



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

Vice-presidents: Lady Legard, Peter Goodchild, Nick Lane Fox

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Miss Caroline Walton
Planning and Development
Richmondshire District Council

Mrs Val Hepworth
Trustee
Conservation and Planning

Planning.Enquiries@richmondshire.gov.uk

conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

27th February 2023

Dear Miss Walton

22/00875/FULL Full Planning Permission for Demolition of Modern Farm Buildings and Conversion / Extension of Redundant Traditional Farm Buildings into Four Residential Dwellings at Home Farm, Forcett Hall Road, Forcett, Richmond, North Yorkshire, DL11 7SB

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) for the Full Planning Permission. We refer you to our letter regarding the Listed Building Consent **22/00876/LBC** dated 5th February.

We agree with the Heritage Impact Assessment at 1.3 Description of the Proposed Development: and have no objection in principle to the proposal however we have been unable to determine the detail of fenestration, materials etc in the plans submitted – there is no notation on the existing and proposed site models, nor on the existing and proposed elevations and the information on the application form is limited. We therefore cannot come to any decision about the quality and sensitivity of the proposed scheme.

We agree that there is the possibility of archaeology on the site and that there should be an archaeological watching brief and record made of any finds.

On the submitted Landscape Sketch Plan Option 3 we have reservations. Although the site was a historic farm court yard we consider that in view of our climate concerns, the need to increase the current levels of biodiversity and that this is a historic rural estate, that the landscape plan for the future of this site should pay more heed to those criteria and give the future residents good 'green space'. There is a lot of hard landscaping on the Sketch Plan. Why are there large areas of sett paving? In particular immediately south of Units 1 and 2. Could the tarmac be replaced by gravel, as well as reducing the setts? If it was felt that there is a need to prevent the gravel from moving about then mesh could be used beneath the gravel. Gravel would certainly give a more rural and historic estate feel and there would be less run off.

Also in our view, for development on an estate with a breadth of heritage assets, there should be more detail of the design and planting submitted eg what species will be in the hedgerows? Will it be a native mixed hedge, or beech, or hornbeam etc. Why are there two rows of five trees in planters. What species of trees are proposed and how will they survive? Trees should be in the ground not in planters. If there are archaeological restraints, the whole site might need rethinking and in which case we would expect a more detailed scheme when the site has been cleared and any archaeology

determined. We have not seen any information in the plan for domestic infrastructure such as bin/recycling stores. We agree that estate fencing is a suitable boundary for the units.

In conclusion, we have no objection to the principle of converting the redundant traditional farm buildings into residential dwellings, but as noted above, we have considerable reservations about the scheme as in the submitted documents.

Yours sincerely,

Val Hepworth
Trustee Conservation and Planning

cc. Historic England e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk; Conservation@ the Gardens Trust