



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Emma Walsh
Senior Development Management Officer
(Harrogate Office)
Economy Environment and Housing
North Yorkshire Council
PO Box 787
Harrogate, HG1 9RW

Yorkshire Gardens Trust
11 Caroline Close
York
YO24 4EQ

21 January 2024

Dear Emma Walsh

Applications for Studley Royal ZC23/02884/LB and ZC23/02883/FUL

I'm writing on behalf of the trustees of Yorkshire Gardens Trust to draw attention to a factual error in the above applications that has only just come to light, spotted by an architect member of YGT. The source of the error is page 78 of the Design and Access statement. There, a confusion between 'floorspace in the World Heritage Site' and the *footprints* of the existing tearoom and new Visitor Centre has led other submissions to understate the footprint of the proposed new Visitor Centre as compared with the existing tearoom and extensions. The error has been repeated by the applicant, the Heritage Impact Assessment, and the Gardens Trust. We believe the error may have affected important interpretations and conclusions as to the impact of the proposed Visitor Centre.

The total *floorspace* in the World Heritage site at Canal Gates consists of the existing tearoom building with its extensions, the first floor of that building and the floorspace of the temporary, freestanding former shop. This is calculated at 336.4m², and this is the area used by NT as the *footprint* it compares to the proposed new Visitor Centre. It is misleading to include the first floor (91.4m²) as part of the footprint; and it is disingenuous to include the area of the temporary hut (52.7m²), which has no physical connection to the tearoom building, being separated from it both in materials and location. Removing these errors from the calculation means that the footprint of the existing tearoom building with its extensions is 192.3m², much smaller than NT's figure of 336.4m² (a difference of 144.1m²).

The effect of the error is shown in the table below. As can be seen, the error is material: compared with the footprint of the existing tearoom and its extensions, the proposed building will occupy a footprint 3 times greater; and compared with the footprint of the historic tearoom, the proposed building will occupy a footprint nearly 6 times greater.

The error appears in the NT Planning Statement at page 14 ('Provision of new single storey extension to the tea-room of 480.2m² (335m² net increase in footprint...') and at page 38 ('increase in built footprint of 335m²'). It is followed by the Heritage Impact Statement at page 102 ('The extension is 1.5 times larger than the footprint of the Studley Lodge building with its current extensions. This would normally be considered to be large enough to be liable to dominate the listed building.'). The Gardens Trust follows the HIA in sizing the footprint of the new Visitor Centre at 1.5 times the footprint of the existing tearoom ('The most significant change to the historic character of the Canal Gates area would be the introduction of a large new building extension with a footprint some 1.5 times larger than the current Studley Lodge', unpaginated, but page 4 of GT's response letter of 29 Sept 2023). In both cases the footprint of the proposed extension

should be stated as two times greater than the existing building, giving a total footprint for the new building three times greater than the existing structure.

We believe the original error and its repetition are important. The error has been used as a foundation of the application by NT, and its repetition in other submissions has compounded the problem. We reiterate our objection to the application.

Yours sincerely

Chris Webb
Chair, YGT

Cc Historic England, e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk ; Conservation@thegardenstrust.org

Table to illustrate the effect of the error in calculating the footprint of the existing and proposed buildings

Existing buildings	Area (a)	Proposed net surface area of extension (b)	Total proposed surface area (c)	% increase of extension ((b/a)*100)	% increase in total footprint ((c/a)*100)
Ground floor (tea room)	192.3	-	-	-	-
First floor (tea room)	91.4	-	-	-	-
Temporary hut	52.7	-	-	-	-
Planned building					
Total of above used in NT calculations	336.4	387.7*	724.1	115%	215%
Total excluding first floor but including hut	245.0	387.7	632.7	158%	258%
Total including first floor but excluding hut	283.7	387.7	671.4	136%	236%
Existing footprint of tea room	192.3	387.7	580	201%	301%
Footprint of historic tea room	99.8	480.2	580	481%	581%

All measurements in square metres

*Area of proposed extension minus existing extensions to be demolished: $480.2 - 92.5 = 387.7$

Diagrammatic sketch of the effect of the error in calculating the difference between the footprints of the existing and proposed buildings

