



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Ms Emma Walsh
Planning Services (Harrogate Area)

Mrs Val Hepworth
Trustee
Conservation and Planning

North Yorkshire Council
planningconsultation.har@northyorks.gov.uk
dmst.har@northyorks.gov.uk

21st November 2024

conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Dear Ms Walsh

ZC24/03617/DVCON Section 73 application for the Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) 4,5 and 6 (Archaeological) of Planning Permission ZC23/04555/FUL Rationalisation of the existing Estate yard at Fountains Abbey including installation of concrete storage bays and retention of storage containers (part retrospective). Fountains Abbey Estate Yard, Adjacent To Chestnut Cottage, Studley Royal, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG4 3BB

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development that could affect a site included by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks & Gardens – Studley Royal at grade I. 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 registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.

On 27th January 2024 we responded to **ZC23/04555/FUL Rationalisation of the existing Estate yard at Fountains Abbey including installation of concrete storage bays and retention of storage containers (part retrospective). Fountains Abbey Estate Yard, Adjacent To Chestnut Cottage, Studley Royal, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG4 3BB**

We concluded that we agreed that the proposed works were of limited impact and would not generate harm to the significance of the site, its wider heritage context or the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the WHS. We thought that there may be some, but very limited archaeological impact, but this will be addressed by the mitigation identified in the Heritage Statement. We considered that the application met the requirements of the NPPF (December 2023) and had no objection to the planning application.

ZC24/03617/DVCON gives the reasons for the conditions to be removed or changed as:

Variation of condition 1 to enable the proposed feed bays to be amended due to rising costs. The amended scheme includes the installation of 2 x bays instead of 4 x bays. Amendments to the proposed materials from concrete blocks to wooden sleepers with H beams. Revised drawings.

Removal of conditions 4, 5 & 6 (Archaeology) The changed design represents very little if any archaeological risk and therefore the previous archaeological conditions are considered not to be necessary. The archaeological caution expressed in the HS (which was at an NT rather than outside

world level of sensitivity) was based on a) the generally low but present archaeological potential from prehistoric to early post-medieval date, b) the development's overlap with the – somewhat dubious - 1854 depiction of service buildings of mC19 date and c) the depth of excavations which could penetrate to depths where – if present – a and b might be encountered. The changes to the proposal i) shorten the structure by only implementing its east end thus avoiding the map depiction and ii) limiting excavation so that we are only level current surface deposits rather than digging to any significant depth and therefore won't be likely to reach any underlying deposits. Therefore, the degree of archaeological risk declines from slight to negligible (at most).

As we noted in our previous response the site is a working yard already. It is largely screened from the wider setting of the World Heritage Site/Registered Park and Garden (WHS/RPG) and listed buildings by the high boundary wall, fencing and trees to the south-east and south and the natural topography. The new timber bays are slightly lower than the existing stone boundary wall so shouldn't be visible from the road either.

We note the assessment of archaeological risk and have no further comment.

The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust had no objection to the previous planning application, and this remains our view.

Yours sincerely,

Val Hepworth
Trustee Conservation and Planning

Cc Yorkshire and the Northeast Historic England; Kristof Fatsar Historic England; conservation@ the Gardens Trust