



# YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

[www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk](http://www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk)

Mrs Val Hepworth  
Manor House  
Skeebly  
Richmond  
North Yorkshire  
DL10 5DX

Ms Julie Haycock  
Planning Officer  
Planning and Regeneration  
Wakefield Council

[dmsplanning@wakefield.gov.uk](mailto:dmsplanning@wakefield.gov.uk)

[conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk](mailto:conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk)

5<sup>th</sup> April 2022

Dear Ms Haycock

**16/01095/S7301 Variation of condition 2 of approved application 16/016095/FUL dated 16th May 2017 (relating to approved application 12/01524/HYB dated 18th April 2013) (part detailed, part outline application for the re-development of former Bretton Hall campus. Detailed application: the conversion of the Mansion House to form a 120 bed hotel with ancillary restaurants, bar, spa, conference, wedding facilities and temporary marquee locations (C1) including erection of 3-storey extensions to the north and east wings and the partial demolition of later addition extensions to the Mansion and full demolition of Ezra Taylor, Alec Clegg, Victor Pasmore (including Music School and Dance Studio) buildings, Refectory, Student Services bungalow and hostel/ancillary buildings; conversion of the Camellia House to ancillary hotel use; conversion of the Stables, Coach House, Theatre, Gym, Library and link block to 7 office units (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1); erection of two 2-3 storey office pavilions (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1); and associated new access roads, car parking infrastructure and landscape works. Outline application: Erection of six 2 storey office pavilions (B1(a)) and/or non-residential institutions (D1)). Application to amend some of the detailed drawings to which the application and approval relates Bretton Hall, Park Lane, Bretton.**

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust in its role as Statutory Consultee with regard to any proposed development affecting a site listed by Historic England (HE) on their Register of Parks and Gardens. In this case Bretton Hall, Yorkshire Sculpture Park is registered grade II with the Hall listed grade II\*. 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 do not have any record of us ever having been consulted on 16/016095/FUL.

On the planning portal 16/016095/FUL shows as 12/01524/HYB and condition 2 of the consent is a very general one:

**Planning permission GRANTED for the following PART of the development:** in accordance with the plans and specifications hereby approved subject to the following conditions and reasons:-

2. None of the 6, two-storey office buildings subject to outline planning permission shall be commenced until details of the following reserved matter(s) for that building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: (a) appearance; and (b) landscaping. Application for approval of all the reserved matter(s) shall be made before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason : Pursuant to the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Our previous response to a planning application was for **19/02294/LBC** dated 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020 followed by notes dated 26<sup>th</sup> November 2020 after our site visit on 17<sup>th</sup> November with Helen Bower, Wakefield Council Conservation Officer and representatives of the developer, Rushbond.

In principle the Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust are very supportive of the re-development of the former Bretton Hall campus.

We welcome:

(i) the improvements to the proposed car parking in front of the stable block – now a combination of the more informal with a formal arrangement facing the east elevation of the Stable Block which will be less intrusive in approaches to Mansion from the north and east.

(ii) the removal of car parking spaces along Beaumont Drive which will much improve the sense of arrival at the hotel and enhance the landscape.

(iii) the reduction in the number of car parking spaces to the Grasshopper car park to the south-east of the Mansion which will minimise the visual impact on the setting of the Mansion and 07 proposed planting to existing slope to help screen car parking.

(iv) the Formal East Lawn 03, but we have concerns about the impact of the Hotel Wings Extension (Future Phase), although the proposed extension appears to have been reduced and not project beyond the line of the mansion into the Lawn as shown on the Landscape Variations 20417\_P502 Rev C, South -East Landscape Plan, June 2021.

(v) that there will not be any new physical boundaries between Yorkshire Sculpture Park (YSP) and Bretton Hall.

Although overall we are supportive of the proposed new use for the listed buildings, we underline that we are eager to ensure that the proposed works conserve and enhance the buildings and their setting within the registered park and garden.

The Gardens Trust and Yorkshire Gardens Trust wish to raise our particular concerns regarding :-

- a) the repair of the Camellia House doors and windows and the design of its new access paths
- b) the proposed new roofing to the Orangery, (and we note Historic England's concerns about the proposed change to the design of the orangery windows and doors).
- c) the single clerestory light shown over the Conservatory
- d) the supposed existing car parking at the far north- west corner of the site
- e) demolition and further building works to erect a new kitchen north of the Orangery because of the root protection zones needed for the superb mature English Oak and London Plane tree close by
- f) the proposals to remove all trees to the south of the Bretton Hall Mansion terrace
- g) the proposed temporary marquee in location A1.
- h) the proposed office blocks, (Future Phase)

a) The Camellia House

On page 17 of the Heritage Impact Statement section 5.10 it states that the wooden windows and doors are of poor thin quality, probably from the 1990's and should be replaced by better thicker ones to the original glazing pattern. We note that no such upgrades are planned.

However, windows and doors in the mansion, including the Orangery designed by George Basevi of 1836 i.e. some twenty or so years later than the Camellia House are to be upgraded as per the Heritage Statement's recommendations. We consider this an inappropriate cost saving for such a well-known building as the Camellia House.

We also draw your attention to the 6" and 25" mile Ordnance Survey maps of Bretton Hall's surroundings (1847-1939) which show that the Camellia House's access paths were always curved. Three are shown to the north and one to the south-east, the latter leading gracefully to the main house. As a result, we see no problem in reinstating two or more of them but not in such an angular way as proposed.

b & c) Bretton Hall, listed Grade II\* has two important garden buildings attached to it, Jeffrey Wyatt's Conservatory from 1814 and George Basevi's Orangery put up c.1836. They were commissioned by Diana Beaumont and her son respectively and both had glass roofs which are shown on the OS maps (25" to the mile scale) from their erection until at least the sale post 2nd World War to Wakefield City Council some 100 to 120 years later. We believe that the Orangery's glazed roof at least lasted longer until the 1990's.

We are surprised and much regret that neither area of glazed roof is to be reinstated and whilst we very much support the plan to provide bat roosts for this huge mansion, query whether this is the best place with a new kitchen directly behind and the venting and clatter that will result. We support opening up the interconnection between the Orangery and Conservatory but regret the loss of daylight and sunshine that restoration of their original glazing would have provided.

d) As per our previous response comments, we note the inaccuracy in the Landscape Masterplan which shows "existing parking" in the far north-west corner of the site where none exists. YSP use this forested area for outdoor sculpture workshops and their hard standing for a temporary fabric roof is in a different place.

We would advise that permission from the appropriate authority will be needed to fell these trees and should be part of a later planning application.

e) Tree number, 119b an excellent mature English Oak and tree no 119g an excellent mature London Plane have large root protection zones around them in the Tree Survey included with this planning application. Not only is a van turning circle shown predicting regular vehicle traffic to this area but due to the demolition and rebuilding of the kitchen to the north side of the Orangery vehicles, materials, scaffolding and possibly access to the main house are proposed for this area.

We are very concerned that this will lead to the loss of both specimens and request that no materials or contractors' accommodation be allowed within this courtyard in particular. That access for house works or contractors' plant should also be withdrawn and that as much as possible of the courtyard root zone be kept free from compaction. Even on completion we request that delivery vehicles should be excluded completely, and goods delivered and removed by hand.

The old sports courts could be used instead, their restoration to grass following the new kitchen's completion.

f) We question the proposals to remove all the trees to the south of the Hall Mansion terrace. Several are dedicated trees, and all are young and - if healthy - capable of being relocated by a tree spade machine. The consequences will be reciprocal; views out from the Mansion and views back from YSP.

g) As the earlier proposed temporary marquee in location A1 is not now marked on Landscape Masterplan All Phases Rev H-1012655 but is marked on another (Bretton Park Landscape

Masterplan A0-1012934 dated 08 09 2020) can we trust that this has been removed from any proposals?

We note the following in the Bretton Hall Landscape design Statement 24 06 21, p5/6: ' Condition 10 of the existing permission 16/01095/FUL relates. This limits the provision of marquees to a maximum of three locations within any of the five areas identified including the area A1.....'

As we have explained in our previous responses, this location would be very damaging to the reciprocal views to the south that are such an important part of the intended historical and aesthetic experience and important for the public visiting YSP and we object.

h) We have serious concerns about the positioning of the proposed office blocks, (Future Phase) S, T, U, V, north-east of the Stable Block. They will be very evident from the New Hotel Guest Approach Drive 01.

Yours sincerely

Val Hepworth  
Trustee and Chairman Conservation and Planning

cc. Chris Mayes, Landscape Architect North of England, Historic England  
[e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk](mailto:e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk); Conservation@ the Gardens Trust