



YORKSHIRE GARDENS TRUST

President: The Countess of Harewood

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

www.yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

Val Hepworth

Trustee

Conservation and Planning

Planning Services
Leeds City Council
Leeds

conservation@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk

planning@leeds.gov.uk

department.of.planning@leeds.gov.uk

10th October 2022

Dear Sir/Madam

22/05951/FU Sports pavilion and changing rooms, Ingle Lane, off High Royds Drive, Guiseley, LS29 6FS.

Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust. The Gardens Trust (GT) is the statutory consultee regarding proposed development affecting a site on the Register – High Royds Hospital, Grade II Listed Building, HE ref 1240191; and set within the grounds of High Royds Hospital, Grade II Registered Park and Garden, HE ref 1001469. 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. This application concerns a proposed new sports pavilion to service existing football pitches and an existing cricket pitch.

We understand that the original planning permission for the residential development of the site recognised the important social and sporting role of such a facility and ensured the provision of a sports pavilion as part of a Section 106 attachment. We further understand that permission was consequently granted for a substantial clubhouse in 2016 (16/06151/FU), but not constructed and that permission may have lapsed. This current application seeks to construct a smaller, simpler building.

We recognise that the proposed location is not only practical, but it is also prominent and, in this Grade II Registered Park, demands an appropriately sensitive, simple building. In this context, it is our view that the currently proposed building in terms of fenestration, elevations, massing and materials does not meet that challenge. We are disappointed that the Design and Access Statement does not acknowledge that the site is within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden and the consequent unsympathetic mean/clumsy design.

Although the pavilion site is some distance from the main buildings it does need to show respect for the old hospital. It's a beautiful setting, prominently located between mature trees, mown grass and the hospital – in a Grade II Park

We are additionally concerned at the prospect of uncontrolled PV panels on the roof. The layout “sketched” is muddled – can a controlled arrangement be adopted perhaps ensuring that the panels fall within an ordered area?

The application advises that no hedging is to be removed – but we note that there is a length of approximately 17m of mature hawthorn hedge apparently occupying the very location of the proposed building. Does this question need to be re-visited?

We note that the cricket pitch appears to be already served by a pavilion (Crompark Cricket Club), which is located further round the cricket boundary. Is the pitch to be served by two pavilions?

We note that, close to the existing clubhouse, there appears to be a substantial badger set. Does this need to be taken into account in the construction of the new building?

We are also concerned that the pavilion as shown could be hammered by footballs which are driven at the goal but miss. We note that the designer has “sensitively” omitted windows from this vulnerable side (except for the entrance doors) – but putting a building behind a goal may become a mistake. We also query whether the building will be large enough for all the pitches and players.

As it is our opinion that the currently proposed building design does not meet the challenge of this sensitive location, and we are concerned about the lack of control over PV panels, we conclude that we object to this application.

Yours sincerely,

Val Hepworth
Trustee Conservation and Planning

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