



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Leeds City Council
Planning Services
Merrion House
110 Merrion Centre
Leeds LS2 8BB

Val Hepworth
Trustee
Conservation and Planning

conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

planning@leeds.gov.uk
department.of.planning@leeds.gov.uk

27th June 2023

Dear Sir/Madam

23/03314/FU Retrospective application for boundary treatment adjacent to main road, dry stone wall and hard standing, including 4 no. gates and proposed soft landscaping; Linton House, 40 Norwood Avenue, Menston, LS29 6GT.

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register. The site for this application is set within the grounds of High Royds Hospital which is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469 (now known as Chevin Park). The Yorkshire Gardens Trust (YGT) is a member organisation of the GT and works in partnership with it in respect of the protection and conservation of registered sites and is authorised by the GT to respond on GT's behalf in respect of such consultations.

High Royds Hospital was built as a mental hospital by West Riding County Council, and it was opened in 1888. It had been designed by the County Surveyor, Vickers Edwards. Edwards adopted an "echelon" layout for the wards – only the second such building in England. Constructed around the centre of its 100ha site the Hospital enjoyed a generous boundary of fields and trees. The hospital closed in 2003 and it has been progressively converted to residential use since 2007 to the present day. The site now consists of a carefully managed mix of original hospital buildings, now converted to residential use, and groups of new dwellings all set within the listed park.

Linton House, lies within the Registered Historic Park and Garden towards the north west, and we are informed by the applicant that it was built as part of the Hospital, as an "adolescent unit". It is now converted to form 6 dwellings (Planning Permission reference not recorded). The building is located somewhat away from the structured heart of the hospital, so that its setting is less "urban" than many of the other hospital buildings as it borders onto a horse field, etc.

We understand the "main road" referred to in the application to be Linton Avenue, not Bingley Road which borders the north of the land owned by the applicant. (Bingley Road forms the northern boundary of the registered site.)

We are disappointed that the Design and Access Statement does not note that the site is a Registered Park or Garden (HE ref 1001469).

We are somewhat confused by the “As existing Block Plan”, etc. which appears to show the site complete with the works which are in fact the subject of this retrospective application – it might be more informative if the “as existing” drawings showed the site “as pre-existing”.

We have no problems with the new stone wall.

But we are unhappy with the inappropriately large sizes of Gate A (dwellings 4, 5 and 6), and Gate B (dwelling 1). If Gate A needs to be large enough for Horse Box manoeuvring, etc then can it be designed to bring its appearance into keeping with its residential neighbours? As for Gate B, can it be reduced to the same size as Gates C and D?

As for the detail design of the gates, they will look better with black painted steel mid-bars, in place of the grey fibre cement boarded panels. But these are horizontal actions on sloping openings – and the large tapered gaps below are most unfortunate. Following a site visit we wondered if the thresholds can be adjusted so that they are horizontal, or more nearly so? However, this needs to be determined on site as a built-up section could look less pleasing.

We consider that the areas of tarmac are excessive and will be a problem in storms. We find the large area of tarmac/hardstanding associated with Dwellings 4,5 and 6 to be most unsightly (clearly overseen from the housing on the raised ground to the south). Can this be re-arranged so that the large area of heavy vehicle parking is relocated or reduced, or at least visually broken up by the introduction of secondary materials e.g. reinforced grass, interlocking paving, etc? Gravel would also be a visually pleasing alternative and would be helpful in terms of drainage.

Regarding the proposed planting, we note that apart from the birch (unspecified) and the single Canadian Maple, the proposed material is medium to low shrub/bush. But this site has supported more large trees in the past, and in our opinion, the arrangement of the property and its neighbours would lend itself to a collection of substantial, major specimen trees. In particular there is room for large trees in the south- west corner – rather than just low, suburban bushes.

Therefore, on the several grounds as noted, we object to this application.

Yours sincerely,

Val Hepworth
Trustee Conservation and Planning

cc. Historic England e-yorks@historicengland.org.uk; Conservation@ the Gardens Trust