

25_02583_FUL - Parish Council - Objection

Application Reference: 25_02583_FUL

Proposal: Wetland enhancement works upstream of Sherborne Broadwater to reconnect river with floodplain, manage silt, preserve open water, improve biodiversity, and mitigate flood risk.

Objector: Sherborne Parish Council

Address: c/o Brook Cottage, Sherborne, GL54 3DU

Date: 21 November 2025

Document 5 of 6

25_02583_FUL - Parish Council - Objection

Appendix 4 – District Council Consultation

This document should be read in conjunction with all documents submitted by Sherborne Parish Council.

This is a summary of the 50 objections (as of 20 November 2025) posted at the CDC's planning portal. This Appendix also includes all the comments, as written, included within each objector's own submission.

Summary of the 50 objections as of 20 November 2025:

The overwhelming sentiment expressed by Sherborne residents, local stakeholders, and other objectors to the National Trust's (NT) planning application for the creation of a wetland in the Sherborne Broadwater and surrounding Grade II listed parkland is one of strong opposition. The following key themes and arguments are consistently raised across the detailed objections:

Heritage and Landscape Impact

- The Broadwater and parkland are cited as significant 18th-century designed landscapes, integral to Sherborne's identity and village character, and protected by multiple local and national planning policies.
- Objectors argue the proposed wetland scheme would irreversibly alter and damage the historic open water landscape, changing it from cherished open water to marsh or swamp, undermining its aesthetic, cultural, and ecological value.
- Many references are made to the NT's neglect since acquiring the estate, with former maintenance such as periodic dredging abandoned, resulting in silted and overgrown waters.
- The NT is accused of failing to appreciate or properly research the area's true historical significance, with assertions that the Broadwater's origins are earlier than suggested in the application, and that the heritage assessments lack rigour and consultation with relevant experts or statutory bodies.

Ecological and Environmental Concerns

- The ecological surveys underpinning the proposal are described as outdated, incomplete, or seasonally inadequate, with no robust evidence that the scheme will achieve the promised biodiversity uplift.
- Claims of increased biodiversity and habitat improvement are challenged, both on the grounds of insufficient evidence and because the loss of open water is believed to be detrimental to existing species, especially waterfowl.
- Objectors stress that existing water meadows and wetland features within the estate, which could be restored or extended, are more suitable for such interventions.

Flood Risk and Technical Flaws

- Significant doubts are raised regarding the technical soundness of the Flood Risk Assessment, with claims that recent changes to the site (e.g., fallen trees, silt management upstream) render modelled scenarios obsolete.
- There are concerns that the proposed scheme could increase flood risk to properties and land adjacent to the Brook, and that key legal infrastructure (e.g., water supply easements) have been ignored.
- Many objectors point out that the main sources of silt (road runoff and upstream sources) have recently been addressed or could be managed more effectively and cheaply through

traditional interventions such as ditch and gully maintenance, without altering the historic landscape.

Lack of Consultation and Procedural Failures

- Numerous objections highlight insufficient community involvement, with the planning process described as a *fait accompli* rather than a genuine consultation. Promised sharing of key documents (like the Conservation Management Plan) and meaningful engagement with statutory consultees and local heritage organisations has not occurred.
- Key appendices and technical documents referenced in the application are missing, and local knowledge, including community-commissioned heritage statements, has been disregarded.

Financial and Management Concerns

- The scheme is widely criticised as an expensive experiment (with an estimated cost of £200,000) without a clear maintenance or management plan, and no defined or measurable criteria for success.
- Objectors fear the NT lacks the funds, commitment, or track record to ensure the long-term stewardship of the site, referencing previous failures (such as the water meadows project) where restored features were subsequently neglected.

Policy Non-Compliance

It is repeatedly asserted that the proposals conflict with multiple local plan policies (EN1, EN4, EN5, EN10, EN11) and the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which require the conservation and enhancement of heritage and landscape assets, and the prevention of harm to designated historic environments.

Suggested Alternatives and Conclusion

- Objectors broadly support environmental enhancement in principle but urge that the NT should prioritise restoring and maintaining the Broadwater and its landscape to its historic open water state, using traditional management (dredging, silt traps, proper drainage).
- There is a call for collaborative, evidence-based approaches involving local expertise, and for any future proposals to be rooted in robust data, with transparency and genuine consultation.
- Many recommend that the Council refuse or defer the current application until a comprehensive heritage and hydrological assessment, clear management plan, and meaningful community engagement are undertaken.

In summary, the objections reflect deep concern for the heritage, landscape, and community of Sherborne, with a strong consensus that the current planning application is fundamentally flawed, both in process and substance, and should not proceed in its current form.

All the comments, as written/verbatim, included within each objector's own submission. The use of bold text is used to delineate between individual objectors.

I am grateful for the opportunity to object to the National Trusts planning application to create a wetland here in the heart of Sherborne.

The once expansive areas of open water as shown within the Historic England Registered Park and Garden entry for Sherborne House (Grade II*, NHLE ref. 1000733) Sherborne House 1000780 Historic England, has been neglected for at least a decade.

Choked with weed and vegetation it is almost unrecognisable for a large part of the year as one of the most loved features of the village.

This has been a source of dismay for not only the people who live in Sherborne but also the people who visit Sherborne. There would always be people commenting on how beautiful Sherborne Brook was, they would stand in amazement and gaze at the abundance of wildlife.

This was reflected in 'the Spirit of place' a national NT initiative which was meant to put people in touch with how a building, landscape, view made them feel.

To get to the soul of the area.

Top of that list here in Sherborne for both residents and visitors, the thing that gave people peace and connection was Sherborne Broadwater.

Andy Beer who was at the time the NTs Head of Visitor experience and is now the NTs director of strategy and places co wrote the seven principles of interpretation all about the spirit of place and its significance said at the time,

"People don't come to visit our places to appreciate our interpretation. They come to experience, to admire, or simply enjoy being in the place itself.

The Trust held two meetings for the Sherborne community where they were informed of the proposed wetland project, shortly after there was a following meeting with the Riparian owners and the Parish Council, it was at this meeting that one of the National Trust representatives admitted that this plan was a 're imagining' of the landscape.

I am at a loss at to why just a few years earlier the community said the thing which connected them spiritually to Sherborne needed 're imagining'

How can a charity which is supposed to protect and preserve our history for future generations actively seek to change it forever, without full consultation and co-operation of the people who call Sherborne home.

The reasoning behind such a drastic intervention is by their own admission not certain to work. And worst still when challenged about maintenance of the proposed wetlands, fully admitted there was absolutely no costing or maintenance plans for the near, mid and long term future.

This in itself is not only reckless but fiscally irresponsible. They disclosed that the proposed plan was costing circa £200K, and JBA the consultants, who devised this plan, said they had not been commissioned to provide a maintenance plan and that their scope of works from the NT had been quite narrow. They also admitted that this proposed plan is not guaranteed to work as far as stopping silt entering the Broadwater.

Alongside the fact there has been no definitive plan to de-silt the Brook at all.

Over the last few years, various community led experiments have repeatedly identified the main source of silt entering the Brook as road run off. Proper ditches and gullies cut at defined intervals

to capture the water and silt deposits would be infinitely cheaper and easier to maintain, than destroying an historic landscape. The NT were provided with a map showing where new grips and gullies could and should be cut and water capture pools could be created at a fraction of the cost of the wetland project.

The proposed scheme also has the potential to increase the flood risk for some of the riparian owners who live by the banks of the Brook.

As owners of their home they have the right of quiet enjoyment without fear that their property, land, trees etc will be damaged by the actions of the National Trust.

In Sherborne there is an area called the 'water meadows' this surely is an infinitely more suitable place for a wetland creation. The clue is in the name.

The 'managed decline' of Sherborne, a term I have heard from several NT employees, as a whole, gives little comfort or confidence when it comes to National Trusts plans. The term refers to watching something fail rather than doing something to preserve or restore. The Trust has managed the decline of the Broadwaters for over a decade, procrastinating, spending money on failed modelling and basically doing nothing to halt the silt and the growth of weeds and vegetation.

Trees just left where they fall, historic properties left to ruin, listed walls bowing and crumbling, homes in need of repair, fences and gates rotting and falling down.

This would be a far better use of the charities funds. I wonder what the membership would think of the NTs actions.

I urge the NT to work with the local community, restore the Broadwaters, and identify a different more suitable space for the NTs desired wetland. Allow the flora and fauna to retain their home.

Work with the community and I can assure you the community will participate fully.

Surely this destruction of a Grade 2 listed landscape can not and should not be sanctioned.

I therefore respectfully urge the council to reject this planning application.

For years, the National Trust in Sherborne has ignored the fact that the Broadwater, which forms the central feature of a Grade II listed landscape, has been literally disappearing before our eyes, filling up with silt and becoming matted with weeds and grasses.

I would love to be able to welcome this planning application as part of a coherent scheme to restore the open water on the Broadwaters, which form the central feature of an 18th-century landscape which was handed over to the NT in 1986 by Lord Sherborne for its preservation. Sadly, this application is not that hoped for scheme which residents of the village have been unsuccessfully pressing for over many years. Instead, it is an ill-conceived plan that cannot hope to have more than a very minor effect on general levels of silt in the Broadwater. It is a case of attempting to close the stable door after the horse has bolted. There is also a question mark over just how much silt is still being carried downstream since work was carried out upstream at Haycroft where silt traps were created some years back.

The application refers to 'maintaining' open water on the Broadwater, but essentially, because of the NT's neglect, there is no open water to maintain except around the cascade so that the very premise of the scheme is based on a misrepresentation of the current situation.

The Trust maintains that if its planning application is successful, it will result in "a ribbon of water" running through the vegetation currently clogging up the lakes. However NT officers have admitted publicly that it is not known how wide this ribbon of water would turn out to be! How can the NT plan

to spend a large amount of money on a scheme the outcome of which seems to be wholly speculative

Similarly, there is also a total lack of understanding surrounding the current biodiversity on the site. The Cotswold District Council's own Senior Biodiversity Officer, Luke Etheridge points out that the data included in the application was collected well over two years ago, making its conclusions out of date and potentially inaccurate. Mr Etheridge opposes the application on these and other grounds.

I have no expert knowledge of biodiversity, but I do know from my daily walks through Sherborne that there has been a huge drop in the number of waterfowl on the Broadwaters. Where just a few years ago literally hundreds of ducks and other migrating water birds were to be seen feeding, today there are hardly any. The much-loved swans have either died or disappeared, and even ducks are now a rarity. What a loss to the area.

On aesthetic grounds, the NT's scheme is entirely unsuitable for land described by the NT's own project manager, Andrew Dawson, as a part of 'a much-loved historical landscape'. A recent tree felling exercise on the site resulted in a scene of total devastation, tree trunks lying where they had fallen or standing shorn of their branches. These will now be left to rot as part of the wetlands project. This is redolent of the look of most of the estate which appears sadly neglected especially when viewed beside the two neighbouring estates at Haycroft and Barrington.

I would urge councillors, before they take a decision, to visit the site and the Broadwater to make up their own minds if they feel that the NT is fulfilling its role of properly maintaining land designated as being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Finally, I would just like to comment on the Trust's failure to consult the local population who live in Sherborne. Having promised a couple of years ago to keep residents informed, this did not happen. Indeed, information has been deliberately withheld from the community in the form of a report commissioned by the NT about the historic significance of the Broadwater. We still don't know what is in that report. In June of this year two public meetings were held prior to the Trust submitting its completed application. At these events residents were told that the purpose of the meetings was to "inform" us of the contents of the applications, not to engage us in a consultation process in which our views could be taken into consideration. Essentially a fait accompli.

Having visited the area over the last 35 years, I have always admired the beauty of the Sherborne Brook with its beautiful flowing waterway down the Windrush valley and there is no doubt that this particular area was developed historically with water controls and a mill to manage

the waterways efficiently and to ensure the beauty of the area through correct management.

It is vital to the area, for the benefit of tourism and supporting the local shop etc, that this brook is properly maintained and not left to become a wetland - i.e. just left to continue its demise.

It is worth noting that when the Tremain family retired from their generational farming tenancy, one of the first things the National Trust did, was to restore the nearby water meadows at I believe huge cost. It was clear that they wanted to try and restore it to its former workings so that people could walk and enjoy the beauty of the water meadows. Why then, 30 years later they decide not to dredge and restore the brook to its former glory, which is what they should be doing, rather than 'letting it go' and trying to claim they want to make it into a Wetland. Seems to me like an irresponsible cop out and should not be allowed to happen. I therefore strongly object to this

proposal

Sherborne Broadwater is a defining characteristic feature of the Sherborne Estate.

These plans will destroy it and consequently destroy something at the heart of an estate and its community.

It will also have negative impact on the wildlife whose habitat will be destroyed by these plans.

Although I am in support of the overall principle of establishing new wetlands, enhancing biodiversity, mitigating flood risk and minimising silt deposition within the Sherborne Broadwaters, I have major reservations about the proposed location for this project and its efficacy.

The scheme is situated within a Grade II Registered Park and Garden (Sherborne Park), and within a designated Conservation Area, which make the site wholly unsuitable for this development. My concerns also extend beyond its proposed location, as I question the effectiveness of the scheme in achieving its stated aims. Specifically, I am not convinced that it will result in a meaningful reduction in the continued accumulation of silt within the Broadwaters, nor am I confident that it will succeed in preserving the currently diminished areas of open water. The proposals will certainly not result in the re-establishment of extensive areas of open water, nor the restoration of the Broadwaters to their historic pre-eminence within the Sherborne Park landscape.

I question the validity of the Panning Application:

The submitted Heritage Assessment contains reams of irrelevant information regarding many listed heritage assets that will not be affected by the scheme. But surprisingly, there is very limited, and indeed somewhat ambiguous information about the heritage value and provenance of the Broadwaters and the area of parkland known as 'Old Park'. The application underestimates both the age and cultural significance of the Old Park and the Broadwaters. The application documents state that the lakes were "likely constructed in the late 1700's / early 1800's" for "amenity purposes", but later it is stated that construction occurred in the early 19th century to provide a head of water for mills downstream.

We know that the Old Park was originally laid out as a deer park in the late 16th century, nevertheless I contend that much of the present-day parkland shows strong evidence of the influences of the 18th century English Landscape Movement and the later 19th century 'Picturesque Movement'. The lake configuration is very typical of mid-18th century landscape design and indeed Isaac Taylor's County Map of 1777 appears to show the two lakes. Moreover, LIDAR data also reveals details of a more complex landscape history with evidence of formal tree avenues and driveways, and well-defined earthworks which seem to predate the more informal 18th & 19th century landscapes. Thus, the parkland has a very significant heritage value which surely must be preserved and enhanced.

In respect of the Ecological Impact Assessment, this is substantially flawed. The ecological survey was undertaken at a suboptimal time of year in early March 2023, and at the time of the planning submission was 2½ years out of date. This does not accord with CIEEM guidance and planning guidelines. There are no Protected Species Assessments within the application documents, yet we know there are Otters, Water Voles, and Badger setts within the vicinity of the brook and application site.

Also, given the size of the development area (greater than 1Ha) and its location on a Main River, the application should have been accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The

submitted Flood Risk Analysis report does not constitute a FRA as it fails to meet the requirements stipulated within the NPPF guidelines. The appraisal lacks detailed topographical survey and historical river level monitoring data.

The application fails to address the landscape and visual impacts of the scheme. There are several sensitive visual receptors in the locality, including listed buildings, residential properties and public rights of way which directly overlook the site, as well as the iconic views across the parkland and Broadwaters from the village road and Sherborne House & Stables. We have already seen significant negative visual impact upon these receptors caused by the silting up and degradation of the Broadwaters over the past 15-20 years, in addition to the adverse landscape impact this has caused upon the special character of Sherborne village and its Conservation Area. The project to create further areas of marshland will only serve to further degrade the inherent beauty of this historic landscape and will have further significant adverse impact upon nearby residents and other visual receptors. I was very surprised that the application was not accompanied by a comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

Similarly, there is no Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which is somewhat amiss when it is proposed to remove trees within a Conservation Area.

Policy Non-Compliance:

In my view, the proposed development does not comply with the following policies within the extant Local Plan:

EN1 - BUILT, NATURAL AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT: requires the protection, conservation & enhancement of the historic and natural environment.

The scheme fails to enhance or restore the Broadwaters and the historic parkland.

EN4 - WIDER NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE: only permits development where it does not have a significant detrimental impact on the natural and historic landscape.

The proposals fail to take account of the historic landscape character, visual quality and local distinctiveness of the site. They do not enhance, restore nor better manage the historic landscape.

EN5 - COTSWOLDS AONB (National Landscape): promotes a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, character and special qualities of the landscape.

The proposed scheme is inconsistent with these principles.

EN10 - HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT: DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS: states that 'great weight will be given to the asset's conservation' and 'proposals that would lead to harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will not be permitted.'

The scheme fails to conserve the heritage asset, but instead will cause significant harm.

EN11 - HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT: CONSERVATION AREAS: states that 'development proposals will be permitted provided they preserve and enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'

These proposals will not preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Sherborne Conservation Area, the heart of which is the historic parkland and open water bodies within the river valley.

A scheme that is significantly flawed:

Although I fully endorse the objective of reducing the quantity of silt entering the Broadwaters, I remain unconvinced that the proposed scheme will achieve this aim effectively. The scheme does not address the root causes of silt entering Sherborne Brook. In my view, a more

successful strategy would involve preventing silt-laden water from local roads reaching the Brook. This could be accomplished by regularly maintaining roadside drainage grips and establishing a series of swales and retention ponds or basins within fields and woodlands adjacent to the roads (within the ownership of the National Trust). Collectively, these measures would offer a more targeted and effective solution for protecting the Brook and Broadwaters from further siltation, with little or no impact upon the integrity of the registered parkland and Conservation Area.

Whilst I agree that the proposed scheme may have some effect in removing suspended solids from the Brook, this will only seldomly occur during very occasional high-water conditions. A significant proportion of the material commonly referred to as 'silt' within the Brook actually consists of grit and larger solids. These materials are primarily washed from the adjacent roads and then form a heavy 'bed load' within the watercourse. Such 'bed load' will not be readily removed by simply lowering the bank of the Brook, but instead it will continue to move downstream over time, ultimately accumulating in the Broadwaters.

The claim that the scheme will reduce flood risk is also something of a misconception. The lowering of the right bank of the Brook does have the potential to reduce flood risk for nearby residential properties, but it is important to acknowledge a significant limitation. The absence of a long-term management plan associated with the scheme raises concerns regarding the sustainability of its flood mitigation benefits. If substantial amounts of silt and other debris are deposited across the adjacent land and are not periodically removed, the effectiveness of the f

lood mitigation scheme could be compromised. Moreover, the introduction of dams and baffles within the Brook will cause upstream water levels to rise and could promote the additional accumulation of debris and silt within the stream channel, thus resulting in increased flood risk. Additionally, the dumping of excavated material within Flood Zone 3 at the eastern end of the site (adjacent to the boathouse) will result in a loss of floodplain storage, potentially leading to further flood risk further downstream.

I fail to see what will be achieved by blocking the existing ditch south of Sherborne Brook on the western edge of the Old Park. This ditch intercepts clean water emanating from a series of springs to the south and then delivers that clean water directly into the Broadwater. Blocking this ditch will only cause increased flooding within the parkland.

Irrespective of increased flood risk issues, I also question why the excavated materials from the site need to be deposited within an area 700 metres to the east. This only serves to widen the area of disturbance, causing increased visual impact and further harm to the registered parkland. The excavated material could be spread more efficiently near to the site, outside of the floodplain.

Given the evidence presented here, I respectfully request that the District Council refuses this planning application.

Sherborne Brook doesn't need to be reimagining; it needs looking after!

As proposed, the scheme appears to have little chance of achieving its stated aims of 1) preventing meaningful quantities of silt from entering Sherborne Brook and 2) increasing biodiversity within the proposed area of wetland. A third aim of the scheme (providing a sustainable way to reduce the build-up of silt) is to facilitate the restoration of 'meaningful' (as yet

undefined by the Trust) areas of open water within the historically important Upper Broadwater (no mention of the equally important Lower Broadwater). Both are a significant aspect of Sherborne's listed landscape.

Removing silt - the proposal says the scheme will be effective for approximately 5% of the time. i.e. when the natural water level rises to a point of overspill into the new area of wetland. In the meantime, for the remaining 95% of the time, water will flow directly into the Upper Broadwater as it does now. The anticipated cost of the scheme, shared by the National Trust (NT) during the village pre-planning information meetings held during June, is in the region of £200k. £100k for consultancy/NT time and materials leading to the Application, and a further £100k for implementation. That's a lot of money (initial outlay excluding ongoing maintenance) for a scheme that would be productive for just 5% of the time.

Over a period of several years, various community led experiments have repeatedly identified the main source of silt entering the Brook road 'run-off'. The main A40-Bourton-on-the-Water road runs downhill for one mile between the A40 and Waterloo Bridge and then rises for just over one mile from the Bridge towards Bourton-on-the-Water. A properly managed (partnership between the NT, Gloucestershire County Council, and the community) series of roadside ditches served by open grips to divert water at regular intervals, would contribute far more towards sustainable silt removal than the proposed wetland scheme, and would be much easier to maintain.

In addition, there are several roadside areas where new grips and new catchment pools/areas could be positioned - low cost to create, and low cost to maintain. Suggested locations and offers of help were provided to the NT several years ago.

Increasing biodiversity - according to the consultee submission provided (Biodiversity Officer Report) by the District Council's Senior Biodiversity Officer the proposed scheme does not provide adequate information and recommends the scheme should be refused.

The officer writes: The submitted information is insufficient to demonstrate that the mandatory requirement to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) can be met, and that the potential impacts to biodiversity, including species afforded protections under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and species listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 can be fully understood and adequately mitigated.

Impact on Sherborne's historically important landscape - During the past decade (most notably), the large serpentine mid-late 17th Century lakes (the Broadwaters) have been neglected to the point where they are now little more than unmanaged swamp. For most of the year it is almost impossible to see the original outline of the once expansive areas of open water as shown within the Historic England Registered Park and Garden entry for Sherborne House (Grade II*, NHLE ref. 1000733) Sherborne House 1000780 Historic England.

Fallen trees have been neglected for years with little noticeable attempt to fulfil basic Riparian Owner responsibilities.

After such a long period of neglect, the National Trust's seemingly renewed interest in looking after what was inherited by them during the late 1980's, must be welcomed. But proposals need to be credible, well thought through, take proper account of local knowledge, and be rooted in basic engineering principles and practices.

The intentional introduction of obstructions within the Brook (designed to slow water flow and raise water levels) as detailed within the scheme would further promote the growth of invasive weed and

larger Successionary species within the Broadwaters.

Soon after deployment, the obstructions will encourage silt to settle behind them creating fertile ground for further invasive vegetation. Soon afterwards, silt will spread to the sides and the front (flow facing) of each obstruction and in lieu of a properly funded and executed maintenance programme (none mentioned in the Application), the area will become congested leaving only the residual flow of water to find its way to the Broadwaters.

There is a real case study which illustrates the above scenario very well. Looking downstream from the weir which separates the Upper and Lower Broadwater Lakes, a fallen tree was intentionally left in place (north bank circa 20m east of the weir) by the Trust. This quickly followed the path described above and later became the catalyst for much of the growth now evident in the west end of the lower Broadwater.

The main subject of the application is the creation new wetland habitat within Sherborne's Old Park area of the Estate. Proper thought needs to be given to its location, and the visual and material impact it will have on the listed landscape. Perhaps a scheme which tries to combine silt removal and wetland creation needs to be separated. There are other more effective ways of removing silt as described above. They are low cost and easy to maintain. Separating the two objectives opens up other location options for new wetland. Perhaps reinvigorating/extending the now poorly maintained Water Meadows (circa 1m east of Waterloo Bridge) would give both ambitions room to succeed.

There is absolutely a win win outcome within easy grasp.

This is an interim statement from Sherborne Parish Council.

The District Council has kindly extended the period for the Parish Council to respond to the National Trust's planning application until 4th November 2025. This extension has been granted due to the complexity of the application (approximately 250 pages and diagrams in 20 documents), the need for the Parish Council to seek specialist advice, and a call for community consultation to provide a consensus view. The Parish Council will comprehensively respond by the revised date.

To ensure that our response is complete and reflective of community opinion, the Parish Council has conducted a survey of Sherborne Residents. The findings from this consultation will inform our final response and help to ensure that it accurately represents the priorities and concerns of the local community.

At this stage, however, the Parish Council has identified a number of major concerns in respect of the scheme and is therefore objecting to the planning application. The initial reasons for objection are:

- i. The potential adverse heritage impact upon the historic parkland (a Grade II Registered Park & Garden).
- ii. The potential adverse impacts on the settings of a number of nearby Listed Buildings.
- iii. The potential negative visual impact upon local residential properties and public rights of way.
- iv. Impact upon the special character of the Sherborne Conservation Area.
- v. Concern that the scheme does not comply with extant Local Planning Policy, namely Policies EN1, EN4, EN5, EN10 & EN11.
- vi. Significant concerns over whether the proposed scheme will be effective in achieving its stated aims. (This is one of the reasons the Parish Council is seeking specialist advice)

I object to this application to turn Sherborne Broadwater into a wetland as it will destroy forever the traditional and historical park setting and the flora & fauna which inhabit it. Not only is this body of water a centuries-old Listed heritage asset, it is populated by a wealth of species which will come under threat from the years of construction through the disturbance, destruction of habitat, noise and other types of pollution associated with such a project. A rough estimate by the applicant is that the biodiversity 'might' eventually increase by just approximately 20%. This is clearly unjustifiable.

I do not support this scheme as I do not believe it will work in achieving its objectives. It will actually make things worse - eventually choking up the whole of the Sherborne Broadwater and field - adding further to the current look of neglect and eventually destroy our beautiful historical parkland views and views of open water landscape. The Sherborne Broadwater and Parkland are of world class significance that should be maintained and treasure for future generations - a 'methane bog' is not appropriate in this setting.

Being a 3rd generation of the village, although no longer resident in the village, I feel I would like clarify one or two things.

Point 1. The river was never connected to a flood plain, the original river dug out to form 2 ornamental lakes and 2 waterfalls created, circa late 1700s from memory (Grandfather)

Point 2.

30 metres before the lower waterfall, is the old HYDRO ELECTRIC turbine house. This provided electricity for Sherborne House in the late 1800s early 1900s .of which my grandfather operated, surely this structure has SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL importance and should be preserved, and certainly not Flood Plained out.

Point 3.

An old Ice House was located on the roadside above the top waterfall. This was sealed with stone work in the 1960s , but can still be seen from the road (look for the slight arch in the wall) this would prove the age of the lakes as historic, as the ice in winter was collected and stored in the ice house,

This project should not go ahead, as the late Lord Sherborne, who gifted the estate to the National Trust, did so on the basis the estate would be maintained for future generations, and kept as so.

Sherborne is mentioned in the Domesday Book of 1086. Sherborne Brook (which incorporates the Broadwater) gave the village its name. Spelt 'Scireburne', it translates as 'bright stream' and, back in the Middle Ages, it had four watermills. Human interaction with, and management of, the river has continued throughout history: pictorial and documentary evidence proves it has existed more or less in its current form since the early 1700s. There is evidence of a drainage system into the Broadwater designed to prevent flooding of its banks; the remains of an Ice House on the southern bank to name but two.

Sherborne Broadwater is the jewel in the crown of the village, a wide, tranquil stretch of clear

water cherished by local people and a haven for flora and fauna. Under the ownership of Lord Sherborne, The Broadwater was dredged periodically to keep it free of silt and debris: Sherborne Estate was bequeathed to The National Trust in the 1980s and has not been dredged since. This once beautiful, open stretch of river has gradually deteriorated into a swamp.

A survey report commissioned by the Trust estimates, were it to convert Sherborne Broadwater to a wetland, the biodiversity uplift for land and river combined would be just 19.25%. It acknowledges there would be permanent loss of grassland habitat and potential harm (injury, death) to species during construction. And the benefits? A 'habitat mosaic' and a 'slight positive impact' for birds and some other creatures.

What about the impact on the people who live in Sherborne? Nowhere are they mentioned in the survey report yet this is also their habitat. The negative impact of the project to turn the space into a wetland is incalculable. The disruption of years of construction work, the destruction of an uplifting and familiar landscape could cause untold harm to the mental health of inhabitants of the village - surely their views should be a priority?

For all the years the NT has done nothing for the broadwaters and now they do this.

Way overboard and too late..... just do what Mr Paul at Haycroft has done. Highly successful and effective , no intrusion

The Ornamental Waters of Sherborne Park Estate - A Significant Unresearched Historical Asset

I am writing to formally and strongly object to the National Trust's current proposal affecting the historic water feature known locally as the Broadwater and historically recorded as the Ornamental Waters, located in the Home Park opposite Sherborne House. The proposal, as submitted, reflects a serious failure in both historical due diligence. If implemented, it would likely irreversibly damage one of the most historically significant and culturally valuable features of the Sherborne Park Estate.

Violation of Local Planning Policy EN1

As stated in Section 5.3 of Local Planning Policy EN1:

"New development will, where appropriate, promote the protection, conservation and enhancement of the historic and natural environment by:

(a) ensuring the protection and enhancement of existing natural and historic environmental assets and their settings in proportion with the significance of the asset."

This proposal clearly contradicts both the letter and spirit of Policy EN1. Instead of conserving or enhancing this historic landscape feature, the National Trust appears to be accelerating its decline through long-term neglect, and now proposes a plan that amounts to final erasure-under the guise of ecological management.

Neglect, Degradation, and the Risk of Irreversible Loss

The Ornamental Waters have for centuries been a defining and celebrated element of the Sherborne Park landscape. Yet rather than safeguarding this treasured feature, the Trust has allowed it to deteriorate into a swamp-like state.

The Picturesque Movement and the Waters' Likely Designed Origins

The Broadwaters-historically referred to as the Ornamental Waters-are highly likely to be an intentional creation of the 18th-century Picturesque movement, which valued irregular, romantic natural landscapes shaped to evoke emotion and framed views. Unlike earlier formal garden design, this movement embraced asymmetry, naturalistic water bodies, and painterly compositions. The curving banks, integration with mature woodland, and layered vistas all suggest design rather than accident. These elements align strongly with Picturesque principles and are of major historical significance in the evolution of English landscape aesthetics.

And yet, no serious study has been done to investigate their origins. The Trust's claim that they were created in 1811 by the 2nd Lord Sherborne is unsubstantiated, unfootnoted, and, I suspect, historically inaccurate. Overall, I see a lack of documented historical research or archival references in the Trust's materials.

Given the estate's known connections to prominent designers such as Charles Bridgeman, William Kent, Sawrey Gilpin, and Wyatt, it is both plausible and essential to investigate their potential involvement. At nearby Lodge Park, Bridgeman's role has been verified by the Trust. Why has no comparable effort been made here?

A Call for Independent Academic Research

It is not too late to save the Ornamental Waters, but only if the process is paused and a comprehensive, independent historical research project is undertaken. This must involve professional historians, ideally PhD-level researchers, who do original archival research searching beyond the Gloucestershire Record Office, where they can find relevant documents like they did at the Bodleian for Lodge Park and Bridgeman. Relying on cursory internal assessments or informal assumptions is simply not acceptable for a site of this potential national importance.

Before any decision is made, an external investigation into the origins and significance of the Broadwaters must be commissioned.

Cultural and National Significance Has Been Ignored

The Broadwaters are not merely of local interest. Their national value was showcased in two seasons of the BBC's "Springwatch", where presenters like Chris Packham regularly filmed and praised this area's biodiversity and scenic beauty. In Episode 1 of Springwatch 2017, at timestamp 40:46, you can see the Broadwaters in their former glory. I encourage you to view this footage online.

BBC News Coverage of Sherborne Park Estate - August 2014

Today, this once-prized landscape has become a brown, stagnant swamp with little water remaining-allowed to decay through inaction.

Inadequate Visual Evidence and Lack of Transparency

The Trust's proposal offers no meaningful visual comparison of the Broadwaters' past, present, and proposed future. While some images are indexed, they lack dates and do not reflect the true scale of degradation. I personally photographed the area in October 2025, and the difference is stark-yet, there is no channel through which public photographic evidence can be submitted as part of the consultation. This absence of visual transparency is deeply concerning.

Additionally, several links to documents have not worked and the first two pages of the application itself are not filled out. I have taken screen shots about these omissions and link failure but have

no way to submit them

The beautiful landscaped Georgian lakes at the heart of Sherborne Park have been

neglected for many years. The failure to dredge under the National Trust's ownership has resulted in the open waters of the two lakes, which were a haven for wildlife, becoming clogged with silt and suffocated with weeds, undermining one of the most beautiful, protected landscapes in the Cotswolds which consequently now needs substantial investment to restore. There seems to be no evidence that turning the east end of this landscape to turn into marsh - as seems to be the essence of this experimental proposal - would offer any solution to this problem and is likely only to make it worse.- The site is Grade II listed and in a wider conservation area. The proposal risks damage to both

the water features and structures (the two lakes, the bridge, the boathouse, the weir) on the site.- The site is clearly a valuable amenity to both locals and the increasing number of visitors to the village, central to the experience of the village. The proposal risks damage to the amenity.- The existing Georgian landscaping is fortunately officially protected, clearly requires that protection, and is likely to be damaged by the execution of this proposal were the Council able to override it.

I am writing to object to the proposed wetland works on the following grounds:

1. Change in the characteristics of a grade 2 listed parkland from open water to "swamp".
2. There has been no consideration of the impact of flooding on the other properties that lie on the north and south sides of the river.
3. There has been interaction with the local Parish council but the NT seem to have ignored the Parish Council's endorsed statement that the Broadwater are of Community Heritage significance.
4. The development prevents the use of the Permissive Access which was granted to the local residents by Lord Sherborne. This access was to use Fisherman's Bridge (also known as Gamekeepers Bridge) and is included in the National Trust "Sherborne Estate" Tenants Handbook.

My objection is based upon the impact on the Conservation Area and how the proposed works will impact upon the Grade II Listed parkland associated with Sherborne House.

The proposals will cause irreversible damage to the existing landscape if the river banks are eroded. The Applicant has, since their tenure, neglected the river and their plans, to let nature take its course, will further impact upon the Listed setting and landscape which are core to the Sherborne Estate.

Additional flooding will further limit access to the public and local residents. The proposal is aimed at reducing sediment in Sherborne Brook and enhancing local biodiversity however, prior to the National Trust's ownership the Brook was dredged and levels of silting up were managed, allowing for large fish stocks and wildlife.

The land along the valley already appears neglected in large areas (where it previously provided fertile grazing land). The National Trust do not appear to have shared their Conservation Management Plan and it is therefore unclear how the area is to be maintained going forward.

Surely, any proposals for a scheme that impacts the Listed Parkland must provide details of management going forward which should be available to the public and taken into account in decision-making process.

I purchased ABCDE House in ABCD primarily for its outstanding view across the field directly below the property and outstanding scene of the River (Broadwater) Sherborne with its waterbirds and wild life. The whole area was exceptionally maintained but gradually the NT elected to cease all maintenance.

The NT have provided details in their design and access statement on how damaging the development will be to the existing environment. It will dramatically change the open views and landscape setting as a result of the woodlands becoming wetter, the low laying field below my house becoming even more sodden which will significantly alter the character and Listed heritage assets' setting by incorporating unnatural human made development.

This application significantly affects not only the Listed heritage assets, but the very heart of the village and the Brook in the valley bottom.

I wonder if the Councillors or Planning Officers have ever seen or are aware of what was once the most beautiful and greatest asset of the listed Sherborne -the Broadwater. It used to be a great pleasure to behold for villagers and numerous visitors taking a walk along the village road or others driving through en route.

I have to write that I have watched the continual degrading of the valley (Broadwater) and it is a disgrace that this once beautiful area has been totally neglected over the past 15 years by the National Trust, through lack of maintenance and dredging.

The historical importance of this application and its negative impact on the listed parkland are far greater than the NT is willing to consider.

Without question this application will result in a significant detrimental impact on the traditional and historic landscape park setting.

Finally, the application site is on a GRADE II LISTED REGISTERED PARKLAND and deserves to be protected from the intrusive development of lowering the existing flood plain over such a large area. The introduction of material into an open river and channel, engineered bank lowering, partial blocking of the footbridge and levelling of the topography and landscape to fulfil the NT plans is HARMFUL to the listing settings.

I very strongly recommend that rather than destroy the Broadwater, the river be dredged sufficiently to remove the height from which weeds can grow to and above the surface, remove all the rushes and weeds along either side of the river and the overhanging trees trimmed back to reveal the Broadwater which was so attractive 15 years ago.

Having read the comments of my neighbour, I can only say that he has said everything that I would have said and I fully concur with everything he wrote, I sincerely hope that his comments will have some effect,

The area impacted by this planning application forms part of the Grade II listed historic

parkland of the Sherborne Park Estate. The Brook, including the Broadwaters, is part of the 18th century landscape designed as such to be enjoyed by residents and visitors. It isn't just the flora that people can enjoy, but the multitude of fauna that the landscape is home to, both permanently and as a temporary stop for migrating birds etc.

The National Trust carried out a project some years ago, to give them a better understanding of what was important to both the residents and visitors of Sherborne. The project was called "Spirit of Place", and following a very well represented survey, the Brook came out as the most important feature of the village. It was thought at the time that the results of the survey would feed into the future maintenance plans of the National Trust. However, the 'neglect' of the Brook over the last 10 years has led to this most important part of the village landscape being almost unrecognisable to its original design.

I have lived in the village for almost 16 years and during the first 5 or so years, almost every visitor I spoke to mentioned the outstanding beauty of the Brook. I have heard no such comments for many years. Surely it is inappropriate to 'reimagine' a grade II listed landscape in the manner proposed by the National Trust. This will change the important historical features which will then be lost forever.

The village already has wetlands which should support exactly the flora and fauna that this project is aimed at. These water meadows too, appear to not have had the maintenance that is needed to ensure the site continues to prosper as an ecological haven.

Should the planning application be successful, not only will a valuable Grade II historic landscape be lost, but as there is no mention of maintenance in the documentation, it is likely that this too, will deteriorate over time in much the same way as the water meadows and other important features of the estate. I do not believe that the visual impact of these works is minor or neutral as the consultants claim, but the opposite. The impact of these works will change the designed and protected landscape forever. Future generations will not be able to enjoy the historical significance of the Broadwater because it will cease to exist.

I believe that aside from the damage of a Grade II listed landscape, the proposal will breach several policies within the Cotswold District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, namely:

EN1 Built, Natural and Historic Environment - the protection and enhancement of historic assets. This policy should be directing the National Trust towards restoring the Brook and then maintaining it.

EN4 Wider Natural and Historic Landscape - the proposal will cause significant continuing detriment to the landscape, rather than reversing its current deteriorated state.

EN5 Cotswolds Natural Landscape - This policy places a statutory duty on the National Trust to conserve and enhance the scenic beauty. This application is surely in breach of this requirement.

EN10 and EN11 Cultural Heritage and the Historic Environment - again this policy is there to ensure that areas of significance such as this are preserved and enhanced, not changed into something entirely different that may cause loss of the features that led to the Grade II listing.

For the above reasons, I hope that the Council refuses the application and urges the National Trust to restore and maintain the Brook and Broadwaters to ensure the historical, listed significance is not lost.

Historically this has been one of the most beautiful views in the village of Sherborne,

sadly now very neglected. Back in the day when it was well cared for, it was teeming with wildlife. As a grade 2 listed area I can only think that the National Trust are trying to legally justify this neglect.

I very much reject this application

The residents of Sherborne have watched with both horror and sadness at the loss of the once open Broadwater as it has declined and become clogged with weeds, silt and overgrowth. The once ornamental water feature, a design from the 18th century, was central to the character of the Sherborne valley and one that residents and the many visitors to the village, always marvelled at sadly today however, the view from the public road and footpaths presents a very different picture. It is no longer an open, reflective expanse of water, one that had high aesthetic and heritage value, but an expanse of water that is more bog like in character. As residents we question the motivation behind this application - is this not the final attempt to walk away from their duty to maintain and preserve this landscape? They recognise it will take much work to restore it to its former glory - to overturn their shameful neglect over the years. The National Trust is guilty of not conserving or enhancing the scenic beauty of the area - and we notice that there is no plan to reinstate the area to its former glory or to offer a comprehensive plan for the maintenance and restoration of the area. It has failed in its stewardship - the current proposal offers little evidence that the Broadwater is safe in their hands moving forward. We urge the Council to refuse this application.

I wish to object to the proposed plan by the National Trust concerning the Sherborne Broadwater.

We have lived here for twelve years and during that time we have seen a beautiful Grade 2 listed Broadwater turn into a swamp. We have learned from neighbours and friends in the village, who have lived here for decades, that when the estate was owned by Lord Sherborne the Broadwater was regularly dredged of silt, allowing free-flowing open water clear of weeds. Sadly, neglect and bad management have allowed a buildup of silt and the resultant swamp. This is symptomatic of other areas of neglect in the estate such as crumbling walls and the poor state of some of the NT houses in the village. One only has to compare the Sherborne estate with the two privately owned and beautifully maintained private estates either side, Barrington and Haycroft.

The primary reason for the National Trust proposal is to manage silt entering the Broadwater; there doesn't appear to be any mention of reducing the silt that is already there. Rather than spending a huge, as yet undisclosed, sum of money on this proposal, the National Trust should first stop all silt entering the water, and having achieved that, dredge the lakes and river.

The proposal says it will take account of the historic landscape character and there will be no significant detrimental impact. This sounds good, but who will judge this and how will it be evaluated?

The proposal says the development will conserve and enhance biodiversity. Again, this sounds good, but how will this be measured and by whom?

The proposal ignores the effect the creation of a wetland will have on local residents property and land. It does highlight the risk of flooding; a serious threat, which should be a red flag.

As mentioned above, there is no mention at all of the costs involved in this proposal. Does the

National Trust have the funds to finance this?

There is no mention about how this will all be managed in the future and by whom. Does the National Trust know how many people this would involve and at what cost?

In conclusion, I urge you most strongly to refuse this proposal.

In the Sherborne River we have a well documented 18 century riverscape of historical significance, turning it into a wetland is not a legacy that Lord Sherborne would have wished when he handed the estate to the National Trust in 1987. Wetlands are fine in their place but not flooding an area of such parkland significance. Baffles for flood prevention have been tried in this area before and not been successful. The river area needs dredging as in past years. Once a wetland is established we will have lost all the bird migrations on the Upper Water .It could be construed as an act of rural vandalism and I would urge the Council and the National Trust to think again, preserve what they have got in terms of unique parkland and once open lakes ,and suggest something different.

I object to this application as it will result in a significant detrimental impact on the traditional and historical landscape park setting.

I wish to object to the proposed plans by the National Trust concerning The Broadwater, Sherborne.

This 18th-century water feature, situated within Grade II listed parkland, is an important part of Sherborne's historic and natural heritage. It has already suffered from years of neglect due to the lack of regular maintenance and dredging.

The proposed works would risk further damaging this valued landscape. Without appropriate long term management, The Broadwater would inevitably deteriorate into an overgrown, stagnant area, losing its historic and ecological character.

A comparable example undertaken by the NT can be seen in the Sherborne Water Meadows project, which was restored but later left to decline. The same outcome here would be both irresponsible and irreversible.

I therefore urge the council to refuse this application and instead promote the proper conservation and maintenance of The Broadwater in line with its listed status and environmental importance.

I wish to formally object to the proposed works described as the "wetland enhancement project" at Sherborne Brook and the Broadwater. While I fully support nature restoration in principle, this application presents significant heritage, evidential, and procedural concerns that must be addressed before any consent is granted.

1. Insufficient Heritage Consideration

The Broadwater and its surrounding parkland form part of a Grade II Registered Historic Landscape, designed and refined over centuries and representing an important example of 18th-19th century landscape architecture within the Sherborne Estate. The current proposal risks further deviation from the original design intent rather than restoring it. The

degraded state of the Broadwater is not the result of natural processes but of long-term mismanagement and neglect, visible not only in the Broadwater but across the wider estate.

Importantly, the Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (JBA, 2024) explicitly limits its scope to "the immediate environs of the Brook" and confirms that it does not provide a full study of the historic context of Sherborne House or the wider parkland. This means the assessment omits many of the designed and visual relationships that define the Broadwater's cultural significance. The report also identifies that final construction methods and locations for key features (e.g., bank lowering and woody debris structures) are subject to later contractor method statements, leaving their impact on the historic fabric undefined at this stage. Consequently, any claim of "minor or neutral" heritage effect is premature. Furthermore, the assessment recognises that the Broadwater and its upper pool are deliberately designed features-not natural wetlands-integral to the 19th-century picturesque landscape composition attributed to William Sawrey Gilpin. Interventions should therefore aim to conserve the historic form and aesthetic of these waterbodies, not replace them with a speculative "rewilded" alternative. A full Heritage Impact Assessment, including setting and visual analysis, should be undertaken before determination, ensuring that both the design intent and experiential qualities of this unique landscape are properly understood and preserved.

2. Absence of Historical and Environmental Evidence

No evidence has been provided demonstrating how ecological or hydrological conditions have changed over time. Without long-term data or historic baselines, the design appears assumption-led rather than evidence-based. A credible restoration should be guided by comparative mapping, hydrological records, and archival material reflecting the site's historic configuration.

3. Limitations of the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

The Sherborne Brook Restoration - Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment relied on a single field survey (3 March 2023). Such an early-spring survey cannot capture the full diversity of flora and fauna. A proper baseline would require multi-seasonal surveys over several years. This limitation makes the projected "22% biodiversity uplift" speculative rather than proven.

4. Heritage Value Overlooked in Technical Reports

The technical documents describe the Broadwater merely as a "man-made lake controlled by weir structures," omitting its cultural and designed significance. This approach treats the landscape as purely ecological, disregarding its status as a constructed heritage feature. Biodiversity gain does not automatically deliver heritage restoration, and planning policy requires both to be addressed.

5. Lack of Management and Monitoring Plan

There is no published plan detailing how outcomes will be measured, maintained, or funded long term. The BNG report itself states that "a separate detailed management and monitoring plan will be required prior to implementation." Such a document should be made public before any determination, ensuring accountability to the local community and statutory consultees.

6. Community and Resident Impact

The proposed works appear likely to cause extended disruption to both wildlife and

residents, particularly through access restrictions, noise, and landscape alteration during construction. The community deserves clarity on construction duration, mitigation measures, and reinstatement commitments.

Conclusion

I respectfully request that Cotswold District Council either refuse or defer this application until: 1. A full Heritage Impact Assessment and verified hydrological model are provided; 2. The Biodiversity Net Gain claims are validated through seasonal field data; and 3. A transparent management and monitoring plan is shared with the public. Only then can the project demonstrate genuine restoration value-ecologically, historically, and socially.

I'm adding my own view to the Sherborne House Residents' Company objection. The plan from the National Trust reads like a set of limited works that deal with symptoms and ignore what's been lost.

The Broadwater used to define this part of Sherborne. You could see open water, reflection, movement. Now it's weeds and silt. That didn't happen by chance. It happened because the Trust stopped looking after it. What's proposed now would lock that decline in, not reverse it.

There's a chance here to do something that matters. Bring the Broadwater back. Dredge it, shape it, look after it. Restore it as a part of a historic, significant designed landscape. The proposal is short-term thinking dressed up as conservation.

Sherborne Brooke is in dire need of dredging in order to retain the beauty and health of the brook. The National Trusts plan to let it continue to fill with weeds in order to make it a "wetland" is not in keeping with the historical significance of Sherborne Brooke. In addition the National Trusts plan ruins the look of the meandering water that was designed to beautify the area of Sherborne Village as well as to enhance natural habitat of trout, waterfowl such as Swans, wild animals such as deer, birds, insects, fawn and flora.

I cannot imagine losing the brooke to a marsh. It is not acceptable.

I write in objection to the proposed plan. I am particularly concerned about the dismissal of the importance of the heritage landscape.

Some years ago the National Trust provided this sentence, an extract from their own internal Heritage Assessment:

(Gregory A. - National Trust - Sherborne Statement of Heritage Significance, 2013)

Quote "Views into and out of the village, especially those that take in the Sherborne Brook - an 18th century formal landscape of lakes and cascades - should be considered especially significant." Unquote

This is a very clear internal assessment that is worthy of consideration by the NT today, however inconvenient to their current plans. It is of note that subsequently they refused to share the full 2013 heritage statement.

Having looked through the application documentation it is clear that as well as ignoring their own internal statement of heritage significance, they do not appear to have considered the community's own Statement of Heritage Significance, endorsed by the Parish Council two years ago.

Putting aside the technical aspects of this project, the heritage aspects of the locale are vitally important and deserve much more careful consideration. Heritage affects every member of the community, and it is disappointing that the NT appears to give it so little value in 2025.

I wish to register my objection to the proposed works affecting the Broadwater and the surrounding areas of Sherborne Park Estate.

My family has farmed in Sherborne since the early 1940s, and I have lived here since 1949. I can clearly recall that the brook was dredged every few years, which kept the water flowing freely and the Broadwater clear of weeds, silt, and sediment. Following dredging, the material was spread across adjacent land, enriching the pasture and supporting the agricultural landscape.

The proposal to flood the woodland and pasture on both sides at the east end of Sherborne Estate Park appears, in my view, to be inappropriate and counterproductive. It risks leaving the brook overgrown, obstructed, and unsightly, rather than restoring it as a well-maintained watercourse.

This area forms part of a Grade II listed historic parkland, designed for the quiet enjoyment of both residents and visitors. In my opinion, the proposed works will not enhance the setting or character of the park, but rather detract from its beauty and heritage value.

Furthermore, I understand that significant expenditure-reportedly tens of thousands of pounds-has already been incurred on this project. These funds would have been far better allocated to dredging and maintaining the brook, which would improve water flow, encourage wildlife, and restore the Broadwater as an attractive and ecologically balanced feature within the landscape.

For these reasons, I urge the relevant authorities to reconsider the proposal and prioritise practical conservation measures that reflect the historical management of the site and its enduring value to the local community.

Although I do not currently reside in Sherborne, my family that has historical links to Sherborne via my late grandmother back to the 1600's.

My G Grandfather was the Head Electrical engineer at Sherborne Turbine in the late 1800's early 1900's producing the first electricity for Sherborne House. This electricity was produced from the water flowing from the two 18th century ornamental lakes i.e. The Broadwater and the Narrow Water.

My Grandfather was the last Groom for Lord Sherborne in the mid to late 1920's

My father (born and buried in Sherborne) and my late brother (resided in Sherborne most of his life) were Master Builders and over the years carried out repairs, renovations and roofing work on probably all the houses, farms, the church, Sherborne House and Lodge Park. My father was the chairman of the parish council for a many years.

I was raised in Sherborne, christened in Sherborne, went to school in Sherborne, played for Sherborne Rovers Football Club and married in Sherborne Church and all my family going back generations are buried in the churchyard. Sherborne is in my blood. So, with my background and ancestry in the village, I think that I am qualified as a due stakeholder of the village. For the record, I am also a North Cotswold constituency voter.

I vehemently object to the planning application.

When Lord Sherborne passed away in the 1980's, in his will he gifted the village to the now incumbents that is for free 'Gratis' on the understanding that they maintained the village of

Sherborne to the same standard as he left it.

This proposed swamp goes against everything that Lord Sherborne and his ancestors created, that is, in the 18th century, they constructed two Ornamental lakes, the Broad Water and the Narrow Water along with two beautiful waterfalls. The field bordering the lakes to the south of the Narrow Water will be destroyed by this planning application. This field (as long as I can remember) has always been grazed by sheep. Grazed by sheep What does that tell us? It tells us that this field and the surrounding fields bordering the Ornamental lakes were fertile pastureland and not overly wet. As is commonly known sheep can get foot rot grazing land that is too wet. In pre mediaeval times, Sherborne was well known for sheep and the washing of their fleeces with the fuller's earth that was so abundant in the village. So why is the incumbent trying to create a marsh on such fertile land? Perhaps the money would be better spent on restoring and using the fields bordering the lakes for grazing rather than trying to change the ecology of the area?

In recent times there has been an overtopping event near the Boathouse and Turbine (this is derelict as well), this is the area particularly affected by this planning application. The overtopping can only be put down to the silt and weeds in both the Narrow Water and the Broad Water. In fact, if you tried to use the boat in the Boathouse you would only be able to punt a few yards upstream before becoming stuck in the weeds, rather than the three or four hundred yards to the upper waterfall. The Ornamental Lakes and the waterfall were the focal point of the village, but now they are blocked with silt and weeds, these lakes should be an open expanse of water, perhaps the money for this planning application could be diverted to dredging the 18th century Ornamental Lakes instead? Lord Sherborne used to dredge both the Broad Water and Narrow Water on a regular basis, I don't think the incumbents have dredged the lake in the last 35 years or so, why not? Do they have a plan to render the Ornamental lakes extinct? What happened to "maintaining the village as I leave it bit? They have not maintained it at all!

Indeed, via the naked eye, the area bordering the lakes and the park north of the river can only be described as derelict, yes derelict, a Grade Two listed parkland derelict. Both lakes blocked and full of silt and weeds, fallen trees and branches everywhere, left where they fell, the Grade 2 listed Sheafhouse with the roof caving in, nettles and thistles everywhere, abandoned.....Why? More importantly, how have the incumbents been able to get away with it?

Going further afield, maybe the money for this trivial project, could be used to renovate the numerous houses in the village that lay dormant and uninhabitable..... yes prime housing stock unused. Why is this allowed to happen when there are many youngsters looking to rent property in the area?

Or maybe the money could be used to repair the Cotswold stone wall that runs throughout the village that is in urgent need of repair?

Or maybe spent on the keeping the verges tidy?

Or maybe, tidying up the fallen trees and branches?

Or maybe used to house some tenant farmers to utilise the fields surrounding Sherborne that lay idle. No grazing, no arable crops, do they think food is only produced in supermarkets?

Or maybe, they could return Sherborne to the people that really care about Sherborne and its historical past? Gratis of course?

I am writing to object to the planning application above.

I am emailing you because I want to include images to explain my objection and I can't add these on the online form. Our family has owned Elm Tree Cottage in Sherborne for over 50 years and we look out directly over the area in the proposed scheme.

This is the view we used to have - 1970/80s when the water in the Brook was clear and visible from our house.

This is today's view (image taken 11/10/25)

To the left of this view there's an area that was until recently tall trees. The National Trust decided that the trees needed to be removed and we were left with the view below (image taken 25/01/25). I complained to the NT that this looked terrible and they promised that further work would be done to make good the area. Nothing has happened to date.

I have studied the plans for the new planning submission (25/02583/FUL) and used AI to create an image of what the area would look like from our house.

The image below is what is proposed.

The beautiful, well maintained, natural landscape we saw when we first started coming to Sherborne has deteriorated significantly over the years through neglect.

Now we are faced with a new, in my opinion hideous, man made landscape with tree trunks scattered across it. I therefore object to the proposed scheme.

The creation of a wetland is not a good idea. Many people are upset about the neglect of the area under NT trusteeship and I agree. Please restaure our beautiful broadwater.

I believe that the true age and heritage of the Sherborne Brook Open Water, a Grade 2 Listed Landscape, is not fully understood by the National Trust. It was also a key part of the Conservation Master Plan, that they have been working on for a long time.

They first announced work on the Broadwater Project over 3 years ago, and advised they would be undertaking a desk top survey and modelling of the Sherborne Brook. I understand that there has been at least one additional iteration to the modelling in that period.

The content of the CMP Plan, has still to be shared with the village, and has been promised many times, with dates continually being out back.

There were two presentations about the proposed Broadwater plan, followed by a visit to the Broadwater fairly soon afterwards, which were presented as a plan that was being submitted for planning permission, rather than for discussion.

At the presentations, two phases to the project were advised, funded from the Sherborne Estate, but at the Broadwater visit, it became apparent that there was a third phase, that would require external funding. This shows that consultation with the village has not been well handled or accurate.

With the current pressure on housing in the UK, there are at least 8 homes in Sherborne, which are empty - some for over 2 years - and it is possible that the money for this project in the short term, could be better utilised in improving the housing stock?

I am no environmental expert, but with the change in local conditions, with tree felling that is going on, along with more sustained periods of rain, I do not think that the Consultants have considered all these options, since their work in April 2024, and therefore this undermines some of the information they have presented, and needs to be reviewed again, before this planning application

can be fully considered.

Some work further up river, has removed a lot of silt from entering the Broadwater, and recent work on clearing grips, to reduce the silt running into the river, has only just been undertaken, and awaits the Highway Agency to do their part. We need to see how effective this work is, as it may make some of the work in this area, unnecessary, and therefore the plan would need to be resubmitted.

Nowhere has any mention of the amount of open water being created by this project being stipulated, which is a concern, as I suspect that it will take unto 7 years to see the result of their wetland project. This is if the project is actually completed, as National Trust, locally, have a record of not completing work or projects, to either financial issues, or change in policy directions.

It is clear that work needs too be undertaken on Sherborne Open Water, but the direction this is proposing, is flawed, I understand that the Parish Council is undertaking a independent Hydrological Assessment, and that this planning application should be refused, and at the very least held, pending a review of this assessment, and further work on the possibility of flooding that may occur, should it proceed in its current form

I wish to object to the National Trust's planning application for the development of a wetland habitat in Sherborne. I have serious concerns about the potential impacts of this proposal. The proposal risks altering the historic landscape of the Grade II registered parkland; a significant heritage asset which is already under threat from degradation.

Lowering the floodplain would be to create a habitat that never existed in this location, and the extensive and invasive works would be extremely detrimental to existing wildlife and the community.

I believe there is insufficient evidence to support the efficacy of this plan and have concerns that this will merely compound the ongoing neglect by the National Trust of the Sherborne Brook and Broadwater.

How is the success of the project going to be measured, and if the proposal does not have the desired result, does the National Trust have the resources to put into place an alternative scheme to bring back the Sherborne Brook to its former glory.

We have been associated with Sherborne House, Sherborne since 1981 and been owners since 1998 and have witnessed first hand the precipitous decline of the beautiful scenic Sherborne Brook. The National Trust has overseen this degradation with minimum interest or responsibility over several decades and now wants us to approve an unsubstantiated bandaid to the restoration and future maintenance of the Brook. We fully support all objection comments made and evidence provided thus far to the CDC. This issue is far too an important part of the heritage of this area for a speculative medium term plan to be chanced or approved. We reject most strongly to the proposed plan.

The brook is not a 'wetland' although it currently resembles a bog, it is open water. It must be returned to the clear broadwater that it was before the NT allowed it to silt up through neglect.

I am a long term Fellow of the Royal Geographic Society (RGS) and a resident of the village of Sherborne. It has been both sad & frankly shocking to witness the gradual silting up of our historically significant lakes on the river Sherborne (Windrush). Since the NT assumed responsibility for this, frankly there has been zero effort on the part of the NT to responsibly manage this historical area of great natural beauty. Both the Sherborne villagers and the public alike have suffered loss.. Previously the area was managed effectively with an understanding of the basic maintenance requirements to avoid silting. Photo's & stories abound of this pristine part of the Sherborne Estate where abundant varieties of wildlife including Swans thrived..Fishing was a joy...Due to the neglect of the NT, Swans are absent,.

The plan put forward by the NT has been very poorly conceived with little supporting evidence from experts who truly understand the area & its exceptional history.

Creating a wetland in this area risks multiple hazards in my view not the least of which is flooding and potential damage to property. This holds serious legal implications. Then there is the question of its impact on the historical fauna & flora of the area..

Interfering with an area settled for around two centuries is extremely unwise and I would counsel the NT to be wary of unintended consequences!

Surely, calm & rational heads can only conclude that the correct way forward for this area is to require the NT to manage it professionally & responsibly as of course it was historically, via periodic river /lake dredging to remove the silt and return the natural flow. This will encourage wildlife including fish and all other species ...

This would, I sincerely believe, be a good result for all, including the NT!

The title of this application, 'Wetland enhancement', is really misleading. It suggests improvement of a marsh or a bog. In fact it concerns what was a beautiful, well preserved, much loved, eighteenth century Grade II listed parkland. A landscape of national value.

Sherborne North Park is no longer that landscape. Photograph no 1 Appendix D of the Cultural Heritage Assessment document is out of date. There is now no open water left in the two lakes which have graced the parkland for so long. In the recent past The National Trust has simply failed to maintain them as they have been maintained for centuries.

If this application were to destroy a grade II listed building on the grounds that the owner didn't want to maintain it then it would be rejected without much thought - indeed, it is unlikely that the Trust would even contemplate it.

I hope that this application will be refused so that the Trust will then do what it proclaims on the first page of its website - 'Preserving the past. How we're protecting heritage for future generations'.

As Chairman of Sherborne Park Residents Company Ltd, the freeholder and management company representing the thirty resident owners of Sherborne House, I write to

object to the National Trust's application 25/02583/FUL concerning works to the Sherborne Brook and adjoining parkland within Sherborne Park.

Sherborne House (Grade II listed) and its 13-acre estate overlook the Brook and the man-made ornamental water feature known as the Broadwater, a designed element of the 18th-century landscape that is central to the character of the Sherborne valley and visible from the public road and footpaths used daily by residents and visitors. The works proposed by the National Trust directly affect this culturally and historically significant area of landscape, yet fail to demonstrate any commitment to its restoration or preservation.

Principal Concerns

The Broadwater-a man-made body of open water more than 250 years old-has been allowed to deteriorate severely since the National Trust ceased regular dredging and maintenance around fifteen years ago. What was once an open, reflective expanse of water of high aesthetic and heritage value is now clogged with weeds, silt, and overgrowth. The present application does not propose to reopen or restore this feature to its historic form. By permitting partial works without addressing the underlying neglect, the application risks entrenching long-term degradation rather than reversing it.

The application underestimates both the age and cultural significance of the Broadwater. It states the lakes were "likely constructed in the late 1700s/early 1800s," citing an 1815 Ordnance Survey drawing purportedly showing mills downstream. However, examination of that map shows no mills on the Sherborne Brook; the nearest are miles away on the River Windrush. No primary evidence is given for post-1770 construction. In contrast, primary sources-including the 1709 Kip drawing, the 1770 map showing two lakes, and estate records from 1739-1740 referring to a "new pond in Old Park"-strongly indicate that the Broadwater and its companion lake were created in the early to mid-18th century. The National Trust's dating is therefore unsound, leading to an underestimation of heritage value and policy weight.

Policy Non-Compliance

The proposals conflict with multiple Cotswold District Local Plan policies and with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

EN1 (Built, Natural and Historic Environment) - requires the protection and enhancement of historic assets. The scheme fails to enhance or restore a designed 18th-century water feature of clear heritage importance.

EN4 (Wider Natural and Historic Landscape) - prohibits development causing significant detrimental impact to landscape character. The ongoing deterioration of the Broadwater represents continuing harm that the proposals do not remedy.

EN5 (Cotswolds National Landscape) - establishes the statutory duty to conserve and enhance scenic beauty. Allowing the continued loss of an iconic water feature visible across the valley is inconsistent with that duty.

EN10 and EN11 (Cultural Heritage and the Historic Environment) - require preservation and enhancement of heritage significance. The Broadwater and associated structures are integral to the designed landscape of Sherborne Park, yet the application provides no cultural heritage impact assessment and no plan for reinstatement or maintenance.

Visual and Cultural Significance

The Broadwater has long served as a central visual and cultural landmark in the village, embodying the reflective and proportionate design principles of early landscape architecture. Its neglect is apparent to all who pass along the public road and footpath through Sherborne. The

"desk-based" cultural heritage assessment submitted with the application fails to capture this significance, relying on secondary sources and overlooking the public amenity and historic continuity that the open water provides. The argument that present degradation diminishes significance is circular: neglect does not erase cultural or aesthetic importance, and the remedy should be restoration, not acceptance of decline.

Cumulative Neglect

The deterioration of the Broadwater must also be viewed alongside other neglected parkland features-the sheaf houses, collapsing stone walls, and the decaying Old Park enclosure-which together demonstrate a wider pattern of insufficient stewardship. The consultants' claim that the visual impact of the works is "minor" or "neutral" is unsustainable when measured against this cumulative decline in one of the most important designed landscapes in the Cotswolds.

Conclusion and Requested Action

Sherborne Park Residents Company Ltd therefore objects to Application 25/02583/FUL on the following grounds:- The proposal fails to address or reverse the existing degradation of the Broadwater.- It offers no restoration plan for a 250-year-old man-made heritage feature central to the landscape's cultural identity.- It conflicts with Local Plan Policies EN1, EN4, EN5, EN10, and EN11, and the NPPF's principles

for conserving heritage and landscape character.- It undermines the statutory duty to conserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Cotswolds

National Landscape.

We respectfully urge the Council to refuse the application or defer it pending a comprehensive plan that:- Reopens the Broadwater to its historic extent;- Demonstrates clear benefit to the cultural heritage and landscape quality of Sherborne Park; and- Commits the applicant to ongoing maintenance and preservation.

Only a proposal that restores and maintains this historic designed water feature can be considered consistent with local and national planning policy.

As probably the oldest inhabitant of Sherborne and having lived here for 63years, I am extremely concerned about the above mentioned application from the National Trust.

II wonder if any of your councillors or current members of the National Trust ever saw or are aware or what was the most beautiful and greatest asset of the village- the Broadwater - a joy to behold for villagers and numerous visitors taking a walk along the street or others driving through.

I consider it an utter disgrace that this has been totally neglected over several decades by the National Trust, through lack of maintenance by dredging.

This beautiful stretch of water was dredged periodically in Lord Sherborne's time and thus maintained, not only for the benefit of people to behold but also for the bird, fish and insect life to prosper and where my late husband, the tenant farmer, grazed his beautiful young heifers and also his sheep, keeping it well grazed and tidily maintained.

The Broadwater dates back to the 18th century and is an important feature of the historic landscape and must not be obliterated by totally unnecessary, idiotic plans to transform it all into what would soon become a hideous swamp through lack of annual maintenance and thus deprive Sherborne of its greatest asset. This is the case when the National Trust decided to restore the Sherborne Water Meadows some 30 odd years ago - then, at vast expense and much publicity, they were restored with dredged ditches, repaired bridges and new sluice gates, etc. to a grand

opening, only to be neglected thereafter, and left to revert to a large unkempt meadow, full of scrub and weeds as it remains to this day.

It is inconceivable and irresponsible that you could possibly permit this very special feature of nature in historic Grade 2 listed parkland to be allowed to disappear and I therefore urge you to refuse planning permission.

This document provides more detail to the comments submitted online.

REFUSAL IS RECOMMENDED on grounds of fundamental application inadequacies making proper determination impossible. This application contains comprehensive technical failures and procedural breaches that prevent proper assessment.

Eight Critical Flaws require immediate refusal:

1. Critical Infrastructure Omitted

53-year legal water supply easement ignored despite NT knowledge.

2. Project Rationale Fundamentally Flawed

Expensive intervention for potentially solved problem.

3. Heritage Assessment Issues

Ignored primary sources and speculation with no sources.

4. Water Levels and Flood Risk Assessment Invalid

Obsolete baseline contradicted by documented site changes and demonstrable underestimation of Flood Risk.

5. Conservation Management Plan Withheld

Complete CMP excluded from consideration by the community.

6. Consultation Claims Unsubstantiated

Statutory bodies actual involvement may be less than it may appear.

7. Technical Adequacy Failures

No project performance criteria provided. No management plans going forward. Assessment of area of Grade II parkland misrepresented.

8. Legal Framework Compliance Failures

Enhanced heritage protection requirements ignored.

Recommendation: Application should be REFUSED.

Page 1 of 24

OBJECTOR CREDENTIALS

I am a retired engineer with landscape analysis expertise living in a property immediately adjacent to the project area, and a riparian landowner of the landscape next to the NT owned property under discussion. The plan appears to affect my property directly as well as the broader locale. I inspect the Brook once or twice daily and am uniquely familiar with its characteristics. I have studied the Brook, taken measurements and samples over an 18-year period, collected silt and associated data and assisted the EA in its studies of this portion of the Brook. I sit on the steering committee of the Windrush Catchment Partnership and I'm therefore familiar with a number of related issues.

This objection is based on substantial technical evidence and demonstrated expertise in both catchment management and local heritage.

Page 2 of 24

EIGHT CRITICAL FLAWS IN DETAIL

1.

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OMISSION - REFUSAL REQUIRED

Legal Water Supply Easement Ignored

This represents a fundamental procedural inadequacy requiring immediate refusal. A 53-year legal easement providing essential water supply to my property runs directly through the proposed excavation area. Despite NT knowledge of this infrastructure (documented through multiple discussions, site visits, etc), their consultants were not briefed, plan to bulldoze scrapes exactly where the pipeline lies, and the application makes no provision for protection of the water supply or suggests alternate arrangements or negotiation. Here's an extract from that deed showing the route of the water supply and beside it an extract from the NT planning applications.

1972 Deed extract (full version at Annex A). On these I have highlighted the course of the water pipeline from A-B-X in yellow on both documents.

The Hazards & Constraints Plan confirms systematic site investigation failure:

- Utilities shown in the application as "approximate and for guidance only".
- "Contractor will confirm location...prior to commencement of works".
- No specific utility assessment despite known easement.
- If JBA had been informed of the presence of the water supply, they would not have plans to bulldoze Scrape No 1 and probably the bank lowering where it is which appears to threaten the water supply.

Evidence:

- Legal easement documentation (1972) between Lord Sherborne and property owner. See Annex A for a full copy.
- Site plans showing water supply crossing proposed scrape location and bank lowering location.

Page 3 of 24

- The existence of this plan and the route of the water supply is well known and the subject of extensive (and positive) discussion between me and NT employees going back to 2010. At a NT request in about 2012 I provided them with a copy of the deed which they had lost. Extensive discussions took place (which can be evidentially supported with email correspondence about the route of this supply - Emails DAVIES-BARTER 2010-2020). There were extensive (positive) email exchanges and a site meeting on 16 November 2023 between myself and NT employees (Mr Nicholas and Ms Lindsay) when the route of the water supply was marked out in orange tape, as a potential constraint for tree felling operations that took place in following days (17-19 November 2023). If the known and accepted presence of the water supply service was an issue for tree felling it is impossible to understand why it is not an issue for bulldozing scrapes with a significant risk of rupture.

Planning Implications:

- Incomplete application - essential utility infrastructure assessment missing.
- Legal rights ignored - established easements unaddressed.
- Professional failure - inadequate site investigation despite knowledge.
- Neighbours (me and my family) concerned about their right to water and this

right seemingly deliberately ignored.

Page 4 of 24

2.

PROJECT RATIONALE FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED

Lack of Silt Source Analysis - Problem May No Longer Exist

The application proposes reducing silt accumulation in the lakes but completely fails to examine actual silt sources and whether the problem still exists following recent changes to the water catchment. This represents a fundamental project inadequacy. There is no data provided on any assessed rate of silt deposition, flow rates, its sources and the variables involved.

The application specifically and starkly ignores two original critical silt sources that have been addressed and in a third area crucially mischaracterizes it.

a. Upstream Silt Source Already Controlled

Haycroft Lake dredging (600m upstream) recently (within 5 years) created an effective silt capture environment. Since this intervention:

- Downstream silt flow is now observed as minimal.
- The Brook is entirely clear even after heavy rainstorm events at project area.
- There is no examination of this key factor in project paperwork, no suggestion this issue has been addressed or even considered. Even an assumption that silt remains an issue is not even stated. There has been plenty of time for the NT or their consultants to take observations.

Direct Riparian Observations: As an adjacent property holder conducting daily inspections over three/four years since upstream dredging, I have observed significant reduction in suspended silt (virtually none present).

Impact: The primary silt source may already be controlled, which questions the entire project purpose. The proposal makes an unstated assumption that silt remains a problem, without any characterization of it. For an expensive project impacting a Grade II listed parkland, this omission makes the proposition very weak. Refusing the application will save the NT a significant financial sum.

b. Road Runoff Recently Addressed

Waterloo Bridge road runoff (from both the North and South) was recently solved through a joint effort forcing road runoff into grips, ditches and woodland.

- Problem recently addressed through alternative intervention.
- Application fails to assess current effectiveness.
- No baseline comparison of pre/post road runoff management.

Direct observations: In the two months since road runoff management implemented, there has been complete absence of usual detritus and mud from road sources.

Impact: Secondary silt source appears effectively controlled through recent intervention.

Page 5 of 24

c. Spring Water Mischaracterized as Field Runoff

Critical technical error: Consultants have mischaracterised clear spring water as silt laden field runoff.

Evidence:

- Ancient spring line marked on OS maps, see:

https://open.substack.com/pub/sherbornebrooksupportgroup/p/sherbornes-125m-spring-line?r=3elqv3&utm_campaign=post&utm_medium=web&showWelcomeOnShare=false

- The building in the NE corner of Elm Tree Cottage at w3w:///punchy.catch.crusaders is even constructed to hold a “well” fed by this spring line. The issuance from this spring runs into the ditch the project plans to block.
- This is clear spring water year-round, not seasonal or weather driven field runoff.
- This is part of 125m contour spring line – a natural clean water source.
- The stated intention by the NT in their briefings suggested blocking the ditch between W3W///dine.defining.gazes and spouse.merit.flap was to take “field drainage” containing silt etc into the wetland after occasional heavy weather instances. But it is very clear that the actual original purpose of the ditch is to take clean spring water to the Brook 365 days a year. Indeed it is the blocking of this ditch due to poor maintenance that seems to have caused the area around w3w ///rezoning.package.shaves to become saturated in recent years – it was formerly dry meadow.

Impact: The scrapes are described as being filled with silt laden water from the Brook and the field run-off after weather events perhaps twice a year. But by blocking the ditch, the scrapes etc will be filled with clean spring water 365 days a year for no purpose. This may also prevent silt laden water entering the scrapes on those days it might be required. This is therefore a fundamental flaw in the proposal.

Page 6 of 24

Project Pursuing Solution to Solved Problem

Summary: This expensive intervention addresses a problem that is:

- Mainly already solved through upstream lake dredging.
- Recently addressed through road runoff management.
- Mischaracterized through weak technical analysis.

Impact: The fundamental project justification fails – this is an expensive heritage damaging intervention for a potentially non-existent problem. The project should be rejected on these grounds alone. At the very least the NT should conduct a data driven silt examination of the brook before being given permission to proceed.

Of particular note is a comment made by the NT at the 9 July 2025 Meeting. The minutes of that meeting have been omitted from the application. It was suggested to the NT that monitoring the silt in the brook should take place first before the project was begun to gauge the efficacy. It was explained by the local NT management team that their Board was exerting “incredible pressure” to proceed. Elsewhere the NT management described being under pressure to “do something”. It seems therefore that the NT board pressure is a more significant factor than actual silt presence in the Brook.

The NT claims that flood plain intervention reduces the level of intervention required to subsequently get the lakes clear but there is no evidence provided to support this assertion.

3.

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT - Challenged

Century-Spanning Dating Errors, With Ignored Primary Sources

The NT application contains fundamental contradictions about lake construction dates spanning over 100 years:

Design and Access Statement contradicts itself:

- Claims lakes "likely constructed in the late 1700's / early 1800's" for "amenity purposes".
- Later states construction in early 19th century to provide a head of water for mills downstream shown on 1815 Ordnance survey plan. The Ordnance Survey plan quoted is at this link:
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Ordnance_Survey_Drawings#/media/File:002osd000000020u00116000.jpg
- Examination of this map shows no mills on the Sherborne brook – the first mill is at Windrush, on the River Windrush, miles downstream and two further mills at Barrington. The hydraulic engineering justification for saying that two impounded bodies of water on the Sherborne Brook could usefully power mills in Windrush and Barrington is extremely doubtful, given the volumes of water available in the Windrush. The application provides no primary sources to further this claim, and specifically none indicating construction after 1770.
- In contrast there are several primary sources suggesting that the two lakes (the Broadwater and the Narrow-water) are much earlier. These are detailed here:
- https://open.substack.com/pub/sherbornebrooksupportgroup/p/cartographic-analysis-dating-the-lakes-in-sherborne-a-challenge?r=3elqv3&utm_campaign=post&utm_medium=web
- <https://sherbornebrooksupportgroup.substack.com/p/dating-the-lakes-in-sherborne-a-challenge>
- In particular note the apparent presence of two lakes on the 1770 map, the presence of a sluice and weir on the 1709 Kip drawing (exactly where the sluice and weir exist today) and the primary source evidence in estate archives for building a "new" pond in Old Park in 1739/1740. "Pond" was the way of describing lakes in the early to mid-18th C. Also consider the lack of mills on Sherborne Brook on the 1815 Ordnance Survey drawing referenced in the application.

Community Heritage Significance Statement (2023) ignored:

- Produced by community and endorsed by Parish Council
- This document contains detailed heritage analysis by the community
- Not considered by NT consultants despite being key stakeholder input.
- This document is available at this link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/pgryp7b9bvck1938grybr/HeritageStatement-Sherborne-Brook-Final-March2023.pdf?rlkey=zvetlil2bx3isjlrupa1gzmd0&dl=0>

As an aside, perhaps, there is clearly the remains of a riverside masonry structure at the point indicated on the aerial image below. This is not mentioned in the heritage

assessments which is odd – it is plain to see for anyone walking the bank at this crucial point. It should be highlighted as a potential site of archaeological interest.

Page 9 of 24

4.

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT - FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED

Technical Baseline Completely Obsolete

Critical Failure: The NT's Flood Risk Assessment (25 November 2024) uses baseline conditions that no longer exist.

Major storm (late November 2024) caused fundamental site changes:

- Two large oak trees blown into brook at W3W [///insects.forgiving.orders.](#) and [///bolts.dispensed.jetting](#) plus significant branches and debris. Typical autumnal debris and leaves have been trapped by the tree debris, blocking the surface of the water completely and raising water levels clearly. I have added the location of these fallen trees to the application plan here in green:
- This summer (2025), water levels at the point just upstream of these fallen trees, a crucial part of the plan, have been raised above the normal summer level by about 150mm even after a drought. I have raised this with the NT in a number of documented emails and at the meeting of 9 July 2025. Given the calculation of water height levels is crucial for the entire bank lowering, deflectors, leaky dam and depth of scrapes, this unaddressed change in the baseline conditions is most important and logically the plan needs to change,

Page 10 of 24

or the fallen debris removed from the Brook, which the NT have specifically told me they will not do. Thus, the project plan is fundamentally and demonstrably working from incorrect baseline data.

- The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) details a point on page 6, on my land, where it displays the consultant's calculation for a 1 in 100 year flood event, including an extra 43% margin for climate change. This then is the extreme "worst case" for the "after-project" situation. The image below is an extract from that page to which I have added a red arrow to one extreme point at [w3w \[///topic.available.nooks.\]\(#\)](#)

This calculation should assure me that any flooding of my land post project would be extremely rare. Regrettably, it has the opposite effect. Flooding has reached this point on my land 4 times in the last 13 months, on the following dates:

- 23 September 2024
- 23 November 2024
- 7/8 December 2024
- 25 January 2025

Page 11 of 24

Here is a photograph of this spot, flooded on 23 September 2024 (before the fallen trees raised the river level yet further):

The left of the image is the extreme point [w3w \[///topic.available.nooks.\]\(#\)](#) The Brook runs in the background.

Thus, hydraulic calculations relating to both the proposed plan in the application and the Flood Risk Assessment are clearly significantly impacted. This application

should be rejected on these grounds alone.

There are further issues with the FRA. I pointed out to the NT and JBA that the image on Page 9 of the FRA, which purports to show "Baseline vs. Restoration Flood Extents for the 2 Year and 100 Year Plus 43% Climate Change Return Period Upstream of Road Bridge", shows no such thing because the so called post "restoration" (it is NOT a restoration) flood extent obliterates the baseline. They agreed to redesign this diagram at the 9 July meeting but have failed to do so. This further concerns me, that they may be hiding the extent of the flood risk to my property. I have chased the NT by email (documented if required) but have yet to receive any reassurance.

Their application and failure to address the issues raised gives me no reassurance that my property will not be significantly flooded as a result of this project. The application gives no assurance that the hydrology of the proposed plan is still valid given the dynamic changes since November 2024.

The NT produced meeting notes from the 9 July 2025 meeting makes an action point for JBA to check their calculations against these observation. This has not been actioned to my knowledge. This failure in the consultation process further adds to my serious concerns.

Impact: Core flood storage calculations are invalid due to obsolete baseline, making proper determination impossible. The project should be rejected on these grounds alone.

Page 12 of 24

5.

CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN WITHHELD

Professional Guidance Deliberately Excluded

The Design and Access Statement in the application confirms: "The CMP has not at the time of writing been formally adopted by the National Trust, however the draft copy has been utilised in the preparation of this assessment"

This admission proves:

- CMP is complete and has informed NT's assessment. The application even dates this CMP as "2023".
- The document appears to have been deliberately withheld from public consultation.
- Asymmetric information - NT uses CMP while excluding CDC and community from considering it.

- The NT are relying on the CMP but at the same time not formally adopting it.

Oddly, a statement given by the NT at the 9 July meeting suggests that the plan was developed before the CMP and only the more recent heritage statement considered it, so there are further apparent contradictions within the application.

Given that the application clearly suggests in the heritage impact statement that the CMP states the lakes were formed on the Sherborne Brook to power mills miles down the Windrush, it is important that we see the detail in order to challenge this remarkable statement.

The NT admits this project requires CMP for heritage assessment yet refuses to share the document.

Impact: The public and CDC cannot assess heritage impact without a fundamental

guidance document that the NT confirms exists and has used in part but has not formally “adopted”.

Page 13 of 24

6.

CONSULTATION CLAIMS UNSUBSTANTIATED

Statutory Bodies Misrepresented

Formal detailed Historic England consultation on this project appears to not have taken place.

- The Application claims consultation with Jo McAllister at Historic England
- There have been recent direct, documented emails between myself and Ms

McAllister: McAllister has not seen detailed project plans or the CMP:

I note that in the Conclusion and Recommendations section of the “Sherborne Brook Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, part of the application (Page 41), a particular recommendation is this:

Quote: “Consultation with key stakeholders is recommended prior to the submission of a planning application, including the Conservation Officer for the Sherborne Conservation Area, Historic England, and the Gardens Trust.”

Unquote.

It is clear that the applicant has failed to follow their own recommendations for consulting. As well as Historic England, I have been in dialogue with the local branch (Glos and Avon) of the Gardens Trust and they too appear to be unsighted. Email documentation can be provided. There is also no apparent consultation with the Conservation Officer responsible for the Sherborne Conservation Area in the applications. The public rely on or give weight to the opinions of these statutory bodies and so the lack of detailed public-viewable consultation with these bodies demand that the application is rejected.

Windrush Catchment Partnership (WCP) Consultation

- In dialogue with the NT, they claimed consultation with WCP had occurred.
- As a WCP Steering Group member I have seen no such consultation.
- The WCP Coordinator requested to the NT to see detailed plans but was told briefings would occur “once the planning process is completed”.

Page 14 of 24

- Quote from the WCP coordinator: “I asked the NT to present their plans more fully, they explained that they preferred to wait until after communication with the community and the planning process, ...”
- This therefore is not useful consultation.

Missing Crucial Appendices - Application Incomplete

The Community Involvement Statement in the application explicitly references three crucial appendices:

- Appendix 1 - Sherborne Parish Council: Feedback to National Trust following 9th July JBA meeting
- Appendix 2 - Notes and actions from 9th July Meeting
- Appendix 3 - One page information document

These appendices are completely missing from the planning application submission.

This represents fundamental application inadequacy - key consultation evidence

referenced but not provided, making proper assessment of community engagement impossible.

Systematic Consultation Breach

Individual Project Level:

- In September 2023: At the request of the NT, I coordinated riparian landowners to a meeting with the NT. Three riparian owners were represented and others asked to be informed. The outline of a plan was discussed but no specific details were provided. The NT committed to producing minutes and also committed to ongoing engagement as plans for this project developed. Neither of these happened.
- A period of 21 months since that meeting there was no subsequent consultation until a predetermined plan was presented as fait accompli to the community in June 2025. Since that June 2025 meeting, where and I several others raised concerns, the plan has not changed nor have my concerns been addressed.
- The Community has had no opportunity to influence plans despite promises.
- This demonstrates broken promises and a bad faith process.
- Furthermore, the NT in the public meeting in June 2025 publicly questioned my integrity suggested that I had agreed to all this detail in September 2023. (The plan by JBA wasn't even written until over a year after that meeting). This was disingenuous.

"Big Nature, Better Access" Program Level:

- NT made explicit public commitments in March 2024 to CDC for a working group including Parish Council and community representatives, which this project falls under.
- 18 months on, this democratic framework remains unfulfilled.

Page 15 of 24

- It is clear from the minutes of the 9 July 2025 meeting that this project falls under the "Big Nature, Better Access program" from a NT perspective.

Impact: CDC should demand evidence of claimed consultations and question why statutory bodies are being consulted after planning permission rather than before. Without this, this application should be rejected.

The NT's own Cultural Heritage Curator suggests the view of the parkland thus:

The proposed plan simply does not meet this description, which itself weakens the Historic England expectation of a "spine of open water" in the valley bottom. The proposed wetlands in the Grade II listed parkland is anything but "subtle".

Page 16 of 24

7.

TECHNICAL ADEQUACY FAILURES

No Performance Framework or Success Criteria

The application confirms experimental intervention without planning:

No Quantitative Targets:

- Application provides no silt capture targets.
- No assessment of intervention capacity or water flows intercepted.
- No defined metrics for success - crucial issue for Grade II listed parkland that is being permanently changed.

- The application does not define any measures of success or failure which means that any result is acceptable to the NT, and by implication any planning approval by the CDC would allow any outcome without recourse. Approval will equate to the NT being give a carte blanche, whatever the outcome.
- At the meeting of 9 July (minutes not provided by the NT in this application) the consultants JBA admitted there is no timeframe for meeting silt capacity in the new scrapes

No Management Planning:

- In the application there is no ongoing management plan for debris interventions. The planned flow deflectors and leaky dam will no doubt require maintenance to free blockages etc (There must be a plan for such activity for it to be credible.)
- Current blockages demonstrate dynamic management needs.
- There is no contingency plan for removal if interventions fail or cause flooding
- This is no long-term stewardship framework.
- JBA consultants admitted on 9 July 2025 that the "leaky dam" will require maintenance.

Site Conditions Mischaracterized

Historical context ignored:

- The area to the East of the ditch, within the Grade II listed parkland is described as having "periodic standing water" ignores fact it was dry meadow until 1990s.
- This area only became waterlogged when Thames Water dredged river and piled debris on bank, and the ditch running South to North has not been maintained at all.
- The application therefore fails to address or attempt to understand how recent changes created the current conditions. The proposed plan makes the situation worse rather than better.

Page 17 of 24

Visual Impact Assessment Inadequate:

- Project Consultants are "marking their own homework" on heritage impact.
- Their claims of "limited" or "negligible" or "neutral" impact from replacing green meadow with wetland/swamp are dismissing real issues and ignoring the community's concerns.
- Independent consultation of this factor specifically should be required from Historic England and Gardens Trust.

Page 18 of 24

8.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK COMPLIANCE FAILURES

Enhanced Heritage Protection Standards

Applications in Conservation Areas and Grade II registered parkland face significantly heightened requirements:

Section 72 Duties: "Considerable importance and weight" must be given to heritage preservation. We trust the planning authorities will give considerable importance and weight to preserving the heritage of this Grade II listed parkland. The character of this part of the local estate has changed considerably over recent decades.

Grade II Registered Parks: Require "great weight" under NPPF Para 212 with

mandatory Gardens Trust consultation (no evidence provided)

Page 19 of 24

CONCLUSION AND REFUSAL GROUNDS

This application demonstrates comprehensive institutional failure incompatible with heritage stewardship responsibilities.

Refusal Required on Grounds of:

1. Procedural Inadequacy - Critical infrastructure omitted, obsolete baseline conditions, missing appendices.
2. Technical Inadequacy - Century-spanning heritage issues, ignored primary sources, no performance framework.
3. Heritage Protection Failure - Inadequate assessment violating NPPF requirements, withheld CMP, ignored community heritage analysis.
4. Consultation Exaggeration- Statutory bodies consultation doesn't appear to have occurred, against the applicant's own internal stated recommendations.

No planning permission should be granted for works based on obsolete site conditions, unsubstantiated consultation claims, ignored heritage research, and experimental interventions without success criteria in Grade II listed parkland.

CONSTRUCTIVE WAY FORWARD

This objection supports genuine environmental improvement through proper process. While this application must be refused due to comprehensive failures, the underlying environmental objectives merit consideration through collaborative catchment management as originally promised but so far not met under the "Big Nature, Better Access" working group framework.

Proposed Collaborative Approach:

- Evidence-based assessment using systematic monitoring data.
- Respect for heritage significance through minimal intervention principles.
- Utilisation of community expertise alongside professional knowledge.
- Catchment-wide solutions rather than isolated interventions.
- Proper consultation honouring explicit commitments. Presenting plans as a "fait accompli" and then characterising this as "consultancy" is not an adequate strategy.
- Cost-effective data-driven interventions at appropriate locations outside heritage constraints.

I stand ready to engage constructively in such partnership, bringing systematic monitoring data, published heritage research, and decades of local knowledge to support effective environmental stewardship that respects both heritage significance and community priorities.

I object to this application on the grounds that it will result in a significant negative impact on the traditional and historical landscape Park setting of this Grade II Listed heritage asset.

The National Trust itself has provided details in its Design & Access Statement on how damaging the development will be to the existing landscape. It will dramatically change the open views and

landscape setting as a result of the wooded areas becoming wetter and low-lying fields becoming flooded more frequently, which will significantly alter the character and Listed heritage asset's setting by incorporating unnatural human-made development. This application significantly affects not only the Listed heritage asset, but the very heart of the village of Sherborne and the brook in the valley.

The application site is on Grade II Listed registered parkland and as such deserves to be protected from the intrusive development of lowering the existing flood plain over such a large area, the introduction of material into an open river and channel, engineered bank lowering, partial blocking of the footbridge and levelling of the topography and landscape to fulfil the applicant's plans. It is HARMFUL to the Listed setting.

The application provides no measure of "success" in terms of volumes of water or silt, or appearance, with the NT claiming it is a "suck it and see" project. This makes it a pure experiment with no clear outcome which I suggest is therefore totally unsuitable for a Grade II listed landscape. There are no plans for ongoing maintenance or contingencies in case of over-flooding. I wonder whether any Councillors or Planning Officers are aware of the beauty of the Broadwater prior to the NT's acquisition of the Sherborne Estate? As a daughter of the farming family which maintained this Listed parkland for three generations and who grew up swimming and boating in the lakes either side of the weir, I can attest to the singular beauty of the Broadwater when it was properly maintained, and the joy the spectacular view gave not only villagers and walkers, but also visitors to the graveyard which overlooks this most special valley.

I - and many others who grew up or lived in Sherborne before the National Trust accepted Lord Sherborne's bequest of the Sherborne Estate in the 1980s - consider it a disgrace and travesty that this spectacular parkland has been totally neglected over several decades by the National Trust, through lack of maintenance and dredging.

The historical importance of this application and its negative effects on the Listed parkland are much more important than the NT is willing to consider or acknowledge.

This NT application seeks to experiment with this Listed parkland setting and heritage asset in such a way that the planning and conservation officers should seek its refusal 100%.

I submit that these factors make a clear case for planning refusal.

The Sherborne Broadwater was engineered around the 18th Century to provide a beautiful view of the centre of Sherborne Park, the standout feature in the landscape of the Sherborne estate. The two weirs enable control of water flow during different seasons. The pasture on either side was managed by rotated grazing of stock that preserved the grassland either side of the chalk stream brook which widened to enable a lack that was historically utilised for low impact leisure activities such as boating and fly fishing. The ponds required regular dredging to free the silt and weed, that enables an environment that attracted extreme biodiversity. During my childhood these are hosted plentiful waterfowl, kingfishers, dippers, wagtails, even the occasional osprey and the now rare water voles that were a daily sight in my childhood. Native brown and stocked rainbow trout were abundantly visible through the clear water. In recent years due to lack of investment and management by the current landlords, it has been allowed to silt up, water flow has reduced and weed has proliferated unchecked. It is now a shameful spectacle for the visitor and the low lying land resembles a bog with less biodiversity, poorer access for walkers and visitors. In addition the road adjacent to the bridges at either end frequently floods as a consequence of the

poor management of the rain run off

The land does not lend itself to a flood plain and the likely consequence would be flooding of the roads at either end, reduced access to the pasture either side and degeneration. The field to the south of the brook and the wooded area to the east are already often flooded during times of high precipitation and the preservation of the banks and the regular dredging of the brook were instrumental in enabling these areas to drain.

The plans and justification appear to have entirely short-term consequences as inevitable the proposed flood plain would silt up rapidly. Evidence that biodiversity would increase by these plans is unconvincing and returning to maintaining it properly as was done historically would be more promising to improve and restore biodiversity.

The Gillat's water meadow project was also, in my opinion, as somebody who walked there from childhood until leaving home, a misguided and catastrophic failure and complete waste of the Trust's money. This was the result of a misconceived idea in the first place, to reverse ground engineering executed over a generation by the previous tenants, that made it usable and to attempt to reverse history to return to an archaic ridge and furrow system. During this era historically prior to drainage and landworks the land was barely usable without a number of resident workers or management and it was naive to try to realise this misguided vision.

Restoration investment on the Sherborne Estate would be much better directed at preservation of the dilapidated buildings at Northfield Barn, and upgrading the many houses in Sherborne village that remain empty despite a shortage of housing of the very local people who would be able to contribute to the estate.

Even a flood plan would require significant management and the result would be decidedly less attractive than the carefully designed parkland that was once the jewel of the Windrush Valley and one of the unique features that attracted visitors to Sherborne.

I object to this application as it will result in a significant physical impact and changing of the traditional and historical landscape Park setting of this Grade II Listed heritage asset.

The NT have provided details in their design & access statement on how damaging the development will be to the existing landscape. And how it will dramatically change the open views and landscape setting as a result of the wooded areas becoming wetter, low lay fields becoming flooded more often which will significantly alter the character and Listed heritage asset's setting by incorporating unnatural man made development. This application significantly affects not only the Listed heritage asset, but the very heart of the village and the brook in the valley bottom.

The application site is Grade II Listed registered parkland and deserves to be protected from the intrusive development of lowering the existing flood plain over such a large area, the introduction of material in to an open river and channel, engineered bank lowering, partial blocking of the footbridge and levelling of the topography and landscape to fulfill the applicant's plans and is contrary to the Listed setting.

There are 28 Listed buildings within 500 metres of the project area and the proposal will greatly reduce access for the public and residents to the application area. The permitted access routes and crossings will be severely restricted as a result of the proposed application and increased flooding of the valley.

The NT's view in support of this application is to have 'a hands off' approach and in their words to let the natural process work as far as possible. They suggest we think of the area as a 'sponge'.

The NT say that intervention should be minimal, but the application's proposals are very intrusive and negatively affects the listed setting and landscape. The NT have historically neglected the current river.

The historical importance of this application and its negative affects on the Listed parkland are much more important than the NT are willing to consider.

The project application provides no measure of "success" in terms of volumes of water or silt, or appearance, with the NT claiming it is a "suck it and see" project. This makes it a pure experiment with no clear outcome which I suggest is therefore unsuitable for a Grade 2 listed landscape.

There are no plans for ongoing maintenance or contingencies in case of over-flooding.

The project plan refers to a Conservation Management Plan which is dated 2023. This project relies on that CMP. This plan has not been released by the NT for reasons they are unwilling to explain. Without being able to examine the CMP public examination of the project cannot be done.

The application document referring to community consultation is missing three important appendices. There has been no reference to the Parish Council endorsed Statement of Community heritage significance.

I submit that these factors make a clear case for planning refusal.

I provide this comment as an Objection on a number of grounds. The 6000 character limit demands this objection is in summary only. A detailed document with comprehensive supporting files will be sent to the planning officer.

I am a retired engineer with landscape analysis expertise living in a property adjacent to the project area. I inspect the Brook once or twice daily and am uniquely familiar with its characteristics. I have studied the Brook, taken measurements over an 18 year period, collected silt and associated data and assisted the EA in its studies of this portion of the Brook. I sit on the steering committee of the Windrush Catchment Partnership and am familiar with a number of related issues. I have also extensively researched the local history.

My objections are:

1. The application ignores the water supply to my house and indeed Scrape No 1 cuts directly across it. JBA consultants appear to not have been told of this essential utility service. The NT are aware of this pipeline, the subject of documented discussion between me and the NT over 15 years and is based on a legal document of 1972. I provided a copy of this deed to the NT when they lost their copy. In the last two years there has been more documented dialogue and site meetings where the line of the water supply was agreed and marked. All other services are marked. My legally established water supply service should not be ignored and therefore risked by this project.
2. The application which purports to prevent silt entering the lakes fails to analyse the source of the silt. Recent events have dramatically limited the amount of silt, namely dredging the lake 600m upstream at Haycroft which has created a successful silt trap, and work to divert road run off from entering the brook at Waterloo Bridge has been recently undertaken. Since these events I have observed very little silt in the Brook. Why spend a large amount of money addressing a problem that may no longer exist?
3. The application mischaracterises the water entering the Brook via a ditch to the south, which is to be blocked. It describes this as field drainage implying it only runs after weather events. It is not, it is a significant clear spring running 365 days a year. This will fill the scrapes with clear spring

water daily, not occasional silt-laden water.

4. The application is vague and inconsistent about the dates of the lakes, crucial in the broader context. One part suggests the lakes may have been created in the late 18thC/early 19th C for "amenity purposes". A separate part, quoting the CMP, suggests the lakes were formed c1820 as reservoirs for three mills downstream. There are no mills downstream until one in Windrush well after the Brook enters the River Windrush, and two more in Barrington. That makes little sense from a hydraulic engineering perspective, and there are no sources supporting that contention. This ignores recent analysis of primary sources showing a dam and sluice existed in the location of the current upper weir below the Broadwater in 1709, and both lakes are shown on a map of 1777. Primary archive sources show that hydraulic work including the construction of sluices was taking place here in the 1730s, after Bridgeman's known presence on the estate. The historical context is therefore more important than the NT are willing to consider.

5. The project plan is based on a desk-based study from April 2024, establishing crucial water heights. This is no longer valid since storms in November 2024 toppled two oak trees into the key area of the Brook, raising water levels by a measured 150mm, at least. This is a fundamental change that I have pointed out to the NT and their consultants but which has not been addressed. Thus the project plan is invalid. Elsewhere there are inconsistencies in levels AOD.

6. The project application provides no measure of "success" in terms of volumes of water or silt, or appearance. This makes it a pure experiment with no clear outcome which I suggest is therefore unsuitable for a Grade 2 listed landscape. There are no plans for ongoing maintenance, or contingencies in case of over-flooding.

7. The project plan refers to and relies upon a Conservation Management Plan which is dated 2023. This plan has not been released by the NT for reasons they are unwilling to explain. Without being able to examine the CMP public examination of the project cannot be done, so the application is invalid.

8. The Flood Risk Assessment contains crucial errors. The "extreme" condition of a 1 in 100 year flood event, plus a 43% margin for climate change is plotted which includes a flood on my property. I have noted that this extreme flood point has been exceeded 4 times in the last year alone. I can provide dates and photographic evidence. This invalidates the FRA. I have pointed this out to the NT and JBA, they have promised to respond but have not done so. A direct failure in consultation.

9. The project's own documentation specifically makes the recommendation to the NT that the plan should be examined in detail by Historic England and the Gardens Trust PRIOR TO PLANNING SUBMISSION. I have had documented dialogue with Jo McAllister at Historic England and with the local Gardens Trust and neither have been consulted on this detail. McAllister confirmed she has not seen the detailed plans or CMP. This makes the application procedurally invalid and the consultative claims in the application unsubstantiated. The application should be refused on these grounds alone. I also confirm that the Windrush Catchment Partnership is keen to be consulted on the detail and contribute to the plan but documented exchange shows the NT are only willing to do this after the planning process is complete.

10. The application document referring to community consultation is missing three crucial appendices. There has been no reference to the Parish Council endorsed Community Heritage Statement.

This application should be refused.

The land subject of this application is Listed Parkland owned by the National Trust (NT) and in itself is suffering from serious inattention and poor maintenance. The watercourse referred to in the application is already degraded, continues to degrade and is in a sorry state. The application by the NT seeks to further this decline so as to completely change the original character of the Park, old vistas, old amenity. It may well seriously damage existing landowners rights. The grounds in support of the application fail on almost all counts eg: inappropriateness; not in harmony with the landscape; no meaningful prior consultation; loss of historic character; failure to address issues of access and exit.

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed wetland development on the following grounds: Failure to Meet Stated Objectives Having reviewed the planning proposal in detail, I do not believe the scheme will achieve its stated environmental or ecological objectives. The proposed works appear likely to cause more harm than benefit to the existing landscape and water system. **Negative Impact on Water Flow and Hydrology** The proposal would remove water from the brook and significantly reduce its natural flow, which is both destructive and unnecessary. This alteration risks long-term damage to the hydrological balance of the area and may have wider ecological consequences downstream. **Destruction of the Brook's Natural Course.** The plan involves dismantling and altering the natural course of the brook, which has evolved over centuries. Such interference is contrary to principles of sustainable landscape management and would irreversibly damage a valued natural feature. **Harm to a Grade II Listed Historic Landscape** The proposed development would irreparably harm a Grade II listed historic landscape dating back to the 18th century. The parkland's historic and aesthetic integrity would be lost through inappropriate engineering works, in direct conflict with national and local heritage protection policies. **Existing Wetland Provision** The estate already contains ample wetland areas, including the established water meadows, which the National Trust has not managed and neglected for many years. Creating additional artificial wetland within the open parkland is unnecessary and would compromise the landscape's open character, which is intrinsic to its historic significance. **Lack of a Credible, Funded Management Plan** The proposal lacks a credible, funded long-term management and maintenance plan. Without proper provision for upkeep, the constructed dam and channels will inevitably silt up and clog, leading to stagnation, flooding risk, and further ecological and visual deterioration. **Overall Harm and Strong Objection** Taken together, these issues demonstrate that the proposal would cause substantial and irreversible harm to the landscape, heritage, and hydrology of the area, without delivering clear or sustainable benefits. I therefore object to this application in the strongest possible terms and urge the planning authority to refuse consent

I lived in Sherborne for a year from 1984/85 and was shocked to see the impact of neglect on the National Trust estate generally and Sherborne Broadwater particularly. My objection to the scheme is for the following reasons: a) Adverse heritage impact upon the historic parkland (a Grade II Registered Park & Garden). b) Adverse impacts on the settings of a number of nearby Listed Buildings. c) Negative visual impact upon local residential properties and public rights of way. d) Impact upon the special character of the Sherborne Conservation Area. e) The scheme appears not to comply with Local Planning Policy, namely Policies EN1, EN4, EN5, EN10 & EN11. f) Significant concerns over whether the proposed scheme will be effective in achieving its stated aims.

I object to this application on the grounds that residents were not given information about the available options with regard to the broadwater. What other plans were considered, and what would be the impact of each? Why was this plan chosen above others? What would the currently proposed plan look like upon completion, and in 10-20 years time? There are no artists' impressions or computer generated images of the outcomes. These are surely needed to help residents envisage the actual changes that would take place, should this plan be approved