



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

www.yorkshiregardentrust.org.uk

Mrs Val Hepworth

Trustee

Conservation and Planning

Ms Marina Martignoni
Woodland Officer
Forestry Commission

martina.martignoni@forestrycommission.gov.uk

conservation@yorkshiregardentrust.org.uk

18th August 2022

Dear Ms Martignoni

EIA-2022-0304 Woodland Creation 12.8 ha of sparsely dense woodland (woodland pasture), composed of broadleaf trees and mostly deciduous shrubs with a very small conifer (yew) component. Land West of A61 and South of Sandy Gate, at the Harewood Estate, near Leeds (Grid Ref SE 317 443).

STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust (GT) 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 Harewood House, which is registered 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.

YGT was consulted on the Harewood PA2 Feasibility Study and we thought the principle of wood pasture as proposed would be a good way forward.

Thank you for sending us further details of the planting. We have asked YGT Vice-president Peter Goodchild, a notable garden historian and teacher with a long connection with the Harewood Estate, who took part in the YGT consultation on the PA2 Feasibility Study, to look at the documents. His comments in table form are attached (see below.)

They are in two parts: some general comments and an analysis of what is shown on the Masterplan figures 18.1 to 18.4.

In the analysis, Peter has identified places where there are questions about the proposals. We suggest that these need to be resolved by Harewood and its team perhaps with some experienced specialist outside help. We are concerned that these would affect the eventual overall historical character of the parkland. Peter has explained the matter in terms of the difference between what we call the 'Polite' (Brown and Repton) and the 'Rustic' (Price, Knight and the young J.C. Loudon) Picturesque. Perhaps it is rather a 'subtle' point but in relation to Harewood and English garden history it is a significant point and one that we think should be made.

In addition, we are not sure how well some aspects of this planting proposal are co-ordinated with the felling proposals: 012/2496/2022 Harewood Estate - Felling Licence Consultation

Yours sincerely

Val Hepworth
Trustee Conservation and Planning

cc. Chris Mayes, Landscape Architect North of England, Historic England
e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk; Conservation@ the Gardens Trust

Attachment to this letter:

A REPORT TO THE YGT: SOME GENERAL COMMENTS ON WOODLAND CREATION EIA-2022-0304 and SOME PARTICULAR NOTES ON WOODLAND CREATION EIA- 2022-0304. AN ANALYSIS.

HAREWOOD ESTATE: PA2 FEASIBILITY STUDY SECTION 18: Parkland Tree Planting Proposals as at 21 July 2022.

A REPORT TO THE YGT: SOME GENERAL COMMENTS ON WOODLAND CREATION EIA- 2022-0304.

Peter H. Goodchild

15 August 2022.

No.	Comments.	
1.	<p>The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) has recently received two sets of consultation documents from the Forestry Commission concerning the Harewood Estate, near Leeds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Woodland Creation Harewood Estate EIA-2022-0304. 2. FW: 012/2496/2022 Harewood Estate – Felling Licence Consultation. <p>The notes and comments set out in this document relate to the first of these (Woodland Creation EIA-2022-0304.</p>	
2.	<p>Harewood House is a Grade I Listed Building set in a Grade 1 Registered Historic Park and Garden. It therefore merits the highest level of conservation from an historical point of view. It is fully recognised, however, that there are also other factors that need to be taken into account in the process of decision-making.</p>	
3.	<p>In my analysis of the proposed parkland tree planting (see below), I have made a note of where the proposals <u>might</u> make a significant change in the historical character of the parkland as compared, mainly, with the OS 25” maps published in 1890 and 1893.</p> <p>This initial assessment is based on the general idea that the number of trees and density of their planting in parkland in relation to the size and pattern of the open spaces has a significant effect on its historical character.</p> <p>A spacious park with relatively few individual trees and clumps is a typical characteristic of the style (the ‘Beautiful’ or the ‘Polite Picturesque’ style) that is connected with Capability Brown and Humphry Repton. A wilder and more intricate pattern of planting that breaks up the space into smaller areas is typical of the ‘Picturesque’ or ‘Rustic Picturesque’ style which is associated with Sir Uvedale Price, Richard Payne Knight, and the young John Claudius Loudon.</p> <p>Loudon prepared an extremely elaborate Rustic Picturesque scheme for the main park at Harewood c.1806 but it was not taken forward. However, a Rustic Picturesque approach may well have been applied in the North Park and Castle Fields, whereas the main park seems to have remained in the Polite Picturesque style.</p> <p>This may seem a rather minor point, but from an historical point of view it is of major significance and was a topic of heated and confrontational discussion in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. This is known as ‘the Picturesque Controversy’ (or Debate) and in it Repton (in defence of Brown), Price and Knight were active and original participants. At Harewood there would seem to have been both Polite Picturesque areas and Rustic Picturesque ones. This usefully demonstrates two different ways of interpreting the ‘Picturesque’ and of perceiving landscapes. Both are still relevant today.</p>	

	In the context of the present-day Harewood, it would be very good to maintain the distinction between the Polite and Rustic Picturesque, but to achieve it well-informed historical judgement is needed which at the same time recognises the Harewood Estate's aims to protect, conserve, and enhance the biodiversity of the parkland as well as their other objectives. It will be a matter of establishing, through dialogue, an appropriate balance between them. In connection with this, it should be said that the required 'integrated and comprehensive approach' to thinking about landscapes is already a striking and welcome feature of the 'Harewood PA2 Feasibility Study of 6 th August 2021.	
4.	The purpose of my analysis of the parkland tree planting proposals is to identify places where the distinction between the Polite and Rustic Picturesque needs to be taken into consideration. I have worked on the basis that the 1851 OS 6" scale and the OS 25" scale maps of 1890-93 are the layouts by which to judge the subsequent changes. The changes that I have identified are not necessarily wrong or undesirable. They are, however, differences from the situation in the late 19 th century and need to be considered from the point of view of whether they detract from the historical and present-day aesthetic character of Harewood or whether they enhance it.	
5.	Whether, as a result of this analysis, any changes should be made to the current proposals will need to be discussed and considered. This must include the input of experienced, specialist historical and aesthetic advice. It will also need to include inspection in the field and not be only a desk exercise. The effect of the current proposals and any desirable ameliorative measures will need to be judged from key vantage points such as from the House, the gardens and pleasure grounds, drives and paths.	
6.	I note that the parkland on the north and south sides of the House are not included in this consultation.	
7.	As a record for future reference , it would be useful to have a statement about how the eventual pattern, spacing and location of trees on each of the Maps 18.1-4 has been determined.	
8.	Has any decision been made about the idea of locating a new main car park , new vehicular and pedestrian routes, and a new visitor reception point in the area covered by Map 18.3? In the recent past, the YGT took part in a discussion about this. If a decision has been made, does it affect the current parkland planting proposals?	
9.	In the top and middle parts of the area covered by Map 18.3, are the locations of two historically significant drives both of which are shown on Teal's map on 1796. In the top part of Map 18.3 is the line of the former main drive from the former main entrance from Harewood village. In the middle part is the new line that Repton proposed. He marked it on the 1796 plan. It was never constructed but it is nevertheless a very interesting idea. I suggest that these two lines should not be interrupted by planting tree on or very close to them. This would help the two lines to be identifiable on the ground and walked, perhaps as part of a guided tour. Possibly, at some point or for a special event, they could even be marked in some subtle way (eg by mowing a strip along the line).	

10.	Has the proposed felling (see FW: 012/2496/2022 Harewood Estate – Felling Licence Consultation) and the on-going management of the Woodland Compartments been co-ordinated with the parkland planting proposals ? Presumably, they have?	
11.	<p>The Harewood landscape is complex and rich in terms of the heritage (both cultural and natural) that it represents. In conducting this analysis of the current parkland tree planting proposals, I have once more been made aware of the need for a way of gaining ready access to information about the various factors that needs to be taken into account when thinking in an integrated and comprehensive way about this landscape, or indeed any heritage landscape.</p> <p>I do not work at or for the Harewood Estate or the Harewood Trust, but I have known Harewood and its landscape for over 40 years and have taken a particular interest in it and its history and conservation. It strikes me that that a system that makes information about the heritage aspects of Harewood and their conservation more readily available would be very useful and not only to those who have a specialist interest in heritage and its conservation. It would also be very useful to those who are not specialists but who nevertheless are involved in the management and care of Harewood and its landscape, as well as to those who just have an interest (professional or otherwise) in it or simply want to know more about it. Although this matter is beyond the scope of the present consultation, it is relevant to it and has been raised by it. How might it be addressed?</p> <p>Perhaps the idea of a ‘Site Heritage and Conservation Record’ needs to be explored?</p>	
12.	The following points arise from the list of species of trees and scrub that is given in the e-mail of 22 July 2022 (at 09:21) from Marina Martignoni to Val Hepworth	
	- In the first column, the compartment numbers are different from those used on the Harewood Estate Restocking maps. The Harewood Estate numbers also need to be given.	
	- Why is holm oak (<i>Quercus ilex</i>) included? Does Harewood have a history of using it? The reason I ask is that it is evergreen and will stand out in an otherwise deciduous mix.	
	- For the scrub, it would seem that only 3 species are recommended (hawthorn, crab apple and wild pear). Should other species be included as well, such as blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>) and native wild roses (<i>Rosa canina</i> , etc)?	
	- What is the policy in relation to the choice of species with regard to the onset of climate change?	

SOME PARTICULAR NOTES ON WOODLAND CREATION EIA- 2022-0304. AN ANALYSIS.

Masterplan Tree Planting Proposals compared with 19th century 25” OS and other maps.

NB. In the last column, I have made a note of where, there are notable differences in the pattern of planting between Maps 18.1-4 of 2021 and the 1890-93 25” OS maps. Whether or not this difference is actually significant in practice to the **historical** character of the parkland, needs to be determined. This may well need to be done on site and from key vantage points

Maps with which the parkland planting proposals have been compared.	Notes on the differences	Significant changes ?, (after the OS 25” c.1890-1893)
NOTES ON MAP 18.1		
OS 25” (Yorks 188:10) s. 1888-92, p.1893	Comparing this with Map 18.1: - Map 18.1 has a large area missing from OS 1893. This made up of the present woodland compartments 17b and part of 17a	X
	- I can see some similarities with the OS 1893.	
	- Map 18.1 seems more densely planted than the 1893 OS on the lefthand side in the upper-middle area.	X
	- the proposed scrub planting on Map 18.1 appears to be new.	X
NOTES ON MAP 18.2		
OS 25” (Yorks 188:6) s. 1888, p.1890	On the upper third of Map 18.2: - it looks as if the density of tree plant has increased slightly.	X
	- the proposed scrub planting has been placed in front of a line of trees and scrub on the 1890 OS that follows the park boundary wall against the Otley Road.	
	In the middle third of Map 18.2: - I can see some similarities with OS 25” 1890, but it looks more densely planted in the middle part. This may be due to natural regeneration in and around the old quarries since 1890.	X
	The lower third of Map 18.3 has a northern finger of land against the Leeds-Harrogate Road, and opposite it a southern finger that runs in the same direction as Church Lane	

	- On the 1890 OS, the northern finger is open without trees.	X
	- On the 1890 OS, the southern finger, is mostly open but with one or two individual trees. Whereas the proposals show a scatter of individual trees.	X
NOTES ON MAP 18.3		
OS 25" (Yorks 188:6) s. 1888, p.1890.	The area shown on Map 18.3 is covered by four 25" OS maps. These are on Yorkshire Sheets 188: 6, 7, 10 and 11	
OS 25" (Yorks 188:10) s. 1888-92, p.1893.		
OS 25" (Yorks 188:7) s. 1888, p.1890.	On the lefthand side of Map 18.3 , Sheet 6 is above sheet 10. These take up about two thirds of the width of Map 18.3.	
OS 25" (Yorks 188:11) s. 1888-1892, p.1893.	On the righthand side of Map 18.3 , Sheet 7 is above Sheet 11. These occupy the remaining third of Map 18.3 but are mostly occupied by the wide boundary plantation against the Leeds-Harrogate Road.	
	Map 18.3 can be divided into top, middle and lower parts. - The top part has the present main drive and the Cricket Ground. - The middle part has the proposed clumps 1 and 2 - The lower part has the proposed clump 3.	
	In the top part of Map 18.3: (OS 25" Sheets 6 and 7) - on the eastern side of the Cricket Ground there is a broad band of loosely scattered individual trees which mark the location of the early boundary plantation that is shown on the Teal map of 1796. The original main entrance gate into the park was here, to the north of the present drive, with its accompanying main drive to the house. The early main drive also lay to the north of the present one. This broad band goes as far south as the proposed clump 1. On the 1890 25" OS the trees are not so densely planted	X
	- Generally speaking, the pattern of the other scattered individual trees seems to follow the 1890 25" OS.	
	In the middle part of Map 18.3 (OS 25" Sheets 10 and 11): - The proposed clumps 1 and 2 are not shown on the 1893 OS 25". However, a scattering of individual trees is shown on the approximate locations of both. The	X

	<p>proposed clumps do, however, reflect the locations of two areas marked in wash on Teal's map of 1796. These were probably made by Humphry Repton himself and represent his suggestions. What are the present intentions here?</p>	
	<p>- The middle part of Map 18.3 shows a much denser pattern of scattered individual trees than on the 1890 25" OS or, indeed, the 1851 6" OS (Sheet 188). What is the rationale for this?</p>	X
	<p>In the lower part of Map 18.3 (OS 25" Sheets 10 and 11):</p> <p>- The proposed clump 3 is not shown on the 1893 25" OS but its location is approximately that of a similarly shaped plantation that is shown on Teal's map of 1796. It marked a corner of the park as it was in 1796. Is this the intention behind the proposal? The park was later extended up to the Leeds-Harrogate Road.</p>	X
	<p>- The pattern of scattered trees in the lower part of Map 18.3 is more dense than on the 1893 25" OS. It seems to reflect the patterns on the 1851 6" OS (Sheet 188) and Teal's 1796 map. What is the intention here?</p>	X
NOTES ON MAP 18.4		
<p>OS 25" (Yorks 188:10) s. 1888-92, p.1893.</p> <p>OS 25" (Yorks 188:14) s. 1892, p.1893.</p> <p>OS 25" (Yorks 188:11) s. 1888-1892, p.1893.</p> <p>OS 25" (Yorks 188:15) s. 1892, p.1893.</p>	<p>The area shown on Map 18.4 is covered by four 25" OS maps. These are on Yorkshire Sheets 188: 10, 11, 14 and 15.</p>	
	<p>Map 18.4 can be divided into two parts, a top part and a lower part.</p> <p>The top part is covered by OS 25" Sheets 10 and 11.</p> <p>The lower part is covered by OS 25" Sheets 14 and 15.</p> <p>On the lefthand side, Sheet 10 is above sheet 14.</p> <p>On the righthand side, Sheet 11 is above Sheet 15.</p>	
	<p>On the top part of the lefthand side of Map 18.4:</p> <p>- The present woodland compartments 15a, b and c are absent on the 1893 25" OS maps. Were they planted after the great storm in the 1960s? Were they an</p>	X

	enlarged replacement for the loose grove that is shown on the 1893 OS? Should they now remain as a dense plantation or thinned to a loose scatter?	
	- On the 1893 OS 25" map the area to the north, west and east of the present plantation 15, was open with very few trees a pattern that has been maintained in the current planting proposals.	
	- The proposed pattern of individual trees on either side of the Lofthouse Drive corresponds with the pattern shown on the 1893 OS 25".	
	On the bottom part of the lefthand side of Map 18.4: - the proposed planting on the eastern side of the Grey Stone Pasture, against the present 25a woodland compartment (Sugar Hills) is narrower and looser than on the 1893 OS 25".	X
	- the proposed planting on the southern side of the Grey Pasture, against woodland compartment 25g (Grey Stone Whin) is much deeper and looser than on the 1893 OS 25".	X
	On the top part of the righthand side of Map 18.4: - The present plantation 14a is absent on the 1893 OS 25" where it is shown, instead, as being open with some loosely scattered individual trees. Was it planted after the great storm in the 1960s? Should it now be thinned?	X
	- the proposed pattern of scattered trees looks very similar to that shown on the 1893 OS 25".	
	- the proposed scrub planting that extends into the parkland from the present plantation 13f, seems to coincide with a loose planting that is shown more clearly on the 1851 OS 6" (Sheet 188) where scrub is indicated as well as trees.	
	On the bottom part of the righthand side of Map 18.4: - the scattered individual trees coincide with what is on the 1893 OS 25".	