

## INCOMING EMAIL

From: Fawkes, Lynette  
 To: Jonathan Smith (Gloucester)  
 CC: David Phillips , Stephen Rickard , Robert Needham , Sarah Smith , Ruth Mitchell  
 Date: 04/05/2021 13:21:04  
 Subject: RE: Burston Garden Centre - site walk over 29.4.21

## Attachments:

- (1) image001.jpg(2 B)
- (2) image002.png(1 B)
- (3) imagebbe21c.JPG(5 B)

Dear Jonathan,

Thank you for your email.

Following our site visit I can confirm that the existing scheme would have a low/moderate impact upon the significance of the grade II\* Listed Building through development within its setting. We acknowledge that following the previous appeal, the scheme has been reduced in size and an attempt made to address the Inspector's concerns.

I stated on site I was happy to enter into further discussions with the applicant regarding development proposals which could result in lessening the level of harm – this would need to be done through our pre-application advice service. One round of advice would be provided for free – after this there is a fee for the service which can be provided to you on request.

I stated that there were a number of areas that could be improved upon that would lessen the harm;

1. The reinterpretation of the historic carriage route across this field as a pedestrian link to the existing Bridleway and on to the shops could benefit from more of a sense of arrival. When entering the development a better sense of open space could be created which would result in the views towards the Manor being more readily appreciated. This need not be a formal area of open space, rather a part of the communally maintained grounds. The placement of some of the bungalow units may need to be reconsidered as part of this.
2. The three storey apartment blocks were still a cause for concern due to their dominating presence however, more could be done to create a sense of permeability through the alteration to the single storey elements. Either a reduction in height of the roof or the removal of the sitting room and its replacement with an open archway should be considered. The removal of one 'wing' of the apartment block was also mentioned.
3. The treatment of the hard surfacing, in particular the parking and road surfaces should be looked at again. The reduction in hard surfacing and its replacement with grass or grasscrete and less formally rigid planting needs also to be re looked at.

Should the case officer be minded to approve this application as currently submitted, Historic England would not wish to alter our comments but the level of harm above should be noted. We would however be willing to work with the applicants to reduce the level of harm in the ways stated above which could result in a better and less harmful development.

Kind Regards



**Lynette Fawkes IHBC**  
**Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas (Herts and Suffolk)**

Tel: 01223 582751  
Mob: 07557 834284

**Historic England** | Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge, CB2 8BU.  
[www.historicengland.org.uk](http://www.historicengland.org.uk)

Follow us on Twitter at [@HE\\_EoE](https://twitter.com/HE_EoE)  
[What's new in the East of England?](#)



Historic England Logo

We are the public body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England's spectacular historic environment, from beaches and battlefields to parks and pie shops.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

---

**From:** Jonathan Smith (Gloucester) <J.Smith@rpsgroup.com>

**Sent:** 29 April 2021 21:37

**To:** Fawkes, Lynette <Lynette.Fawkes@HistoricEngland.org.uk>

**Cc:** David Phillips <davidphillips@dpvconsult.co.uk>; Stephen Rickard <stephen.rickard@castleoak.co.uk>; Robert Needham <rob@inglewoodproperty.co.uk>

**Subject:** Burston Garden Centre - site walk over 29.4.21

**THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL: do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and were expecting the content to be sent to you**

Dear Lynette,

Many thanks for taking the time at such short notice to join us in a site walk-over survey and to discuss the genesis of the current submitted scheme. I think this proved a useful session all round.

I just wanted to summarise today's discussions and some of your comments, and would hope you will be able to confirm this e-mail as a note of today's site meeting.

Having walked the site and compared a number of the scheme's supporting documents (the master plan; the landscape master plan; a number of 3D representations of the scheme, including of the better view of the Manor House from the SE corner of the site; etc) you were able to state that:

- The current scheme represents a material improvement, in terms of the level of harm to the significance of Burston Manor, compared with the appeal scheme;
- The current scheme delivers a low or low-moderate level of harm to the significance of Burston Manor;
- You could perceive potential to further reduce the current scheme's level of harm to the asset's significance. You indicated that you would be prepared to work with the client team and SACDC to deliver such reduction. If the client team were able to entertain minor changes to the scheme, you suggested that these could include consideration of:
  - The position and materiality (eg grasscrete) to car parking in the scheme;

- The position of a few of the bungalows (eg No.30) to emphasis space at the point of arrival into the development from the bridle path towards the SE corner (and on the axis of the identified better view of the Manor);
- Reduction of the height of the central space in the link corridor in the assisted living unit; and
- A softer, informal finish to the perimeter path, such as mown grass.

Sorry to push you further, but the SACDC case officer is due to finalise her committee report by 7<sup>th</sup> May. This is clearly a critical path and I would appreciate your early response to confirm this note.

Many thanks.

Regards,

Jonathan

**Jonathan Smith**

Deputy Operations Director - Heritage  
RPS | Consulting UK & Ireland  
North Warehouse,  
The Docks,  
Gloucester  
GL1 2FB, United Kingdom  
**T** +44 1242 259 290  
**D** +441242 259 837 **M** +447718 707 052  
**E** j.smith@rpsgroup.com



Follow us on: [rpsgroup.com](https://www.rpsgroup.com) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [YouTube](#)

**Have you pledged to Net Zero Carbon?**

Your carbon footprint might be complex, but your journey to net zero doesn't have to be. We're here to help. [Find out how](#)

This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only.

Internet communications are not secure and RPS is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

RPS Group Plc, company number: 208 7786 (England). Registered office: 20 Western Avenue Milton Park Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4SH.

RPS Group Plc web link: <http://www.rpsgroup.com>