

B16: Development Plans. '... Authorities should bear in mind that not all nationally important remains meriting preservation will necessarily be scheduled; such remains and, in appropriate circumstances, other unscheduled archaeological remains of more local importance. may also be identified in development plans as particularly worthy of preservation.

B18: Planning applications 'The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether the monument is scheduled or unscheduled' '... Where local planning authorities are aware of a real and specific threat to a known archaeological site as a result of the potential exercise of permitted development rights (as set out in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act General Development Order 1988) they may wish to consider the use of their powers under **Article 4** of that order (see also 8.6 below) to withdraw those rights and to require specific planning permission to be obtained before development can proceed'.

Planning Website

- 8.5 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

- 8.6 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 in a number of other situations (see 8.4 above).

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

There is no flow chart for this Planning Conservation Advice Note but evaluators should seek answers to the questions below before taking decisions or making recommendations on proposed changes. Some questions are intended to highlight the background information which is required, others to identify potential for adverse impact. The level of adverse impact will depend upon the form and extent of proposals.

Flow charts/questions of other planning conservation advice notes should be followed where these are indicated.

9.1 EXISTING ENTRANCES & BOUNDARIES

9.1.1 Appearance and Repair

How was the entrance composition/boundary intended to appear to the passer-by/visitor/owner when it was designed?

How does the entrance composition/boundary appear to the passer-by/visitor/owner today? (e.g. For an ornamental entrance: is it obviously a designed layout; does it convey the idea of approach to something important; does it continue to impress?)

What changes (other than designed landscape changes) have occurred since inception? e.g. redefinition of land ownership boundaries; loss, decay or overgrowth of elements of the composition etc.

Are such changes reversible and what repair/reinstatement would it be reasonable and practical to undertake?

9.1.2 Proposed Changes (Include Primary and Subsidiary Development)

Would proposed changes be appropriate in the historic setting? (e.g. would they preserve or enhance such setting?)

Would proposed changes result in loss of surviving historic features or layout (include planting)?

Would proposed changes compromise the potential for the repair/reinstatement identified above?

Would proposed changes impact upon views towards an entrance/boundary (from outside, from a carriage drive or from across the historic landscape)?

Would proposed changes be well-integrated with the historic setting (colours, materials, form, scale etc.)?

For all new structures and features

Would proposed changes meet recognised standards of design excellence?

For entrances only:

Would proposed changes conflict with the balance of an entrance composition?

Would proposed changes alter the historic status of an entrance, or of its component parts (e.g. by overt display of independent ownership, or creation of a status residence on a simple lodge site)?

Would proposed changes be in keeping with design patterns and hierarchy of buildings and entrances elsewhere on the historic landscape?

9.1.3 Mitigation

Has adverse impact from proposals been identified?

If so:

Is there potential for mitigation of such impact?

Is such mitigation appropriate to the specific historic setting?

Can such mitigation be secured in perpetuity as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant?

9.1.4 Justification

Are changes proposed in the context of historic landscape repair and conservation?

Are proposed changes necessary* (See 6.1 above)?

If not and adverse impact from proposals has been identified:

Are alternatives available and would these result in lesser or greater impact upon the historic landscape (include evaluation of potential for mitigation)?

* as distinct from desirable in personal, social, financial, commercial etc. contexts

9.2 NEW ENTRANCES AND BOUNDARIES

Where a new entrance would be sited in an existing boundary, questions 9.1.1 to 9.1.4 above should also be answered in respect of changes to such boundary.

9.2.1. **Proposed Changes – Wider Implications**

Has the visual impact of the proposed entrance upon the historic landscape and its setting been evaluated? (e.g. would definition of the new entrance be visible within designed views, vistas, panoramas etc.?)

Would significant changes to internal drive/path layout be required?

Has the impact of such new drive/path layout upon the wider historic landscape been assessed (include wear and tear of historic elements e.g. bridges)?

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

9.2.2 **Proposed Changes – Design and layout**

Is the new entrance intended as a new design feature or a discreet addition?

If a new design feature:

Do structural elements of the proposals meet recognised standards of design excellence?

Is a new design feature appropriate (i.e. can it be satisfactorily justified in the context of an existing cohesive landscape design)?

Do siting, layout and structural design arise from appreciation of the history of development of the designed landscape (a prerequisite to satisfactory integration and design continuity)?

Would the new entrance be appropriate to design patterns and hierarchy of buildings and entrances elsewhere on the historic landscape?

See also *GHS PCAN 12: Evaluation of New Landscape Features*

GHS PCAN 6: Vehicle Parking and Access

If a discreet addition:

Are individual elements and overall scale and design subordinate to any entrance which it replaces?

Would proposed changes be well-integrated with the historic setting (colours, surfaces, materials, form, scale etc.)? See also 4.7 above.

9.2.3 **Mitigation**

Has adverse impact from proposals been identified?

If so:

Is there potential for mitigation of such impact?

Is such mitigation appropriate to the specific historic setting?

Can such mitigation be secured in perpetuity as part of any consent which the authority may be minded to grant?

Are alternatives available and would these result in lesser or greater impact upon the historic landscape (include evaluation of potential for mitigation)?

9.2.4 **Conservation**

Is any (former) entrance(s) likely to become unused as an access as a result of proposals?

Is there potential within this application for ensuring appropriate conservation management of such entrance in perpetuity?