



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

(sender address removed)

South Team
Development Environment and Leisure
Sheffield City Council
Howden House, 1 Union Street
Sheffield S1 2SH
dcscan@sheffield.gov.uk
planningdc.south@sheffield.gov.uk

conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

23rd October 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

20/03276/FUL Demolition of outbuildings, erection of 4 dwellinghouses with associated parking, landscaping and formation of access. Kenwood Hall Hotel, Kenwood Road, Sheffield, S7 1NQ

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to the proposed development affecting Kenwood Hall which although not on the Historic England (HE) Register of Parks & Gardens is included in Sheffield City Council's UDP Policy Background Paper No 4 1997 and is a non-designated heritage asset. The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of historic parks and gardens, and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.

We would like this letter to be read in conjunction with our letter of 18th July 2019 in response to the previous planning application, 19/02022/FUL. **It is important that our response here is read in conjunction with our letter for the planning application 20/03258/FUL Demolition of Banqueting Suite etc dated 22nd October 2020.**

The proposed development is in the core of the Nether Edge Conservation Area and Kenwood Character Area. An area where in 1844 the development of a leading Victorian estate landscape commenced by positioning the proprietor's own home and garden, Kenwood, in this part of Sheffield by the 'most successful' of the 19th century landscape gardeners, Robert Marnock (1800-1889). Marnock advised on the orientation of the house and he carefully re-shaped the land so as to create a bowl-shaped lawn, with glimpses of the surroundings, but principally secluded. The other interesting feature of this lawn was that it enabled views out across the Sheaf valley to the south, without seeing the middle ground that was intended as a housing development. This housing development was one of the early housing projects nationally that defined the notion of a suburban development. Marnock's approach re the setting of the proprietor's house and treatment of its immediate surrounds, enabled a flexibility to the treatment of the surrounding land, which was initially informally enclosed within the park, but could later be opened out. The central area was sacrosanct, this is where privacy was a priority, for the owner, friends and family. Despite it now being an hotel, this status of a single property has thus far been largely maintained. Now it being compromised as bits are sold off- the 'butcher method', as this was called in an analysis by Christopher Tunnard in

1938; different land owners close together would mean compromises to the general treatment of the landscape and ad hoc maintenance, for the individual, rather than considering the whole, i.e. an erosion of the site. These planning applications will result in this special place being forever harmed.

In addition, we have concerns about the detail provided in these proposals that make it clear that the significance of this landscape is poorly understood. Proposals/ plans have been produced for an undulating part within the site with carefully sculpted landform, characteristic for Marnock's approach, but they do not respond to this in the proposals. The four proposed houses (Plot A-D), for example will require extensive re-shaping of the landform. There is probably a 4-5 metre level difference between the highest and lowest level here. It makes it difficult to understand the general elevations, which seem unaware of how this would make a coherent and believable representation; as if this is a drawing board exercise on a flat site only. If the drawings are really representative of what is proposed, rather than indicative, then this is a completely inappropriate approach that will greatly affect the historic designed landscape, and incurs further damage on the central area of the Kenwood estate.

The site proposed for 4 dwellings is NOT a site of previous development as suggested in the planning proposal, (eg at [Planning Statement by DLP Planning Ltd](#) dated May 2019 at 1.2). The site includes part of the old kitchen garden with part of the shrubbery near the stable block but also significantly it is the site of a physically and visually important shrubbery that contained the central space of the layout. It is important in providing a backing to the main lawn to provide seclusion, as well as cleverly providing views out to the wider landscape, without being able to see the buildings in the middle ground immediately south of the garden.

In addition, the proposed buildings are in a faux-modernistic style that is completely incongruous within the environment here; they are totally insensitive and damaging in both their approach and execution.

As we noted in our response to 20/03258/FUL, the planting precedent proposed is 18th Century (as stated from Newton St Loe), but we are working with the site of a garden laid out in the mid nineteenth century. Marnock was involved here from 1844-1876. He was the leading landscape designer in the Natural Style of the nineteenth century. The selection of plants is primarily a 20th Century nurserymen's range.

In addition, the dense proposed development requires boundaries, proposed here as hedges, in a historic landscape that sought complete avoidance of such clipped plant material which was considered (by Marnock and Robinson) to be inappropriate at the time and would further add to the discordance and lack of congruity. The individual plots and glazed faux-modern elevations with the inevitable domestic infrastructure facing out across the bowl of lawn, will look totally out of place and damage the setting when viewed from Kenwood Hall, its terraces and the designed gardens.

Similarly, the hard detailing proposed is standard 21st century detailing that pays no respect to the historic materials, many of which can still be seen on site; reconstituted stone blocks and resin bond gravel are inappropriate and incongruous.

We note the [Heritage Assessment by Franklin Ellis Architects](#), at 6.0 Impact Assessment Proposal 4 and disagree. There will be an impact on Kenwood Hall and we totally disagree with the mitigation. We also disagree with many of the points in 7.0 Summary including the final paragraph. The proposals will materially harm the heritage values and the setting.

[Design and Access Statement](#), August 2020, 5.3 New Housing Plots A, B, C and D. We are dismayed at the Concept Overview 5.3.1 which is completely inappropriate for Kenwood Hall and we are similarly dismayed at much of the rest of this section.

We are concerned about the general nature of the proposals and how they promote both the car and are a continuation of a way of life that is unsustainable and out of touch with the times which requires drastic changes to combat global change and a requires a humanistic approach.

We have been very pleased to hear about Kenwood Community Growers who have renovated the old kitchen garden. This has been very successful and a welcome positive force particularly in these uncertain times. The vegetables grown are provided free of charge to Food Works for use in their kitchen at the Sharrow Community Forum. Green space of all kinds is so important for everyone and especially so now.

We consider that the principle of development of this site for additional housing (Plots A-D) is inappropriate to the character of the site, it adversely affects the historic character and does not enhance nor protect the site as required by National Policy.

In conclusion in our view this planning application (and 20/03258/FUL), is contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Feb 2019) paragraphs 194, 196 and 197. We also have concerns that these applications do not address your authority's statutory duty of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust strongly objects to this planning application.

Yours sincerely

Val Hepworth
Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning

cc. Historic England; Margie Hoffnung, the Gardens Trust